



Finance & Investment Committee (F&IC) Minutes

Venue: Kirkstall & Fountains, Springhill 1, WF2 0XQ
Date: Thursday 12 June 2014
Time: 1400 hours
Chairman: Dr Elaine Bond

Present:

Dr Elaine Bond	(EB)	Non-Executive Director (Chairman)
Pat Drake	(PD)	Non-Executive Director
Rod Barnes	(RB)	Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Finance & Performance
Dave Whiting	(DW)	Chief Executive
Alex Crickmar	(AC)	Interim Associate Director of Finance
Mary Wareing	(MW)	Non-Executive Director

Apologies:

Russell Hobbs	(RH)	Executive Director of Operations
---------------	------	----------------------------------

In Attendance:

Barrie Senior	(BS)	Non-Executive Director (Observing)
John Nutton	(JN)	Non-Executive Director – Designate (Observing)
Anne Allen	(AA)	Trust Secretary
Chris Dodd	(CD)	Commercial Director (Item 6 & Observing)
Catherine Balazs	(CB)	Head of Business Development (Observing)
Malcolm Littlewood	(ML)	Interim Head of Procurement (Items 5.0 & 5.1)
Mark Squires	(MS)	Associate Director of Support Services (Item 5.2)
Raj Odedra	(RO)	Project Manager, Springhill 2 Reception Extension (Item 5.2)

Minutes produced by: (MG) Mel Gatecliff, Committee Services Manager

		Action
	The meeting commenced at 1400 hours.	
1.0	Introduction and Apologies EB welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.	
2.0	Declaration of Interests for any item on the agenda There were no interests to be declared in relation to the agenda items.	

		Action
3.0	<p>Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 April 2014 The Minutes of the Finance and Investment Committee Meeting held on 3 April 2014 were approved as a true and fair representation of the meeting subject to the following amendments.</p> <p>Matters Arising: Page 6, paragraph 10 – reworded to state: ‘JN stated his view that, although a large part of the Trust’s budget, income and expenditure was largely secure and certain, the overall result for the year was, critically dependent on a few key matters including the CIPs, CQUINs and Red Targets.’</p> <p>Page 17, paragraph 2 – ‘bridges’ amended to ‘bridge charts’.</p> <p>Page 20, Summary of Issues to Trust Board – bullet point three redacted for reasons of confidentiality.</p>	
4.0	<p>Action Log and Matters Arising The Action Log was reviewed and updated.</p> <p>2014/23 - Review of Workplan EB confirmed that the meetings had been added to the Workplan. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/24 - Review of Workplan DW stated that the CIP Management Group’s management arrangements had been revised with the key change being the inclusion of all Executive colleagues as members of the Group.</p> <p>At its last meeting the Group had reviewed three key schemes but had not pick up the PID issue. Quarterly reviews of reserve schemes were also being planned. Action closed.</p> <p>It was agreed that DW’s update should be incorporated into all future CIP Update Reports.</p> <p>Action: DW to provide a CIP Management Group Update as part of all future CIP Update Reports going to F&IC.</p> <p>2014/25 - Review of Workplan RB stated that CD would present the new commercial Gating Review during agenda Item 6. CD was also leading on an update of the Market Assessment for the IBP which would be used to inform YAS’ new Market Strategy. This was proving to be a bigger task than originally envisaged and a further update was planned for the September meeting. Action remains open.</p> <p>2014/27 - Cost Improvement Plan Review Action closed (see action 2014/24 above).</p>	DW

	Action
<p>2014/28 - Cost Improvement Plan Review AC confirmed he had completed this action. He had concentrated on the 2014/15 schemes, including the reserve schemes, which might change going forward. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/29 - Cost Improvement Plan Review AC confirmed that GJ's name had been removed and Kate Sim's name added to the list of Lead Managers. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/30 - Cost Improvement Plan Review AC confirmed that the work around NHS 111 additional savings would take place during the course of the year. Keeley Townend was currently working on the item with her Finance lead. Action remains open to be discussed further at the September meeting.</p> <p>2014/31 - Patient Transport Services Finance & Investment Update RB confirmed that some of the difficulties in relation to PTS recruitment around DBS checks had now eased. It was agreed that as progress was being made and TEG continued to provide additional scrutiny, the action should be closed. Any future problems would be reported into F&IC by TEG. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/32 - Major Business Case Update - Leeds Discharge Service RB confirmed that the recruitment process had started for a marketing role in CD's team. Part of this person's role would be to capture learning from the Leeds tender process and customise each individual tender. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/33 - Major Business Case Update - Leeds Discharge Service Feedback had been submitted to Simon Murphy. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/34 - Commissioning and Business Update EB stated her belief that the lack of understanding of PIDs had been wider spread than originally thought.</p> <p>RB stated that this issue had been discussed at the last Cost Improvement meeting. Although two previous rounds of training had taken place, there had been changes in personnel so the time was probably right to re-introduce the training. Action closed.</p> <p>2014/35 - Commissioning and Business Update RB confirmed that this improvement had been noted for future new business developments. Action closed.</p>	
<p>5.0 Procurement Update EB welcomed Interim Head of Procurement, Malcolm Littlewood (ML), to the meeting.</p>	

	Action
<p>ML provided a procurement update which included the action plan from the North of England Commercial Procurement Collaborative (CPC) report and the Procurement Contract Register. The paper was taken as read.</p> <p>ML stated that the Trust was currently looking to improve the structure of its procurement function, adding that he had reviewed the recommendations of the CPC report and added some of his own.</p> <p>He confirmed that work on the actions was underway.</p> <p>There were no questions or comments from those present.</p> <p>Approval: The F&I Committee noted the update.</p>	
<p>5.1 Printing & Documentation Regional Contract (Lead: Head of Procurement)</p> <p>EB expressed frustration at the format and order of information contained in the paper and asked ML to ensure that the layout of future contract reviews and summaries was more user-friendly.</p> <p>EB stated that the F&IC reviewed contracts valued between £250k and £500k and recommended those over £500k to the Trust Board for approval. The only contracts that would be considered under that value would be those previously considered by RB and herself which it had been agreed needed a further degree of scrutiny.</p> <p>ML advised the Committee of the current situation in respect of the provision of print services.</p> <p>EB stated that she had expected to see a full contract but the document attached to the cover was just a summary of information about the contract.</p> <p>ML stated that the current framework contract was due to expire in August 2014. The 3M contract had been awarded on behalf of all of the NHS organisations in NHS England so the contract was already in situ. The choice for YAS was whether the Trust chose to utilise that contract.</p> <p>EB asked how the Trust could be expected to make that choice if it was unable to see the contract.</p> <p>ML replied that NHS organisations would not normally receive a copy of a detailed national contract.</p> <p>The Trust would enter into a memorandum of understanding with the British Service Authority (BSA). Their team would then ask 3M to source a variety of competitive quotes on the organisation's behalf, information about which would then be shared with the Trust.</p>	

	Action
<p>RB asked how the Trust was able to take advantage of the savings mentioned in 3.4 on page 9.</p> <p>ML replied that it was not yet able to take advantage of the savings. The benefit of the arrangement was that it would allow organisations to take advantage of services such as the design, for example, of a YAS bespoke document.</p> <p>RB asked whether the Trust's departments were being encouraged to standardise their record forms, etc, as the production of this type of document template could save money over a period of time.</p> <p>It was agreed that ML should take this action away and report back to F&IC with an update at its December meeting.</p> <p>Actions: EB to embed update from ML into F&IC Workplan for December.</p> <p>ML to present an update on progress re cost savings relating to production of standardised documents, etc at December meeting.</p> <p>MW asked whether 3M, in acting as a broker for sourcing a number of different print suppliers, would take commission or a flat fee, as this would help to frame the Trust's requirements.</p> <p>ML replied that BSA would have to clarify the answer to the question, adding that there was an increasing uptake of this type of agreement as trusts realised that they did not have the appropriate expertise to do their own specialist printing and design, etc.</p> <p>He further stated that the only alternative would be for YAS to negotiate a standalone contract for printing.</p> <p>EB stated that she was not comfortable with the fact that the Trust could not have a copy of the contract. She would like to see both the contract and ML's recommendation on why it was right for YAS.</p> <p>RB stated that it would depend on the nature of what was covered by the contract, adding that it was not unique for national bodies hold on to contracts.</p> <p>BS stated his belief that if 3M could procure a certain cost for printing services nationally, YAS should be allowed to negotiate an even cheaper rate.</p> <p>RB agreed with this statement to a certain extent, as it was his belief that national contracts were not always the most cost effective means of purchasing goods or services.</p>	<p>EB</p> <p>ML</p>

	Action
<p>He stated that, as a matter of principle, the Trust should request a copy of the contract to be assured internally that was the right contact for YAS. Following receipt and thorough review, the Trust would be able to agree that the contract was transactional and that it was happy to accept it.</p> <p>ML replied that, although he had not previously been aware of trusts wanting to see a copy of framework contracts, he was happy to request one.</p> <p>Action: ML to request a copy of the National Print and Forms contract from BSA and share this with members of the F&IC.</p> <p>Approval: Subject to receipt of the above contract, the F&IC accepted the use of the CCS/BSA framework agreement for the supply of print services.</p> <p>ML provided a short update on the e-contract management module, which he stated would provide a more 'live' contract management system than the Trust's current, labour intensive system.</p>	ML
<p>5.2 Springhill 2 Reception Extension (Lead: Associate Director of Support Services)</p> <p>EB welcomed Mark Squires (MS), Associate Director of Support Services and Raj Odedra (RO) Project Manager of Springhill 2 Reception Extension to the meeting and invited them to present an update on the progress of the project.</p> <p>EB stated that the project involved quite a significant investment and queried whether the Reception area needed the proposed level of upgrade.</p> <p>RB replied that some work was urgently required, as there was currently no available space in which to store deliveries. It was not uncommon, therefore, for boxes to be lying around in reception when visitors were waiting in Springhill 2.</p> <p>The lack of space also meant that the Trust was currently unable to display the awards it had won in the Reception area, which the Trust Chairman was keen to do.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that the lack of privacy in the current reception area meant that people walking through reception could overhear conversations.</p> <p>RB further stated that the decision to move post facilities had also led to the need for the re-configuration of office space for EOC.</p>	

	Action
<p>In addition, there were issues in relation to meeting space with a real shortage of meeting rooms. A large number of meetings were held in the canteen area which was not necessarily the most appropriate venue.</p> <p>EB asked why this project had priority over the hub and spoke development.</p> <p>RB replied that both projects were priority projects.</p> <p>RO stated that the design of the current reception area had led to statutory compliance issues. The building still lacked DDA access and once inside, there was very little space for wheelchairs.</p> <p>He confirmed that the fire alarm panel was being upgraded to meet post-refurbishment requirements.</p> <p>DW stressed that the development would not hold the Trust back in relation to its hub and spoke plans.</p> <p>EB asked about staff perception as she believed that a lot would perceive the refurbishment work as a negative move which only benefited HQ staff.</p> <p>A discussion took place about the possibility of switching reception to the larger area in Springhill 1, the disruption that this could cause and value for money.</p> <p>PD stated that it made more sense to use Springhill 2 as the main reception area as the entrance to Springhill 1 was much harder to find.</p> <p>EB suggested that staff perception should be included in the risk assessment of the project.</p> <p>RO provided detailed information about the procurement process currently being followed.</p> <p>MW stated that although the argument regarding cost and competitiveness under the national framework was persuasive, without the ability to assess the things that YAS' normal tender process would cover in more detail, it would be hard to agree that it would meet all of YAS' needs.</p> <p>RB stated that he had been impressed by the quality of suppliers on the framework contract.</p> <p>EB stated that the level of expenditure was below the Board level of approval and she was happy that the Committee had reviewed the paper and debated its contents in enough depth to have led to meaningful discussion.</p>	

	Action
<p>Approval: The F&I Committee noted the contents of the paper and reviewed the current course of action to procure the project.</p>	
<p>6.0 Gating Review EB welcomed Commercial Director, Chris Dodd (CD) to the meeting and invited him to present the Gate Review Forum Briefing, which had previously been presented at SMG.</p> <p>CD stated that he would provide an overview of an alternative Gate Review Process which would allow discussion about how it would operate, what would be expected of participants, what was needed in preparation and any possible next steps.</p> <p>The process was being introduced to prevent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources being committed to developments with no TEG sponsorship or strategic alignment; • Too much time being committed to proposals that did not proceed; • Local developments being undertaken which lost the Trust income; • Ideas progressing outside of formal governance and approval routes. <p>CD explained how the innovation funnel, a filter process to manage innovation through the organisation to meet customer need, would work.</p> <p>The Gate Review Forum would need to sit alongside the Strategy and Planning Review which would set the organisation's overall direction as it needed to align with the strategy of the organisation. It concentrated on prioritising resources and ensuring that organisations delivered on time to budget.</p> <p>CD presented details of the seven stages of the Gate Review Process. He stated that organisations tended to go wrong if they rushed to Gate 3 (Contract) and Gate 5 (General Release). He stressed that the process would also not work if the operating principles were by-passed.</p> <p>CD stated that, within YAS, the ResWeb project had piloted the process. Gate 2 had been passed and a variety of requirements identified as inputs for Gate 3.</p> <p>He further stated that next steps had been identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on direction of travel; • Build process documents on the Intranet; • Complete review input templates; • Complete ResWeb pilot of the Gate Review Process; • Launch to key stakeholders; 	

		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule first formal Gate Review Forum. <p>CD confirmed that the process would run alongside the current YAS Committee framework.</p> <p>EB suggested that the contract cover page could include a synopsis of where the contract had been considered in terms of the Gateway Review process and asked whether updates would sit within the Commissioning and Business update report.</p> <p>RB suggested that items should come to F&IC through Gate 3 and Gate 4.</p> <p>JN asked whether the process was only for business development or whether it could also cover procurement.</p> <p>CD replied that, although it could cover almost anything, it would be used for commercial opportunities and service developments in the first instance.</p> <p>RB stated that, although several people had raised issues about the number of stages in the process, urgent care and the clinical function had welcomed the clarity of process.</p> <p>EB stated that the process would definitely help with the previous issues relating to competing ideas and the allocation of resources in a limited infrastructure.</p> <p>MW stated that TPMG had welcomed the commonality of approach and had agreed that the Trust should use the process for all of its large projects.</p> <p>BS stated his belief that it was a good structure but it would be crucial that sources of appropriate challenge were put in place to ensure successful implementation of ideas or provision of reasons as to why they did not progress.</p> <p>EB stated that she welcomed the presentation and looked forward to future progress reports.</p> <p>Action: Outcomes of Gate Review process to be brought back to the Committee in line with the Committee scheme of delegation.</p>	RB
7.0	<p>F&I Terms of Reference</p> <p>RB provided the Committee with details of the updated F&IC Terms of Reference, which had been amended following the recent F&IC effectiveness session.</p> <p>The meeting considered the proposed amendments and the following additional amendments were proposed:</p>	

		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 – the Chairman of the Quality Committee to be added; • 6.7 – ‘of Standing Orders and Standing Financial Instructions’ to be added; • 7.6 – nominated Non-Executive Director would be MW; • Section 9 – bullet point about disclosure statements to be added; <p>It was agreed that AA should carry out a cross-referencing exercise across the Level 2 Committees’ Terms of Reference to ensure consistency of approach.</p> <p>Action: AA to carry out cross-referencing exercise across the Level 2 Committees’ Terms of Reference to ensure consistency of approach.</p> <p>Approval: The F&IC reviewed and discussed the proposed changes and agreed to make the necessary additional amendments to the Terms of Reference prior to these being presented at the July Trust Board Meeting in Public for agreement and approval.</p>	AA
8.0	<p>Cost Improvement Plan Delivery Update (including update from CIP Management Group)</p> <p>AC provided an update on the Cost Improvement Plan at month 1 of 2014/15.</p> <p>He stated that, excluding reserve schemes, month 2 was more or less on target.</p> <p>The A&E CIPs were currently achieving although the Trust’s performance issues meant that there were additional cost pressures and a risk had been noted around that.</p> <p>To offset the shortfall in the achievement of A&E CIPs a reserve scheme of £1.7m had been identified which was linked to reducing spend on private providers.</p> <p>The CIP target for PTS in 2014/15 was £2.3m with £1.7m of schemes currently identified. Whilst the PTS team was working on the identification of additional CIP schemes it was anticipated that these schemes would not close the full £600k gap in the PTS plans.</p> <p>AC outlined the main risks and invited questions from the Committee.</p> <p>MW noted that the fee income generation CIP and PTS VCS CIP were both showing non-achievement in month 1 with the fact that they were back-loaded given as the reason for non-achievement. She asked whether the Trust was measuring against a profile that it did not expect to achieve.</p>	

	Action
<p>AC replied that the Trust had needed to phase the CIPs and acknowledged that it would need to carry out further work to confirm whether this phasing was correct going forward.</p> <p>AC further stated that ongoing issues relating to Red performance meant that the quality of income generation would need regular reassessment.</p> <p>MW requested an update on the PTS VCS recruitment programme.</p> <p>AC replied that, once again, this was a phasing issue of which Associate Director, Joanne Halliwell, was aware and would need to ensure that it did not lead to non-achievement rather than just a slipping of the timescale.</p> <p>AC stated that, going forward, the CIP Management Group would need to receive evidence that CIPs were being achieved.</p> <p>EB stated that the report gave her assurance that the CIP Management Group was challenging appropriately and thanked AC for providing a clear and detailed update.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee noted the CIP position at the end of Month 1 and the actions being taken to achieve the CIP plan for 2014/15 at the current time.</p>	
<p>9.0</p> <p>Service Line Management Update</p> <p>RB provided an update on the implementation of Service Line Management, confirming that work was ongoing to revisit the project plan.</p> <p>He stated that Kate Sims would be joining the team as there was a need to align individual workforce plans with the wider work and she would be able to provide this information.</p> <p>Work was also underway with the Fleet management team aligned to making the Trust more competitive and sufficient efficiencies had been identified to bring the Trust back into a break even position.</p> <p>He further stated that Service Line Reporting continued to inform the costing and pricing models for the individual service lines: PTS, CCE, 111 and P&E.</p> <p>EB asked whether it was an appropriate time to provide an awareness update during a Private Board meeting.</p> <p>RB suggested that it was probably still too early to go back to Board.</p> <p>He stated that interviews for a project manager were due to take place shortly and there seemed to be a strong field of candidates.</p>	

		Action
	<p>JN noted that two areas of PTS were now making a profit and asked what initiatives had been introduced to bring about this change.</p> <p>RB replied that a lot of work was under way to help understand the profitability of each contract from a target perspective. Although the North was now making a surplus, his initial findings were that the Trust might not be being paid enough in South.</p> <p>EB stated that discussions at the SLM project group should be included on the front page of the report.</p> <p>Approval: The Committee noted the current status of Service Line Management and the progress being made to recruit a project manager to implement across all service lines in 2014/15.</p>	
10.0	<p>LTFM Review including: Review of Changes; Downside Risks; Mitigations</p> <p>AC provided an update on key changes made to the LTFM including changes to downside scenarios and mitigating plans for submission of the LTFM and IBP to the NHS TDA on 20 June 2014. He stated that the key assumptions were similar to the previous version.</p> <p>RB stated that the Trust was due another Monitor assessment case letter in the near future and asked whether this could impact on the base line assumptions.</p> <p>It was agreed that AC should bring an update to the September F&IC meeting.</p> <p>Action: AC to present update on the base line assumptions in the LTFM at September meeting.</p> <p>AC stated that Chapter 7 of the IBP focussed on key risks, downside scenarios and mitigation actions and there had been no significant changes since the Chapter was last considered.</p> <p>However, the Committee needed to be aware of some of the risks relating to the changing environment of the NHS where one-third of trusts were currently in deficit.</p> <p>AC stated that YAS was currently in a better financial position than some FTs but emphasised the need to continue to stress test plans and develop mitigation plans to a detailed level.</p> <p>He talked the Committee through the details of the appendices in terms of mitigations and downsides. Appendix 2 would appear in the IBP with Appendix 3 containing information about a number of other potential mitigations.</p>	AC

	Action
<p>MW noted that there had been a big change in the Trust's cash position and asked what had caused this.</p> <p>AC replied that multiple issues had led to the change.</p> <p>PD stated her belief that as the current rate of demand was less than originally assumed the Trust should be in a better position.</p> <p>EB thanked AC for his thorough paper, which had been easy to read and understand.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee noted the changes made to the LTFM, downside risks and mitigations.</p>	
<p>11.0 Financial Review</p> <p>RB provided the Committee with an update on the Trust's financial risks and exceptional budgetary and treasury items.</p> <p>EB stated that risk 3a, Performance, an update about which was contained in section 2.4, was currently a major issue for the Trust and asked how it would be taken as an accounting issue.</p> <p>RB replied that the Trust continued to monitor the risk closely.</p> <p>JN stated that, based on the figures at the end of May, the Trust would need to perform at over 76% for the rest of the year to pull back to its 75% achievement target. He added his concern that based on current figures the Trust would need also to start to provide for a short fall in another month.</p> <p>RB stated that a meeting had been arranged with commissioners later that month to discuss this issue, what would happen if the Trust missed its target at year end, etc.</p> <p>A discussion took place about potential penalties and the likelihood of their implementation.</p> <p>EB stated that the focus on risk within the paper was useful, adding that she would like to see a paper go to Audit Committee in terms of risk.</p> <p>RB confirmed that CB and her team had commenced on an assessment of current activity. The work included inter-site and intra-site transfers as well as take homes. He stated that activity was reducing with some hospitals not using YAS for any routine work. The team was also working closely with the CSU and the Lead Commissioner to try to ensure consistency of data.</p> <p>RB stated highlighted the overspend in item 2.8 in relation to Fleet maintenance.</p>	

		Action
	<p>He stated that this was partly the result of additional costs to parts purchased due to the age of vehicles and partly the result of the extra work that Fleet had been doing to reduce the servicing backlog.</p> <p>However, things should improve later in the year when a number of vehicles were due to be replaced.</p> <p>There were no questions on the IPR.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee noted the financial risks highlighted and was assured that the risks were being managed and mitigation plans were in place.</p>	
12.0	<p>Fleet Capital Review</p> <p>Prior to discussions taking place on the three papers presented for review at that day's meeting, EB stated that all three papers were missing the new additional procurement sheet and asked those present to ensure that this summary sheet was included within all future papers coming to the F&IC for review.</p> <p>Action: Authors to be advised to ensure that all future procurement papers coming to F&IC for review included the new summary sheet behind the front cover.</p>	RB
12.1	<p>A&E Lease End Ambulance Capital Purchase 2014/15</p> <p>RB provided the background information required to support the approval for the Capital procurement in 2014/15 of up to 23 currently leased A&E Ambulance vehicles utilising the East of England Ambulance Service/Sector Leasing Framework Agreement.</p> <p>RB confirmed that although a five-year lease agreement was in place, the vehicles were run over a seven-year life span. However, constraints were in place to prevent a seven-year lease from being taken out.</p> <p>In relation to section 2.3, JN asked why the Trust had to purchase the vehicles through an agent.</p> <p>RB replied that an agent had to be used because of the National Framework agreement.</p> <p>There were no other questions.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee reviewed the proposed purchase which, as it was within the Committee's Terms of Reference, did not need to go to the Trust Board for approval.</p>	

		Action
12.2	<p>PTS Ambulance Capital Purchase 2014/15 RB provided the background information required to support the approval for the Capital procurement in 2014/15 of 124 currently leased PTS Ambulance vehicles utilising the East of England Ambulance Service/Sector Leasing Framework Agreement.</p> <p>He stated that the vehicles, which had been leased for seven years, were coming to end of their lease period. The intention was to buy the vehicles to replace those in the fleet that were currently between 10 and 16 years old.</p> <p>Released funds could be used to lease new replacement PTS vehicles as part of the bridging exercise to ensure that the Trust reached a point within the next few years whereby none of its PTS fleet was over seven years old as stated in the Fleet Policy.</p> <p>JN noted that the purchase had to be made through an agent and asked what difference this would make to the cost of the purchase.</p> <p>RB replied that the Trust did not expect there to be a significant cost. The agents would negotiate the best price for the organisation, as they were the contracted party. He further stated that, through national contract agreements, the Trust was likely to continue with this type of arrangement.</p> <p>The advantages and disadvantages of the various options for financing capital projects such as outright purchase and leasing were discussed. It was agreed that each capital project should consider the justification for the project and an assessment of the alternative means of effecting procurement.</p> <p>It was noted that the proposal would need to go forward to the Trust Board for approval at its July meeting.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee reviewed the Capital procurement in 2014/15 of 124 currently leased PTS Ambulance vehicles utilising the East of England Ambulance Service/Sector Leasing Framework Agreement and agreed that it should go forward to the Trust Board for approval at its July meeting.</p>	
12.3	<p>Lease of Skoda Superb ECP RRV for 2014/15 Replacement RB provided the background information required to support the approval of the Lease of 9 Skoda Superb ECP Cars, in line with the replacement profile and the Fleet Strategy.</p> <p>JN queried the wording in section 2.5 as it seemed contrary to previous statements about buying rather than leasing being the best option for procurement.</p>	

		Action
	<p>RB stated that the Trust did not currently have access to the capital to buy an RRV fleet, adding that he would clarify the wording of section 2.5.</p> <p>Action: RB to clarify the wording of section 2.5 in relation to leasing being the best option for procurement.</p> <p>EB asked why it was proposed that a different model of Skoda should be used.</p> <p>DW replied that this was because more room was needed for kit.</p> <p>It was noted that the proposed purchase did not need to go forward to Trust Board for approval.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee reviewed the proposed purchase which, as it was within the Committee's Terms of Reference, did not need to go to the Trust Board for approval.</p>	RB
13.0	<p>Workplan Review</p> <p>EB highlighted the changes to the F&IC Workplan since it was last reviewed by the Committee.</p> <p>EB confirmed that any papers or activities allocated to Anna Rispin had now been allocated to Alex Crickmar.</p> <p>She further stated that there was an ongoing review of the contracts that were due to be considered at each meeting with pre-agenda setting decisions being made on which items would need to be included.</p> <p>It was noted that the next joint meeting with the Quality Committee on 5 February 2015 would need to be added to the Workplan.</p> <p>Action: JW to add 5 February joint meeting with the Quality Committee to the Workplan.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee noted the changes to the F&IC Workplan.</p>	JW
14.0	<p>Feedback from Board Meetings</p> <p>EB confirmed that there was no specific feedback to share from recent Board meetings.</p>	

		Action
15.0	<p>Commissioning and Business Update</p> <p>CB updated the Committee on current contracts and new business developments. She stated that there had been no fundamental change to the financial position of any of the contracts since the last update to the Committee although the A&E contract currently had a number of risks both financially and clinically.</p> <p>CB further stated that Hambleton, Richmondshire and Whitby CCG had put out a tender / PQQ notification via 365 Response Framework for urgent journeys in their geographical area.</p> <p>She stressed that if the current contract was to end in March 2015 then exit plans would have to be instigated and YAS would need to understand the implications as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the NHS 111 team continued to work closely with the Business Intelligence team to develop real time reports and dashboards.</p> <p>The PTS contracts had all been signed and real time dashboards developed for local management teams to use.</p> <p>CB stated that the CCGs required more and more personal contact with the Trust which would be a big challenge moving forward.</p> <p>She confirmed that there were no new business developments to report although the team continued to work on potential contracts for Emergency/Urgent Care Practitioners.</p> <p>EB expressed disappointment with this section of the report, as there were usually several new initiatives on which an update was provided. She stated that she would hope to see evidence of further developments reported in September.</p> <p>CB stated that a lot of work was currently ongoing around the area of contract management. The Gate Review process would be fundamental to developments going forward but would take a lot of work behind the scenes to establish it.</p> <p>JN asked whether the majority of business developments were positive ie chasing up new business, or reactive.</p> <p>CB replied that it was a mixture of both. Two urgent care tenders were coming up shortly and Simon Murphy and Chris Dodd were starting to go out to talk to more people which would prove to be beneficial as they started to scope new tenders.</p> <p>It was agreed than an update on the introduction of the Gate Review process should be included in the report to the September meeting.</p>	

	Action
<p>Action: CB to include update on the introduction of the Gate Review process in the September update report.</p> <p>EB thanked CB for her update.</p> <p>Approval: The Finance & Investment Committee noted the update to the paper and the risks within the A&E contract.</p>	<p>CB</p>
<p>16.0 Assurance Statement to the Audit Committee EB stated that this was a new agenda item.</p> <p>Risks were noted as identified in the 'risk' section of each Committee paper and the BAF with the caveat of 3a, Performance which would require further discussion.</p>	
<p>17.0 Summary of Issues to Trust Board/Feedback on Meeting It was agreed that concerns around under-performance against risk 3a, Performance, would need to be raised with the Trust Board</p> <p>EB invited feedback from those present.</p> <p>AA stated that from an assurance perspective, she had a general point to make.</p> <p>She stated that, for good governance purposes, the title of a paper should be same as that on the agenda and the recommendations on the front covers of reports should be the same as those contained in the main body of the paper.</p> <p>This would be particularly important as the introduction of the YAS Forum would lead to greater scrutiny of papers that were publically available and lack of consistency might make it difficult for others to correlate.</p> <p>EB asked DW to remind members of TEG and TMG to share this information with authors of reports.</p> <p>Action: DW to remind members of TEG/SMG to ensure the consistency of wording of recommendations, etc in papers.</p> <p>RB recognised that this was an issue but stressed that there was only so much that the Executives could do as they could not predict who was writing each paper.</p> <p>PD suggested that some formal guidance relating to the writing of report could be produced.</p>	<p>DW</p>

		Action
	<p>AA replied that a pro forma template which contained advice on what should be included in each section was already in existence.</p> <p>EB re-iterated her earlier statement to remind authors of reports that the F&IC 'reviewed' and did not 'approve' items.</p> <p>She thanked everyone for attending the meeting.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 1715 hours.</p>	
18.0	<p>Dates and Time of Next Meeting: 1400-1700 hours 11 September 2014, Kirkstall and Fountains, Springhill 1, WF2 0XQ</p>	

CERTIFIED AS A TRUE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

_____ **CHAIRMAN**

_____ **DATE**