

Meeting: Strategic Commissioning Board			
Meeting Date	02 October 2019	Action	Consider
Item No	8	Confidential / Freedom of Information Status	No
Title	Bury System Urgent Care Review and Re-design Brief		
Presented By	Margaret O'Dwyer, Director of Commissioning & Business Delivery/Deputy Chief Officer		
Author	Margaret O'Dwyer, Director of Commissioning & Business Delivery/Deputy Chief Officer		
Clinical Lead	Dr Jeff Schryer, CCG Chair		
Council Lead	-		

Executive Summary
<p>A savings proposal and financial update report was submitted to the CCG Governing Body meeting on the 28th August 2019.</p> <p>The report proposed a number schemes and service reviews for prioritisation and development in 2020-21 which was based on the work undertaken to date and discussions at the Clinical Cabinet and Professional Congress. It can be noted that savings targets have been attributed to these reviews in line with service redesign and delivery of value for money principles.</p> <p>Attached is a copy of a scoping paper that has been developed in order to take forward the Bury System Urgent Care Review. The paper includes further details in relation to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Objectives • Services in Scope • Proposed Project Teams • Project Sub Structure • Required outputs • Key Local Reviews to be considered • Governance • Key Inter-relationships <p>A further discussion in relation to this scoping paper will also take place at the Bury Health and Wellbeing Board on the 2nd October 2019.</p>
Recommendations
<p>It is recommended that the Strategic Commissioning Board: -</p> <p>(i) Consider the Scoping Paper in relation to the Bury System Urgent Care Review.</p>

Links to Strategic Objectives/Corporate Plan	Yes
Does this report seek to address any of the risks included on the Governing Body / Council Assurance Framework? If yes, state which risk below:	No

Implications						
Are there any quality, safeguarding or patient experience implications?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has any engagement (clinical, stakeholder or public/patient) been undertaken in relation to this report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have any departments/organisations who will be affected been consulted ?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any conflicts of interest arising from the proposal or decision being requested?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any financial implications?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any legal implications?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any health and safety issues?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
How do proposals align with Health & Wellbeing Strategy?	See attached Brief.					
How do proposals align with Locality Plan?	See attached Brief.					
How do proposals align with the Commissioning Strategy?	See attached Brief.					
Are there any Public, Patient and Service User Implications?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
How do the proposals help to reduce health inequalities?	See attached Brief.					
Is there any scrutiny interest?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
What are the Information Governance/ Access to Information implications?	N/A					
Has an Equality, Privacy or Quality Impact Assessment been completed?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is an Equality, Privacy or Quality Impact	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implications						
Assessment required?						
Are there any associated risks including Conflicts of Interest?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the risks on the CCG /Council/ Strategic Commissioning Board's Risk Register?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Additional details	<p><u>Risks</u></p> <p>There are several common risks with the delivery of schemes including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that all decisions including gateway decisions are made robustly based on clear and accurate information/ evidence • Ensure that changes to services are managed safely • The requirement to maintain pace to ensure that outcomes are delivered as soon as safely possible • Due the demand led nature of the services commissioned, together with the requirement to deliver national targets, the range of options to support delivery of financial sustainability are limited in the short term. • The time over which organisational culture and public behaviour change takes to embed is not in line with the time required to become financial sustainable. • There could be qualitative and quantitative unintended consequences. • Some commissioning decisions required in the short term may not be in line with long term aims. • Reconfiguration of services are likely to generate stranded costs that the system will need to bear in the short to medium term. <p><u>Stakeholder engagement</u></p> <p>It is critical that we work effectively with all</p>					

Implications	
	<p>stakeholders to ensure that service developments and changes are delivered safely, 'right first time' and at pace. This is achieved by having all stakeholders involved and contributing to the delivery of schemes through multi-disciplinary and multi-organisation scheme delivery teams.</p> <p>Due to the complex nature of services, the risk of unintended consequences and the large web of interdependencies, an agile approach to delivering change will be adopted with clear gateways where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • progress can be assessed • decisions to continue can be made • necessary changes to the approach can be made • communication about progress can be shared with stakeholders • impact assessments can be revisited as required <p>A process will be agreed, and the progress will be monitored through the Health and Care Recovery Board (which reports to the Joint Executive Team) with regular updates to Strategic Commissioning Board, Clinical Cabinet and Professional Congress.</p> <p>All relevant policies have and will be adhered to in this process e.g. decommissioning and engagement policies.</p> <p><u>Conflicts of Interest</u></p> <p>Conflicts of Interest will be taken into account in line with the statutory obligations of both the CCG and Council.</p>

Governance and Reporting		
Meeting	Date	Outcome
<i>Governing Body</i>	28/08/2019	Governing Body
Health and Wellbeing Board	02/10/2019	To be discussed further

Bury System Urgent Care Review and Re-design Brief

1. Review Objectives

- Improve performance of 4 hour waits to reach the Provider Sustainability Fund agreed trajectory of 92% at FGH by March 2020
- Reduce Non-Elective Admissions at FGH (metrics tbc)
- Deliver £2.6m savings from current spend from Urgent Care Services “in scope” by April 2020
- Redesign to simplify access points to improve patient experience

2. Services in-scope of Review:

- Accident and Emergency at PGH
- Urgent Care Treatment Centre at FGH
- Walk in Centres at Moorgate and Prestwich
- GP Out of Hours Service (BARDOC)
- GP Extended Access (Direct Enhanced Services, now commissioned via the Primary Care networks to ensure additional 30 min access per 1000 population)
- GP Extended working Hours (Extends appts 6.30 – 8 p.m. and at weekends)
- GP in hours – availability of appointments
- Green Car service
- Same Day Emergency Care
- Integrated Virtual Clinical Hub (tbc)

3. a) Proposed Project Teams

J. Schryer	Urgent Care Chair and SRO
N. Parker	Programme Manager (tbc)
K. Patel	LCO MD
S. O'Hare	CCG Finance and Analytics
D. Latham	CCG Urgent Care Commissioner
K. Lee	CCG Urgent Care Commissioner
S. McCallum	Senior Clinical Leads, FGH
A. Abbass	Senior Clinical Leads, FGH
K. Wynne Jones	LCO Senior Manager
S. Taylor	LCO Senior Manager
I. Trafford	LCO, Urgent Care PMO Lead
V. Riding	CE, BARDOC
K. Gibbons	FGH Senior Urgent Care Manager
L. Williams	FGH Senior Urgent Care Manager

with support from:

S. Barnard	GM Urgent Care Lead
A. Osei	GM Primary Care Manager

b) To be identified:

- PMO Support via SRFT/NCA

- Analytics support from GM and NCA
- c) Project sub structure to include:
- Finance
 - BI / analytics
 - Workforce
 - Estates
4. Outputs
- High Level Project Plan to go to Governing Body on 28 September 2019.
 - Final Project Plan with key milestones and timelines to Governing Body on 23 October 2019.
 - Regular update reports to the Governing Body with savings to commence from April 2020.
5. Key Local Reviews to be considered:
- North of England Commissioning Support Unit Capacity and Demand Review – September 2019
 - Utilisation Management Review of ED attendances at FGH – September / October 2019
 - Emergency Care Intensive Support Team (ECIST) Review of FGH – September 2019 which will also support the Intermediate Care Review (below)
 - Various reports developed by the CCG vis-à-vis reviews of urgent Care in Bury
 - FGH local analysis (August 19) of ED Growth
6. Governance
- This Project to be part of the Bury/NCA Transformation Programme (link: Jude Adams)
 - Project Group to be established to include: J Schryer as Chair, S Taylor (MD, FGH), G little (Accountable Officer), Kth Wynne-Jones (LCO), S Barnard as Representative from GM, N Parker (Project Manager), Councillor A Simpson
7. Key inter-Relationships:
- Intermediate Tier Review (on-going, also with a separate savings target, Scope of Review includes Integrated Discharge Team; recommendations from this Review should support flow across the Urgent Care System)
 - Review of Operating Model for Integrated Neighbourhood Teams