



Finance & Investment Committee (F&IC) Minutes

Venue: Kirkstall & Fountains, Springhill 1, WF2 0XQ
Date: Thursday 3 March 2016
Time: 1400 hours
Chairman: Mary Wareing

Membership:

Mary Wareing	(MW)	Non-Executive Director & Chairman of F&IC
Pat Drake	(PD)	Non-Executive Director
John Nutton	(JN)	Non-Executive Director
David Macklin	(DM)	Executive Director of Operations
Robert D Toole	(RDT)	Executive Director of Finance & Performance (Interim)
Alex Crickmar	(AC)	Deputy Director of Finance
Roberta Barker	(RBa)	Interim Executive Director of HR

Apologies:

Roberta Barker	(RBa)	Executive Director of HR (Interim)
----------------	-------	------------------------------------

In Attendance:

Della Cannings	(DC)	Chairman (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 4.1, 5 and 13)
Anne Allen	(AA)	Trust Secretary (Observing)
Barrie Senior	(BS)	Non-Executive Director (Observing)
Ronnie Coutts	(RC)	Non- Executive Director (Observing)
Mike Fairbotham	(MF)	Head of Procurement (Items 15 & 16)
Deborah Ridley	(DR)	Portfolio Manager (Transformation & Hub & Spoke Programme Lead (Item 13)
John Loughran	(JLo)	Financial Capital Projects Manager (Item 13)
Matt Norman	(MN)	Head of Financial Strategy (Item 8)
Mark Squires	(MS)	Associate Director of Support Services (Item 16 & 17)
Kurt Stephen	(KS)	Senior Business Finance Manager (Item 9)
Chris Dexter	(CD)	Managing Director, PTS (Item 9)
Victoria Boundy	(VB)	Head of Contracting (Item 14)
Neil Cook	(NC)	Financial Projects (Item 8)
Ian Hinitt	(IH)	Interim Head of Estates (Item 6 & 7)
Mark Phillips	(MP)	Financial Performance Manager (Items 10 & 11)

Minutes produced by:

Joanne Lancaster	(JL)	Committee Services Manager
------------------	------	----------------------------

		Action
	The meeting commenced at 1425 hours.	
1.	<p>Introduction and Apologies MW welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologised for the delayed start of the meeting.</p> <p>RBa apologies were noted and MW commented that HR representation on the Committee should be addressed for future meetings.</p>	
2.	<p>Declaration of Interests for any item on the agenda There were no interests to be declared in relation to the agenda items but would be noted throughout the meeting should they arise.</p>	
3.	<p>Feedback from Board Meetings This item was not discussed.</p>	
4.	<p>Minutes of the Meetings held on 3 December 2015 The minutes of the Finance & Investment Committee Meeting held on 3 December were reviewed and the following amendments noted:</p> <p>The Chairman should be noted under 'In Attendance' rather than under present. To revert the template back to Membership of the Committee rather than 'Present'.</p>	
4.1	<p>Action Log and Matters Arising The Action Log was reviewed and updated and it was noted that all actions on the log had been completed.</p> <p>JN raised a question in relation to Action 2015/60 – Sickness Absence and Annual Leave – asking if any further work had been undertaken on this.</p> <p>RC responded that it had been discussed at Quality Committee earlier that day and Kate Sims, Associate Director of HR had assured the Committee that there were no repeat offenders from the 13 cases identified. There had been one case that had gone on to a hearing.</p> <p>PD added that RC had stated that sickness within YAS was positive within EOC compared to some private/commercial organisations adding that YAS' attrition rates were the major challenge for the organisation.</p>	
5.	<p>For Approval: Workplan Review MW advised she had received some formal and informal comments from Committee members on the workplan. The intention was to</p>	

	Action
<p>have this on future agendas as a standing item for information.</p> <p>AC advised that that the FT Readiness Review should not be presented to F&IC on 12 May due to the delays in the FT application process and the timeline for the paper being presented to F&IC be reviewed.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the updated Workplan.</p>	
<p>13. For Assurance: Major Business Cases (including PIDs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hub and Spoke Doncaster Hub Update <p>This item was taken out of order of the agreed Agenda.</p> <p>MW welcomed DR and JLo to the meeting.</p> <p>DR introduced the presentation and advised that the Hub and Spoke project was moving apace. She advised that the SOC had been updated and ratified and the Estates review had been completed. As previously notified to the F&IC there was no external funding available to fund the project therefore a locally funded business case had been developed. DR emphasised that the vision for Hub and Spoke remained the same but that it required a different approach.</p> <p>DR guided F&IC through the Hub and Spoke Estates Review and advised that 10 year housing growth had been included in the plan adding this accounted for 450 thousand houses across 22 Local Authorities.</p> <p>DR advised that cumulative costs of the project to date totalled £1.8m adding that there was a potential impairment of £1.3m if the project did not progress to OBC Part 2.</p> <p>RDT added that £1.3m had been Capitalised and some project costs had been written off as revenue. It was intended to spread the cost of the £1.3m across the life of the Hub and Spoke project so that it would be written off as the project progressed in line with guidance from the NHS TDA. RDT commented that raised this may be a point for clarification with external audit at year end.</p> <p>JN asked if anything had been gained by the £1.3m spend. DR responded that YAS now had a lot of information on Estates as a result of the spend.</p> <p>DR outlined the Hub and Spoke Delivery Programme and referred to a table which showed the programme running over different timescales.</p> <p>Discussion took place around the positives and negatives of each</p>	

	Action
<p>timeline with the general consensus being that the 4 hubs in 5 years was realistic and achievable and could be progressed as individual schemes.</p> <p>The Chairman emphasised that YAS would need to be transparent in its decisions.</p> <p>DR advised the Committee that the Estates Review would be presented at F&IC in May.</p> <p>DR outlined the criteria used for the Doncaster hub and advised that where A&E Operations rota plans had changed the plans had been adapted.</p> <p>DR advised that as part of the Hub and Spoke concept that other providers were always considered and that 80% of 'stand by points' were co-located with partner agencies.</p> <p>DR guided F&IC through the Make Ready and VPS pilots. She advised that the 'hours off road' had been cut by two thirds with the Make Ready pilot. Both staff and patient feedback had been positive.</p> <p>In summary MW commented on the treatment of the £1.3m Hub and Spoke investment.</p> <p>RDT responded that it would remain on the balance sheet and would be discussed further at Audit Committee. The Committee noted the points regarding the accounting treatment and the approach being taken appeared reasonable.</p> <p>The Chairman asked if a Non-Executive Member should be more closely aligned to the Hub and Spoke project adding that it might be a role that would suit JN.</p> <p>DR advised that the scheme had been benchmarked against other ambulance services and YAS compared well and had gone over and above where other services were at the moment.</p> <p>MW thanked DR for the presentation and commented that she would look forward to a further update to the F&IC in May.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update and were assured by the progress on the Hub and Spoke project subject to the £1.3m being effectively accounted for and which may need further discussion at the Audit Committee.</p> <p>The Chairman (DC) left the meeting at 1510 hours</p>	

		Action
6.	<p>For Information: Sale of Gildersome Ambulance Station MW welcomed IH to the meeting.</p> <p>Introductions were made around the table.</p> <p>IH outlined the details of the paper which was to notify F&IC of the offers that had been received in regard to the sale of Gildersome Ambulance Station and the recommendations by YAS' property consultants Dacres Commercial.</p> <p>IH advised that Gildersome Ambulance Station had become vacant due to a move by the HART team to a more suitable location. The net value of the site was [REDACTED] and the Trust was seeking [REDACTED] to realise that amount.</p> <p>IH reported that bids had closed on 19 February and an unconditional offer had been received for an amount which had been substantially more than [REDACTED].</p> <p>IH advised that a further unconditional offer had been received on the site on 29 February which was a significantly greater amount than the previous unconditional offer. Dacres Commercial was undertaking the necessary checks of the most recent offer to ensure the offer was robust and viable.</p> <p>IH explained that there was the potential issue around 'gazumping' however, following advice from Dacres Commercial it would appear that YAS would be well within its rights to accept the higher offer even though it had been received later. As it had been an informal tender process and YAS had a right to seek higher offers. Dacres Commercial had advised that it was their opinion that YAS would not fall foul of procurement laws.</p> <p>IH added that in the interest of being open and transparent then Dacres had advised that the site now be opened up to 'best and final offer' inviting both parties who had made unconditional offers to re-submit a bid.</p> <p>RDT added that Procurement had been consulted in respect of adherence to public sector tendering requirements and were content with the proposals.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update and were assured by the process in place on the disposal of the Gildersome site subject to the necessary checks being carried out.</p>	
7.	<p>For Assurance: Contract for supply, provision and management of electricity IH outlined the paper which proposed the approach to buying</p>	

	Action
<p>electricity and for approval of a contract award using the Countess of Chester NHS Trust Framework.</p> <p>IH advised that the current contract was due to expire on 31 March adding that to maintain security of supply, the Trust would need to procure electricity from the market at a competitive price for the next 4 years.</p> <p>IH advised that the overall cost (including VAT) for a four year term Electricity Supply contract would be circa [REDACTED] per year).</p> <p>IH stated that wholesale electricity prices were currently at a five year low and that YAS could maximise the potential savings by locking in electricity purchases at the current levels which would be around circa 20% commodity savings.</p> <p>IH reported that there was the potential to save approximately £88k per annum conversely if YAS were to 'come out of contract' for electricity supply then the Trust might see an increase of 262% in commodity costs.</p> <p>The proposed contract through the Countess of Chester Framework was considered low risk and would enable the Trust to adopt a flexible strategy.</p> <p>MW questioned if other options had been explored.</p> <p>IH advised that the Countess of Chester Framework offered a great opportunity and other suppliers did not offer the same level of service so had been discounted.</p> <p>JN asked about the aggregation of demand with other Ambulance Services to drive down the cost further.</p> <p>IH confirmed that the Countess of Chester Framework offered the cost through a collective. As the current contract was due to expire there would not be sufficient time to explore combining with particular other Ambulance Services at this time but this could be considered in the future.</p> <p>AA advised that in the Terms of Reference for the Northern Alliance there was the intention to combine on procurement.</p> <p>MW thanked IH for the report and the update.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update and agreed to recommend to the Trust Board to proceed with the FEML through the Countess of Chester Framework.</p>	
<p>8. For Assurance : Service Line Management and Transformation Update and PLICS Demonstration</p>	

	Action
<p>MW welcomed finance team members NC and MN to the meeting.</p> <p>NC advised that the purpose of the paper was to update the Committee on the implementation of Service Line Management (SLM) into the Trust.</p> <p>NC reported that the Service Line Led approach to Business Planning for 2016/17 based on identifying barriers to Quality and Financial Sustainability was undertaken during December and January adding this was nearing completion to support the Service Line Objectives for 2016/17.</p> <p>NC confirmed that Monitor had issued Approved Costing Guidance in February 2016 and that the Trust could be assured that the current practice used in the development of PLICS was compliant with the principles laid down by Monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder engagement • Consistency • Data Accuracy • Materiality • Causality and Objectivity • Transparency <p>NC reported that there was six months of data within the PLICS for the test phase and the following demonstration aimed to show what the system was capable of adding that the figures contained within it were for illustrative purposes only at this point with further data cleansing to be undertaken.</p> <p>MN guided the Committee through a demonstration of the PLICS system showing the various management information that the system could provide and highlighting the levels to which the system could drill down to.</p> <p>RDT informed the F&IC that all the income and costs would be included in the system adding that the PLICS system would provide a lot of analysis for management, performance and financial information.</p> <p>JN expressed his belief that it was a very powerful tool provided it was populated with correct and accurate data.</p> <p>MW expressed concerns that the use of the system appeared to be moving towards reporting rather than having conversations with managers and staff.</p> <p>DM responded that as an Executive Director he felt assured that the system would provide him with the management information and data in order to make informed decisions whilst also being able to have discussions and engage with Service Line Managers. Previously without this data this would have been much more</p>	

	Action
<p>difficult.</p> <p>JN commented that he could visualise how this would be used, for example, in contract negotiations.</p> <p>RDT advised that he and NC had met with the suppliers of the system Bellis Hill to discuss what YAS would initially focus on in terms of the information it wanted.</p> <p>MW asked how PLICS would interface with the IPR.</p> <p>RDT responded that it would support the dashboards at service level and KPIs. He added that workshops were planned with A&E Operations, PTS and NHS 111 to agree what type of information the services required from the system.</p> <p>MW thanked NC and MN for the useful and insightful update.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update and were assured by the progress on Service Line Reporting and the progress of the PLICS system.</p>	
<p>9. For Assurance: PTS Update MW welcomed CD and KS to the meeting.</p> <p>CD guided the F&IC through the presentation. He advised that the presentation would cover the Financial Performance of the service as at the end of January 2016 and the performance of the CIP 15/16 and the proposed CIP for 2016/17. He would also outline the Financial Plan over the next year and the financial strategy issues to enable the service to achieve breakeven by 2017/18.</p> <p>RC asked if CD had the right resources in place to enable PTS to reach a sustainable position.</p> <p>CD responded that in his belief the service did not have the people with the skills set on change delivery or the resource to deliver the changes required adding that within the review undertaken there was a proposed Business Change Manager. He acknowledged that some of the change was about introducing changes such as SOPs and ensuring these were adhered to.</p> <p>RDT commented that he would like to see the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of the structures – current/proposed • What else was required to deliver the transformation <p>BS expressed concerns about the deliverability of the breakeven position of 2017/18 noting the short timescale to that point.</p> <p>JN referred to the Curzon report which had proposed a series of</p>	

	Action
<p>savings in year 1, year 2 etc., it appeared that some of the quick wins had been delivered but not the things that would yield the biggest savings.</p> <p>RDT responded that CD had joined PTS which was the least resourced service at management level adding that although the Curzon report had been reasonable with its proposals, they had not supplied any advice on how to deliver the savings. RDT referred to the Telematics system, which could be a powerful management tool, but this had not been followed up and hence had not been used to its full potential.</p> <p>MW raised concerns about the realistic deliverability of the 2017/18 breakeven position adding that the CIP lacked in its description of deliverables. She felt that the service was losing its vision and that was of concern.</p> <p>JN commented that CD should produce a plan that PTS could sign up to and work to with a clear timeframe and clear deliverables. This could be based on the Curzon report but be revised to reflect CDs viewpoint and YAS priorities.</p> <p>MW referred to the three contracts within PTS that were up for tender this coming year.</p> <p>RDT responded this would be a prime focus for the Business Development Team this coming year. He stated YAS was in a good position in that they knew the service and they knew the cost per job, they would be able to put in a sustainable and robust offer to Commissioners.</p> <p>Discussion took place around the breakeven position of 2017/18 with F&IC Members emphasising the need to remain to that timetable adding it was about ensuring that CD had the correct resource to enable him to deliver the required savings.</p> <p>JN asked about the apportionment of overheads to PTS.</p> <p>AC advised this is likely to change based on the recent PLICS work and the re-evaluating of the original overhead apportionments between services. DM observed that the transformation of PTS was not dissimilar to that of A&E Operations and suggested that there may be areas where resources might be shared.</p> <p>Action: DM to consider overlaps in the transformation programmes and if it would be appropriate to share resource in this regard.</p> <p>RDT stated his belief that due to the apportionment of overheads that the deficit within PTS was overstated however, he acknowledged it was not the most efficient of services. He felt that the resources</p>	<p>DM 2016/001</p>

		Action
	<p>required by CD should be put in place to deliver the transformation of the service and deliver the savings within the given timeframe.</p> <p>MW thanked CD for the update and stated that F&IC supported that PTS required resource to improve the service.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update of the report but did not gain assurance that the Quality & Efficiency Savings (CIP) would be delivered within the timeframe without extra resource to deliver the transformation and better definition of the CIPs themselves.</p>	
10.	<p>For Assurance and Discussion: Draft 2016/17 Budget Setting including Quality & Efficiency / Cost Improvement Programme (CIP), Revenue and Capital Budgets, Balance Sheet and Cash Flow</p> <p>AC outlined the details of the paper which presented to the F&IC the proposed income and expenditure budgets, capital plans and quality & efficiency savings (Cost Improvement Programme) for 2016/17. The paper also set out the Draft Balance Sheet and Cash flow Statement for 2016/17.</p> <p>AC advised that the budgets had been prepared in line with the approach outlined in the previous Financial Framework paper supported by TEG and F&IC.</p> <p>AC reported that as a result of the national financial pressures, the Trust had been set at challenging control total (I&E surplus target) of £5.1m for 2016/17 as previously reported to the Trust Board. He advised that the financial plan still assumed a £2.1m surplus financial position; however, this was still to be agreed with TDA / NHS Improvement. The gap between the two related to the financial penalties which YAS hoped to reinvest back into A&E Operations. Discussions were on-going with the Commissioners with YAS remaining firm in its negotiations in this regard.</p> <p>AC guided F&IC through the summary of key movements which were detailed at paragraph 3.5 of the report. AC specifically referred to CQUINs for the A&E/999 contract reporting that these were not achieved in 2015/16 by circa £0.9m. The Financial Plan for 2016/17 assumed full achievement of CQUINs based on the implementation of the new Project Management Office which would improve reporting, monitoring and management of schemes. This resulted in benefit to the financial position from 2015/16 of circa £0.9m.</p>	

	Action
<p>AC further referred to the introduction of the Pensions Act 2014 and its impact on the Trust's employers National Insurance contributions.</p> <p>AC advised that the Capital budget had been compiled after receipt of Capital bids from the various departments. The capital plans/bids had been prioritised and assessed by a multidisciplinary panel including clinicians and subject matter experts to ensure only essential capital programmed were taken forward given the constrained level of capital resource nationally.</p> <p>AC outlined the key financial risks in detail along with the RAG rating which had been allocated to each risk.</p> <p>AC advised that since the Trust Board meeting in December where the A&E Business Case had been presented, Commissioners intentions had been received by YAS. AC explained that there remained a significant difference between the amount requested by YAS and the offer by the Commissioners adding that negotiations were on-going and therefore was a significant risk to the financial plan.</p> <p>AC referred to the draft proposals that had been put forward which would see A&E Operations financial penalties calculated in a different way and would be based on an amount per missed call rather than the current methodology. AC would provide further details as they were received by the Trust.</p> <p>AC emphasised that YAS remained steadfast on negotiations with Commissioners and had outlined the trajectory ready for submission to them.</p> <p>BS observed that the Trust's Reserves were reduced which meant that there was not the same safeguard against the risks.</p> <p>AC responded that the Trust had followed best practice and had delegated budgets out to services for them to be able to deliver their services. This meant that services could better manage their own budgets rather than being held centrally.</p> <p>RDT reiterated that it was about allocating the funding where the money was being committed / spent.</p> <p>AC advised that the Trust had still been prudent with its allocation to reserves, however there were a number of financial risks as outlined</p>	

	Action
<p>in the paper.</p> <p>MW asked DM how the budget setting process had differed from previously from his point of view.</p> <p>DM responded that in his opinion there had been better discussions as to what funding the service required to enable it to deliver its service, he added that the approach had been more inclusive and had also given him a greater understanding of his budget.</p> <p>AC informed F&IC that the aim was to have a better alignment and link between business plans, budgets and performance than in previous years.</p> <p>MW thanked AC for the report and commented on the positive progress with the budget setting process.</p> <p>MW referred to the Extraordinary F&IC meeting scheduled for 15 March at 11.00 and it was agreed this would be in person rather than 'virtual'. It was agreed that Ian Walton and Keeley Townend should be invited.</p> <p>RDT advised that he would aim for the papers to be distributed 3-4 days in advance of the meeting but added that due to the timescales involved some papers might have to be tabled on the day.</p> <p>AC confirmed that 31 March was the deadline to sign the contract, after this date the Trust would go into the mediation and arbitration process if required.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance and Investment Committee noted the update and supported the proposed income and expenditure budgets, capital plans and Cost Improvement Programme for 2016/17, subject to any adjustment required once contracts have been finalised.</p> <p>AC left the meeting at 1655 hours.</p>	
<p>11</p> <p>For Assurance: Financial Review and CIP Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Risks • Year to date Financial Performance • IPR – Finance Section • CIP Tracker 	

	Action
<p>RDT outlined the details of the report which was to provide the Committee with an overview of the main points in relation to the Month 10 Finance position and the Integrated Performance report plus an update on the Trust's financial risks and any exceptional budgetary items of note.</p> <p>RDT reported that the Trust had submitted a revised financial plan to the NHS TDA in September in line with other Trusts nationally. Against the revised plan, in January the Trust reported an in month surplus of £297k, a favourable variance of £22k.</p> <p>JN commented that reserves had been released.</p> <p>RDT confirmed this had been the case. The Fiat chassis that had been ordered and should have been delivered by 31 March were not yet in the effective possession of the Trust. RDT felt confident that the Trust could justify its position in that the chassis' would be delivered as required to a freight-forwarder / shipping agent ex works and thus would be on the Trust's books at the committed amount. BS expressed his concerns about how this would be accounted for within YAS' accounts and discussion took place around this issue.</p> <p>RDT referred to preceptorship costs in month of £111k which had been incurred for newly qualified paramedics.</p> <p>DM informed F&IC of a potential issue in A&E Operations in this regard relating to nursing staff that had been appointed on a contract that contained certain arrangements. He explained that, although the service was not actively pursuing the issue, there had been a few individuals that had come forward with the potential for others to do so. The original arrangement would have to be honoured.</p> <p>MW questioned the £560k overspend within HR.</p> <p>RDT advised that there was some education income due which had not been claimed by YAS adding that there might be some offset against the amount.</p> <p>DM added that these were costs that were not well controlled within the budget, such as accommodation printing costs.</p> <p>RDT advised that Financial Services was considering financial processes across the Trust and would be tightening controls adding</p>	

	Action
<p>that a more coordinated and automated approach would be introduced with the appropriate levels of assurance, accountability and responsibility built in. A meeting was due to take place with Internal Audit to discuss overtime payments.</p> <p>MW thanked RDT for the update.</p> <p>Approval: The Board noted the update and gained assurance on the financial performance of the Trust to date and the risks to delivery of the full year forecast and the mitigation plans as detailed in the risk section in order to secure the financial target.</p>	
<p>12</p> <p>For Assurance: LFTM Update RDT advised that the paper was to provide an update position in respect of the Trust as determined in the LFTM.</p> <p>MW asked if there were any questions in relation to the paper.</p> <p>BS questioned how all the various plans and strategies knitted together and within this and it was agreed this would be better discussed at Audit Committee.</p> <p>Approval: The F&IC noted the update.</p>	
<p>14.</p> <p>For Assurance: Contracting and Business Update (including Gateway Process) This item was deferred to the 15 March 2016.</p>	
<p>15.</p> <p>For Assurance: Procurement Update including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Contracting and Tendering • National Framework and e-procurement Update <p>MW welcomed MF to the meeting.</p> <p>MF outlined the purpose of the paper which was to update the F&IC on key contracting and tendering activity which had taken place since the previous F&IC.</p> <p>MF advised that Mike Stower, Deputy Head of Procurement had commenced with the section on 22 January adding that this had already made a difference to capacity within the team. Paul Fawcett would join the team on 14 March as the Quality Service Lead.</p> <p>MF reported on the Lord Carter of Coles report which had considered spending within the NHS, citing a need to 'ensure that the precious</p>	

	Action
<p>resources of the NHS were utilised as effectively as possible' adding that the report proposed to save the NHS £5bn. He advised that the Trust would be providing a response to Lord Carter's report and that this would be tabled at TMG to gain support for its implementation.</p> <p>DM added that there had been discussions at TMG to understand organisational processes and how these could be made more efficient.</p> <p>MW asked if the information had been used to improve processes.</p> <p>RDT responded that work was on-going to improve processes, for example, the Make Ready pilot. In terms of using management information to drive forward efficiencies and changes this could be much improved and work was underway to address this. As seen earlier on the agenda the PLICS system would provide a lot of information for the Trust.</p> <p>PD referred to the national cap on agency costs and asked what YAS was doing in this regard.</p> <p>Action: A report to F&IC on YAS' position in respect of the national cap on agency costs.</p> <p>MF guided F&IC through the report, highlighting the following: <u>Vehicle spares</u> MF advised this was an on-going piece of work and the intention was to recommend the award of the contract to the April Trust Board.</p> <p>Discussion took place around the formalities of approving the award at Board and that F&IC could only recommend approval to Board. RDT suggested that if it was already within the plan and budget then, subject to the amount of the contract, it could be authorised jointly by the Chairman and the Chief Executive.</p> <p><u>Vehicle Procurement</u> AA advised that the Chief Executive's view was that the capital for these had already been approved and therefore no further approval was required.</p> <p>RDT responded that it had been presented on the agenda to provide assurance that due process had been followed.</p> <p>Discussion took place around this with F&IC agreeing that it would be discussed at the Extraordinary F&IC on 15 March for Board approval on 29 March.</p> <p>Action: Vehicle procurement to be discussed at the Extraordinary F&IC</p>	<p>RDT 2016/0002</p> <p>RDT</p>

		Action
15.1	For Assurance: Purchase of 81 end of lease defibrillators Item deferred to 15 March 2016.	
16	For Assurance: Conversion of Fleet Vehicles DCA Lease Replacements Item deferred to 15 March 2016.	
16.1	For Assurance: Conversion of Fleet Vehicles RRV Lease Replacements Item deferred to 15 March 2016.	
17	For Assurance: Six Month Review – Vehicle Replacement profile 2016/17 Item deferred to 15 March 2016.	
18	For Assurance: Statement to the Audit Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Assurance/Risk Register risks relating to F&IC <p>MW confirmed that the assurance statement to the Audit Committee would reflect the items discussed that day.</p>	
19.	Summary of issues to Trust Board MW reported that the following items had been recommended to Board: Sale of Gildersome Ambulance Station, subject to any further offers received at BAFO stage Contract for supply, provision and management of electricity 2016/17 Budget Setting, subject to additional discussion at 15 March Extraordinary F&IC meeting Conversion of Fleet Vehicles – RRV and DCR The meeting finished at 1750 hours.	
20.	Dates and Time of Next Meeting: Extraordinary F&IC, 15 th March 2016, 1100-1300 Next routine F&IC, 12 May 2016 - 1400-1700 - Kirkstall and Fountains, Springhill 1	

CERTIFIED AS A TRUE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

_____ **CHAIRMAN**

_____ **DATE**