MoJ is undertaking this market engagement ("ME") alongside the ‘Strengthening Probation, Building Confidence’ public consultation, which was launched on 27 July 2018. Please note the following, MoJ:

is not liable for any costs incurred by anyone who chooses to participate in this ME;
may choose and/or be obliged to disclose information submitted to it as part of this ME. In particular please note MoJ is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (as amended) and the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (as amended);
makes no guarantee, representation nor warranty (express or implied) with respect to any information disclosed as part of this ME;
MoJ shall not be liable for any loss or damage arising as a result of reliance on information disclosed as part of this ME and/or from any participation in the ME; and is not committed to any course of action as a result of this ME.
Session objectives

- Provide an update on development of the possible models following previous feedback
- Obtain views on the latest versions of the models
- We have still not made any final decisions about which model to use and all aspects of the strawmen are still just proposals for discussion to help us to develop options and make final decisions
Caseload volumes

• Suggestions for a mix of caseload and starts – we have proposed a caseload model but higher weighting for first three months

• Caseload mix – we have suggested using different weights for different tiers to account for caseload mix

• Tiering would probably be based on primarily static risk level at allocation, but still being considered if could/should be dynamic through sentence

• Alternative to weighting – for length or risk – would be for bidders to use an average of caseload mix in each CPA, may be simpler but this mix could change over time and thus mean under or over-resourcing
NPS use of services

• Volume bands for RAR/licence rehab activities, unpaid work and accredited programmes, including expected numbers of contracted provider and NPS cases

• For RARs, the number of days for contracted provider cases would be the maximum number of days (forecast to be) ordered by the court for the RAR; for NPS cases the number would be based on the number of days per structured intervention (forecast to be) referred to the contracted provider, rather than the full RAR
Volume bands

• General feedback that Authority should set volume bands due to complexity

• Concern that this won‘t fit every bidder‘s operating model and bands might be too wide to reflect actual cost increases of some models

• Would like to re-check whether Authority-set volume bands is still market‘s preferred approach

• As suggested by market, propose six months‘ notice for expected sustained decreases and three for increases
Open book accounting

• Reduction of supplier reporting burden by provision of access to supplier accounting systems rather than provision of template (aside from high level management info) – is this feasible?

• If so, could costs be coded according to Authority categorisations?

• Could Authority also input into audit scope to reduce Authority assurance burden?
Investment and innovation

• We believe that changes in service delivery within the scope of the contracted specification and cost should be easily managed within the model, if for instance actual costs are lower than target costs additional money should be available for spending on other areas within service

• Can you foresee any longer-term investments that would not be made in-year?

• Option of possible three-way split with some money into an innovation fund
Next steps

General Q&A

Round-table discussion of detailed questions

Please send any further feedback by cob Friday 16 November at ProbationCommercialTeam@justice.gov.uk

Thank you.