

**Extract from:**

**Part 1 of The Resource and Performance Committee minutes held on 26 October 2015**

**10. Information Management & Technology**

**10.1 EPR Update**

AC joined the meeting to provide an overview of the current stage of the assurance process which the EPR FBC is undergoing with the TDA and the following points were noted.

- AF reported on discussions between the Trust and the TDA. The Full Business Case was submitted to the TDA in August and subsequently additional clarification and documentation had been requested. The TDA have asked for assurance on five areas of concern: commissioning support; the process on how we got from long to short list; cost differentials; financial benefits and financial comparison across different Community Trusts. In the monthly meeting with the TDA last week there was a clear commitment from them that they would work with us to resolve these issues.
- There are two areas that the committee needed to review: 1) the process of how the Trust agreed the long and short list for the development of the EPR: 2) the costs associated to the different systems.
- AF explained the processes that had been adopted to rule out alternative solutions to procurement and asked Non Executive Directors to specifically consider if they felt due consideration in the past to other alternatives. Examples included developing an in-house solution and agreeing to secure a service from another Trust. MR and RL agreed that these issues had been discussed at previous committees at length. It was noted that these options had been presented in the form of a detailed Outline Business Case and it was agreed that this was due to the changing nature of the national programme and how it was expected to end. In conclusion it was agreed that a longer list of potential options had been given due consideration before focusing down on the procurement plan.
- In addition work will be undertaken outside the committee to strengthen the evaluation of the financial benefits.
- AF referred to the second issue relating to the cost of the system. The TDA are asking was the difference in cost specific enough between the two systems when it was agreed. It had been identified that there was a significant difference in the cost and discussions were held with procurement to clarify the implications if EMIS was not the preferred option. However, a percentage difference was not calculated, it has since been noted that the total difference in cost between the systems is 45%. It was noted that this specific information had not been presented to Board although the cost of running the system was. However, the committee noted that an evaluation matrix had been defined at the start of the process that brought together the figures and arrived at a conclusion. The committee agreed that although the financial difference was significant the evaluation approach was robust and to override the conclusions would expose the Trust to legal challenge on its decision. On this basis it was agreed to support the decision that had previously been made.

- AF also reminded the committee that it was not a straight calculation and that the two systems were not comparing the same price product deliverables. The lower cost system did not deliver everything required and would have resulted in being additional supporting technology being purchased. .
- It was agreed to meet the TDA to resolve the outstanding issues however once resolved the TDA would have to take it through their process which would take a further six weeks. They have acknowledged that we have a timeframe of the end of December 2015.
- If we extend the existing NPfIT contract beyond July 2016 there will be a cost of £156k for each 3 month extension period.

**The Resource & Performance Committee agreed to**

- **endorse the previous decision in light of the additional clarification that had been presented**
- **endorse the approach that had been adopted previously to eliminate other potential solutions.**