

"Re: Fw: VAT & the MFT and others"

Document Type:	Formal	
File Title:	GHP - Blood Policy - Haemophilia - Archer Report - Government Response & Implementation - Implementation - 2010 Review	
File Reference:	GHP/005/006/001/003/001/006 Vol 11	
Protective Marking:	No Marking	
Filed by:	Debby Webb/HP-SL/DOH/GB on 07/04/2011 at 18:19	
Created by:	Nannerl Herriott on 07/04/2011 at 17:29	

Named Security Prior To Moving To Archive:

Who can edit?	Nobody
Who has edited?	Debby Webb/HP-SL/DOH/GB
Who can read?	All readers of the document database

Modification History Prior To Moving To Archive:

Modified Date and Time	Details
08/02/2012 15:48	Refiled from GHP/005/006/001/003/001/006 Vol 10 to GHP/005/006/001/003/001/006 Vol 11

Nannerl Herriott/DHSC/DOH/GB

07/04/2011 17:29

bcc

SubjectRe: Fw: VAT & the MFT and others51C84A632B758B158025786B0058366B

Debby,

Martin is aware that he still needs to make the case for the buy-out of the lease, it has not been agreed or accrued to last year. Once he submits the case it will need to be agreed by SCS (Ailsa or Jonathan).

This issue is being dealt with separately.

Nannerl
Nannerl Herriott
Head of Health Protection Governance
Department of Health
Wellington House
London SE1 8UG

Telephone	GRO-C
an perelegies and a series	L

Debby Webb/HP-SL/DOH/GB

Debby Webb/HP-SL/DOH/GB

07/04/2011 17:11

To Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C

cc Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Christopher Young/FPA-PX/DOH/GB@GRO-C Colin Staniland/OIS/DOH@GRO-C Edward Goff/HP-SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Graham Kent@ GRO-C John Downer/FDB-

Subject Re: Fw: VAT & the MFT and others

Jonathan,

You should be aware that Martin did raise the issue of the additional admin cost burden when he came in to discuss the start-up costs for Caxton. His concern then centred specifically on the on-going extra that would have to be paid in the short-term (three years from memory, but Ted perhaps can confirm) as a result of moving office accommodation. I agree with the principle of your reply, but wonder if we should also address within it the specifics of the one-off extra floor costs? Of course, these may have been taken care of within the accrued 2010/11 start up costs if Martin/Ted/Finance managed to agree a satisfactory buy-out cost of the lease. Again, Ted can confirm, but if so, we can likewise reference it in the reply to say this is no longer an on-going issue.

Debby

Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB

Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB

07/04/2011 16:52

To Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C

CC Graham.Kent@ GRO-C Nannerl
Herriott/DHSC/DOH/GB@GRO-C Edward Goff/HP-SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Debby Webb/HP-SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Christopher Young/FPA-PX/DOH/GB@GRO-C John

Downer/FDB-FM/DOH/GB@GRO-C Colin Staniland/OIS/DOH@GRO-C

Subject Fw: VAT & the MFT and others

Dear All

Please see the response below from Martin Harvey of MFT etc. I think we should dampen

down any thoughts of specified, indexed, funding for admin costs! I suggest that I reply to him straight away on that point, as follows:

Draft reply to Martin Harvey

Dear Martin

Thanks for your reply, and I look forward to hearing your considered views about possible alternative "business models" for "Alliance House admin".

It is important that DH should not even appear to micro-manage. We have not hitherto set out our views on what should comprise the admin functions of the various bodies. The fact that there is now one more body in the group does not change that. It should be enough for DH just to lay down the (fairly obvious!) principles that economy and efficiency should be the watchwords; and that money spent on admin is money not available for charitable benefits. For the same reasons, I don't think it would be appropriate to apply "year on year uplifts" to admin costs.

It is particularly important to have Ailsa's input on this, as it cuts across our fundamental objectives for the schemes, and for the overall budget that we have. Please all let me know what you think tomorrow.

Jonathan Stopes-Roe
Deputy Director, Legislation & Environmental Hazards
Health Protection Division
Department of Health
Wellington House
GRO-C

---- Forwarded by Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB on 07/04/2011 16:41 ----

 "Martin Harvey"
 GRO-C
 To
 Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C

 C
 cc
 cffitzlondon@GRO-C
 , "Peter Stevens"

 07/04/2011 12:19
 GRO-C
 >, -nick@GRO-C
 GRO-C
 >, "Linda Haigh" <Linda@GRO-C</th>

 Subject
 RE: VAT & the MFT and others

Dear Jonathan

Thank you for your email.

I will discuss with leading trustees/directors the possibility of the DH funding the total Alliance House admin' function. I think we would need to be very clear on what the DH believes should comprise the constituent parts of the overall admin' function which will now embrace 5 organisations. I should also be interested to hear what benchmark the DH

might think about applying to year on year uplifts in the overall burden of admin' costs.

If you have anything to add to this, please let me know.

Martin

Martin Harvey Chief Executive Direct Dial: GRO-C e-mail: martin@ GRO-C
Original Message From: Jonathan.Stopes-Roe@ GRO-C [mailto:Jonathan.Stopes-Roe@ GRO-C] Sent: 06 April 2011 17:32 To: Martin Harvey Cc: Debby.Webb@ GRO-C ; Linda Haigh; Roger Evans Subject: Re: VAT & the MFT and others

Martin

I am sorry for the delay in replying to this - and inconclusively too. I shall be in touch again soon, but meanwhile, I would just say that we are not convinced that this is necessarily a situation where VATable supply for consideration is at issue. For example - why could not the "admin provider" body be funded directly by DH for the overall "Alliance House admin function"? Then the question of re-charging would not arise. In the end, of course, sovereign bodies must take their own advice, and make their own decisions. But could you look into this, please, and let me know what you think?

Jonathan Stopes-Roe
Deputy Director, Legislation & Environmental Hazards Health Protection
Division Department of Health Wellington House GRo-C