

Appendix 3

ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL DELIVERY MODELS

The Regionalisation Steering Group meeting held on 24th February used scoring of the models and information collected throughout the scoping phase to drive a discussion on the preferred models. The models were considered as combinations of delivery model (entity type) and structure (organisational configuration).

1. Delivery Models

The following delivery models were considered as part of the options appraisal process:

Model	Key points
Single LA hosting on behalf of other LAs	Steering group agreed that this option was not viable due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Scale and complexity is too large for a single LA to manage. <input type="checkbox"/> Organisational culture would be strongly influenced by the individual LA identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Likelihood of limiting membership of some LAs for political and geographical reasons.
LATC – a new LA owned entity	The steering group agreed that this model should be explored further. Key areas of discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Potential for strategic partnership with VAAs in a new LA-owned entity. <input type="checkbox"/> Lower procurement risk in this model.
LA-VAA joint venture	The steering group agreed that this model should be explored further. Key areas of discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> VAAs would prefer to be around the table. <input type="checkbox"/> The commissioning income stream is vital to VAAs. <input type="checkbox"/> Greater potential for competition and income generation.
Outsource to existing London VAA	This was eliminated prior to scoring as VAAs attending stakeholder forum identified significant concerns with this model as indicated in the single LA host commentary.

2. Structures

Within the above delivery models, a number of structures were considered:

Structure	Key points
Fully centralised: single London body	Steering group agreed that this option was not viable due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to deliver the adoption journey as mapped • Reduces benefit of local knowledge and relationships.
Hub and spoke: Central hub for London-wide co-ordination, commissioning, and delivery. Sub-regional spokes for delivery and local commissioning under the same organisation (not necessarily using current consortia).	Steering group agreed preference for this structure. Key points of discussion were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local enough to maintain relationship with child and adopter at centre. • Good balance of delivery at scale while retaining clear organisational structure. • Configuration flexibility – elements to be commissioned or delivered in hubs or spokes • Long term contract options for providers servicing spokes.
Tiered approach: top strategic tier, second strategic/ operational tier,	Steering group agreed that this option was not viable due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity to current arrangements likely to lead to continuation of postcode lottery. • Additional tiers adding complexity to management and funding arrangements.
As-Is+: current arrangement with more formalised partnerships	This was eliminated prior to scoring as DfE learning events identified that this would be viewed as insufficient change.

3. Recommendation

The steering group recommends the following preferred models for further investigation with regards to their governance, legal implications, procurement and financial implications:

- LA trading company delivery model with a strategic VAA partnership operating in a hub and spoke structure
- LA-VAA joint venture operating in a hub and spoke structure.