

Minutes of Investment Committee meeting held on
 Thursday 25 August 2016, 11.00-12.30
 Room 5.4, 15 Marylebone Road
 (as approved on 22 September 2016)

Members in attendance

Philip Young (PY)	Lay Member for Audit & Governance CWHHE CCGs, Chair
Dr Alan Hakim (AH)	Secondary Care Consultant, CWHHE CCGs; (by 'phone) [i]
Dr Raj Chandok (RC)	GP GB Member, Ealing CCG
Clare Parker (CP)	Chief Officer, CWHHE CCGs
Eva Horgan (EH)	Deputy Chief Finance Officer, CWHHE CCG's (obo Keith Edmunds)
Rohan Hewavisenti (RH)	Lay Member, Hammersmith & Fulham CCG [i]
Trevor Woolley (TW)	Lay Member, Hounslow CCG [i]
Simon Tucker (ST)	Lay Member, West London CCG [i]
Dominique Kleyn (DK)	Lay Member, Central London CCG CCG [i]
Dr Neville Pursell (NP)	Chair, Central London CCG
Dr Nicola Burbidge (NB)	Chair, Hounslow CCG
Dr Tim Spicer (TSp)	Chair, Hammersmith & Fulham CCG
<u>[i] = Independent Member</u>	
Non-members in attendance	
Jules Martin (JM)	Managing Director, Central London CCG
Neha Unadkat (NU)	Deputy Managing Director, Ealing CCG
Helen Poole (HP)	Deputy Managing Director, Hammersmith & Fulham CCG (item 6)
Glen Monks (GM)	Associate Director for Mental Health, (item 5 only, by 'phone)
Simon Carney (SC)	Head of Corporate Governance, CWHHE CCGs (Secretary)
Cathy Bowyer (CB)	Central London CCG Governance Officer (Minutes)

	Business items	Action
1.	Welcome / apologies	
	Apologies were received from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Edmunds (Chief Financial Officer, CWHHE CCGs) • Ben Westmancott (Director of Compliance, CWHHE CCG's) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Fiona Butler (Chair, West London CCG) 	
2.	Declaration of interests	
2.1	CCG Chairs and GP members' Practices were noted as potential recipients of investments discussed under Item 5, Out of Hospital Services. Recusal was felt to be unnecessary as the debate required such clinical input. However, the vote was withdrawn from all GP members for that item.	
3.	Minutes of meeting on 14 July 2016	
3.1	The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.	
4.	Matters arising and Action Log	
4.1	The matters arising and Action Log were not reviewed and were deferred to the September meeting due to the lack of time available.	
5.	Out of Hospital Services – Mental Health – 2015/16 payment approach <u>Note: the decisions for this item were taken by Independent Members only</u>	
5.1	Glen Monks gave an overview and thanked the committee for the opportunity to present the paper.	
5.2	The committee was asked to approve the recommended mental health service tariffs and payment approach for 2016/17.	
5.3	Engagement had achieved key outcomes highlighted in the paper, including structure of the tariff which had been changed to payment per activity rather than per year of care offered; the (Serious Mental Illness) SMI payments had been lowered in line with the (Complex Common Mental Illness) CCMI tariff.	
5.4	In discussion the following was raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within the original set of budgets, the prevalence of SMI was too low which produced a minimal cost through the CCG and incorrect variances; • it was helpful to note that the variation in uptake was not a reflection of the service quality but the differing approaches within each CCG and an increase was required; • there were no additional costs for implementation other than the tariff change. • it would be helpful if analysis was carried out regarding appointments which had been allowed for as not being taken up; and • it was difficult to gauge the severity of cases as patients may travel up and down the scale in response to individual life events, with the severe cases requiring more support from primary care. 	
5.5	The Committee was asked to approve the recommendation to retrospectively apply an activity based payment approach for Serious Mental Illness in 2015/16, in line with the recommendations from the six month review	
5.6	In discussion, it was noted that, although the figures were within the budgets of each CCG, the unused balances from 2015/16 may have been counted as an 'opportunity' going into 2016/17. This risked the 'savings' being allocated twice and for separate purposes.	
5.7	The Committee was asked to agree the approach for budget setting (prevalence vs. activity forecast) in view of affordability	
5.8	For information, tables 3.5 demonstrated there were reduced or no cost pressures	

5.9	<p>when using the 2016/17 tariff.</p> <p>Decision</p> <p>The committee:</p> <p>a) agreed that the word 'cap' was potentially misleading as it could be read out of context as a cap on patient access to the services rather than the reality where it is a cap on payments that would be made to Practices. Instead, this mechanism for limiting payments to practices should be expressed as a limit above which "...would not normally be paid unless exceptional circumstances were evidenced.";</p> <p>b) approved payment of the 2015/16 activity as per the 2015/16 tariffs as they apply to the actual level of activity undertaken; subject to such activity being established as correct and appropriately coded (via challenge routes up to and including audit);</p> <p>c) approved the use of the new 2016/17 tariffs from 01 April 2016;</p> <p>d) agreed that the proposals at b) and c) above should be tested on a number of practices to ensure they are received in the spirit of equity from which they were offered;</p> <p>e) noted that the year-to-date activity levels for 2016/17 suggested that it was highly unlikely that any cost pressure would arise in-year but that the Committee looked forward to the reach of this service broadening over time; and</p> <p>f) agreed that it would be useful for an analysis to be run exploring whether the payment threshold expressed at a) above had led to any unfunded activity in any Practices.</p>	
6.	<p>Hammersmith & Fulham CCG Network Plan Addendum</p>	
6.1	<p>Helen Poole presented the Hammersmith and Fulham Network Plan Addendum following the suggestion from the Investment Committee in March 2016, that the Network Plan be transferred to the Hammersmith and Fulham GP Federation for delivery from 1st July.</p>	
6.2	<p>In response to this, Hammersmith and Fulham GP Federation had formally communicated that they feel it would be preferable for the CCG to continue to manage all aspects of the Network Plan going forwards.</p>	
6.3	<p>The Committee was asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review the guidance developed for the outstanding elements of Network Plan 2016/17 (Referral Review and Non Elective Admissions); and • approve the elements within the Network Plan Addendum to then be considered by CCG Finance and Performance Committee and Governing Body. 	
6.4	<p>In discussion it was raised that the order of the document would be reviewed regarding language, as the case could be read as an exercise in rationing GP Services and, given this is far from the intention, the text should be carefully reviewed to ensure that the risks of this misinterpretation are minimised.</p>	

6.5	<p><u>Decision</u> The committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reviewed the guidance; and • approved the elements for consideration by the Hammersmith and Fulham Finance and Performance Committee and Governing Body. 	
7.	Any Other Business	
7.1	<p><u>West London CCG's Learning Sets 2016/17 Plan</u></p> <p>Noting that there had been significant engagement in correspondence regarding the underlying QIPP methodologies and assumptions beneath the modelling data, the Committee approved the 2016/17 plan.</p>	
7.2	<p>The Committee also agreed that the above modelling methodologies and assumptions should be reviewed in advance of any of the CCGs' 2017/18 plans being tabled for consideration</p>	
8.	Date and time of future meetings	
	22 September 2016	11.00 – 12.30 15 MBR