

Linda Lazarus
09/04/2003 08:49

To: Sara Johnston/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C
cc:
Subject: OUTCOME OF MSBT vCJD SUB GROUP

----- Forwarded by Linda Lazarus/PH6/DOH/GB on 09/04/2003 08:56 -----

Charles Lister
08/04/2003 18:48

To: Vicki King/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C
cc: Linda Lazarus/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Philippa
Edwards/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Jill Taylor/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C;
Zubeda Seedat/PH1/DOH/GB@GRO-C
Subject: OUTCOME OF MSBT vCJD SUB GROUP

Vicki

Happy to update you in the morning. The main outcome is that the group considers that they now have enough information on which to base a recommendation to MSBT. It therefore falls to us to put something together for consideration at the next sub group meeting.

There is little time to do this (given leave plans etc). Linda, Pip and I are getting together tomorrow at 2pm to see if we can map out an outline, including identification of areas where we need further clarification from NBS and others. The idea is to present the June MSBT with a framework proposal. Once this has MSBT's approval, NBS can then be asked to work it up in full.

There are some key issues on which no consensus has emerged, eg whether it is necessary to build up a panel in advance of a test becoming available, or whether this could be done once a test has emerged using samples collected in real time from donors. All we can do at this stage is to set out the pros and cons of each option and make a recommendation for the sub group, and ultimately the main committee, to consider.

We did consider asking NBS to produce the framework but what they wanted to do was to re-present the original Roger Eglin proposal for the sub-group to amend as necessary. It is therefore probably better that we kick the work off based on the evidence and information presented so far to the sub-group, thus continuing Don Jefferies' clean sheet approach.

It would be helpful if we could talk through what you had envisaged as the end product from the sub-group to make sure that we are working on the same lines.

In the margins of the meeting, Peter Garland spoke to me about funding (he was

thinking about the revenue costs of constructing a panel starting 2004/05 - which NBS are still assuming is the route we will go down). I explained that there was no central funding. The money would therefore have to be raised through a levy on blood prices and factored into discussions in the next National Commissioning Group round. In case we do want to start putting together a panel from 2004, the prudent thing to do would be to raise this as a potential pressure at the June meeting of the NCG and then adjust it or remove it altogether when prices are finalised in October/November - by which time we will hopefully have a clear way forward.

Charles