

## CWHHE Clinical Commissioning Group Collaborative

### Minutes of the Investment Committee meeting held on

Thursday 17 December 2015 12.05–13.30

Room 5.4, 15 Marylebone Road

(Approved on 18 February 2016)

#### Members in attendance

Philip Young (PY)	Lay Member for Audit & Governance CWHHE CCGs, Chair [i]
Trevor Woolley (TW)	Lay Member, Hounslow CCG [i]
Simon Tucker (ST)	Lay Member, West London CCG [i]
Rohan Hewavisenti (RH)	Lay Member, Hammersmith & Fulham CCG [i]
Dr John Riordan (JR)	Secondary Care Consultant, Ealing CCG [i]
Dr Tim Spicer (TSp)	Chair, Hammersmith & Fulham CCG
Dr Neville Pursell (NP)	Chair, Central London CCG
Dr Nicola Burbidge (NB)	Chair, Hounslow CCG
Clare Parker (CP)	Chief Officer, CWHHE CCGs
Keith Edmunds (KE)	Chief Finance Officer, CWHHE CCGs

[i] = Independent Member

#### Non-members in attendance

Matthew Bazeley (MB)	Managing Director, Central London CCG
Ian Robinson (IR)	Deputy Managing Director – Service Redesign, Ealing CCG
Rosalyn King (RK)	Director of Health Outcomes, Central London CCG
Siobhan Herron (SH)	Delivery Manager, Integrated Care, Central London CCG
Simon Carney (SC)	Head of Corporate Governance, CWHHE CCGs, Secretary

	Business items	Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome / apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Alan Hakim, Fiona Butler, Mohini Parmar, Ben Westmancott.	
1.2	The Chair informed the committee that, due to the lack of time available before the meeting to review the paper supporting item 6, it had been withdrawn from the agenda.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declaration of interests</b>	
2.1	There were no interests to record that had not been declared previously.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of previous meetings held on 12 November and (extraordinary meeting) 10 December.</b>	
3.1	The minutes were not discussed at the meeting, pending review.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Matters arising from the actions log</b>	
4.1	The matters arising were noted as either in train or on the agenda.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>CL CCG Whole Systems Integrated Care update, including Extension to Patient Referral System – assurance on six-month timeline</b>	
5.1	Matthew Bazeley introduced the item, explaining that the Committee had requested that a plan for the transition of the PRS into WSIC be tabled, along with assurances that there were no conflicts of interest arising from the investment in CLH and on value	

	for money generally. Such were included in the report for the Committee to discuss and note.	
5.2	MB highlighted in particular that the team’s analysis was that the providers were making sufficient progress towards new models of care to justify continuing development; following Central London CCG’s F&P Committee’s rejection of the provider’s WSIC business case, the providers were asked to restructure in order to provide a unified service that would deliver better quality but within the same cost envelope and would fit within Wave One of Whole Systems.	
5.3	MB also asked that the Committee’s support was sought the current direction of travel as an appropriate alternative to the formal procurement pathway, acknowledging that further work was required with the providers to costs, timelines and outcomes but also that it offered a robust test of the WSIC Business Case in a real world setting and there was a real momentum for change built with providers.	
5.4	<p>The Committee discussed the paper in significant detail and recognised that it represented a condensed view of a significantly larger whole. In agreeing that the need to maintain current momentum with providers was vital, the Committee also <b>agreed</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the conflict of interest(s) at play in the issue should be set out clearly and prominently at the beginning of the paper, including the steps taken to mitigate them. This point should apply to all papers tabled at the Investment Committee;</li> <li>• a broad comparison of costs to other CCGs of similar services should be undertaken to provide assurance that costs are generally within the right region;</li> <li>• the evidence supporting the analysis that formal procurement is not the route to follow at this time should be set out; and</li> <li>• the above information should be taken and considered in correspondence so as not to delay matters / risk losing the aforementioned momentum.</li> </ul>	<b>RK</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>This item was withdrawn from the agenda.</b>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Dementia Primary Care Link Workers and Management Protocol in Primary Care</b>	
7.1	Ian Robinson introduced the paper, flagging that the proposal represented an investment supporting the transition of services from secondary care.	
7.2	The Committee accepted that, clinically, the proposal looked to be the right approach as it better-reflected the complexity of the needs of the patients. However, the Committee felt that, before it could reach such a conclusion, the evidence base needed to demonstrate this clearly.	
7.3	<p>The Committee <b>agreed</b> that GPs are the only capable provider, subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• confirmation that there was no overlap between the proposal’s cohort of patients and those already attracting payments under Care Plans (ie there would be no double payments arising); and</li> <li>• clarity being provided to the relevant governance body (ie Ealing CCG’s F&amp;P Committee) of the savings elsewhere in the system that this proposal would</li> </ul>	<b>IR</b>

	realise.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Update on the development of NWL CCGs' Contract Database</b> (in attendance: Zaid Dowlut)	
8.1	Zaid Dowlut introduced the paper, which provided an update on how the unified contracts database was developing, a subject of significant and long-term interest to the Committee.	
8.2	The Committee was pleased to see progress but reiterated that its main concern was ensuring that the full picture of CCGs' contracting was visible to Governing Bodies and their F&P Committees. ZD reported that the next main step before this point could be reached was CCGs' own validation of the data as it is migrated over. He estimated that the contents of the database could be presented to Committees in January / February 2016.	
8.3	The Committee <b>agreed</b> that each Contract Lead, Finance Lead and Managing Director sign off explicitly on whatever is submitted to their CCG's F&P Committee.	<b>ZD / MDs</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
9.1	The Chair reported that the Investment Committee would need to take, in correspondence and over the Christmas break, a number of decisions relating to the CIS project, due to a number of conflicts of interest arising. The Chair assured the Committee that the decision papers, when circulated, would set out clearly what those conflicts are and how they have been mitigated, in line with the first bullet of para 5.4 above.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Date and time of future meetings</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 January 2016, 12.05 -13.30, Room 5.4, 15 MBR; and</li> <li>• 18 February 2016, 12.00 -13.30, Room 5.4, 15 MBR.</li> </ul>	