

**"Re: Archer report"**

Document Type:	<b>Formal</b>
File Title:	<b>GHP - Blood Policy - Haemophilia - Independent Public Enquiry into the supply of contaminated NHS Blood &amp; Blood products - Archer</b>
File Reference:	<b>GHP/005/006/030 Vol 14</b>
Protective Marking:	<b>No Marking</b>
Filed by:	<b>Patrick Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB on 20/03/2009 at 12:46</b>
Created by:	<b>Ailsa Wight on 25/02/2009 at 09:48</b>

**Named Security Prior To Moving To Archive:**

Who can edit?	<b>Nobody</b>
Who has edited?	<b>Patrick Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB</b>
Who can read?	<b>All readers of the document database</b>

**Modification History Prior To Moving To Archive:**

Modified Date and Time	Details
18/08/2009 15:04	Modified registered file
07/09/2009 12:07	Modified registered file
08/02/2012 15:48	Refiled from GHP/005/006/030 Vol 5 to GHP/005/006/030 Vol 14

**Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB**

25/02/2009 09:46

To: Elizabeth Woodeson/CQEG/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Patrick  
 Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Rowena  
 Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Ian Matthews/PR-  
 OFF/DOH/GB@GRO-C  
 cc: David Harper/HPIHSD/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Mike De  
 Silva/HPIHSD/DOH/GB@GRO-C

bcc

Subject: Re: Archer report

Thanks Liz.

I think money rather than services is probably the main issue. I'm not convinced we need any major changes to the latter given current arrangements (which the report doesn't explore in detail) but we can consider with Bruce's people and haemophilia doctors etc.

Free treatment would be a good thing to offer if we can, as you say. I don't think DWP payments are really going to be an option.

We kept the submission short and factual and didn't offer any firm views because we hadn't had a chance to explore any of the points with others. Bit hard to judge the politics at present - we haven't so far been inundated with PQs etc (though I expect they'll come!) and media interest has died down but I suspect MS(PH) will want to offer something. I'd like to discuss with you before we put up anything further about our response.

Message sent from a Blackberry handheld device.  
 Elizabeth Woodeson

**From:** Elizabeth Woodeson  
**Sent:** 25/02/2009 06:46 GMT  
**To:** Ailsa Wight; Patrick Hennessy; Rowena Jecock; Ian Matthews  
**Cc:** David Harper; Mike De Silva  
**Subject:** Re: Archer report

Dear all

Well done for getting a submission up so quickly on this. It is frustrating not to be there with you to help!

My reading of Archer's recommendations are that:

1. They represent special pleading for a particular group of patients to be given preferential treatment which we would almost certainly want to reject
2. Our division is not responsible for services for haemophiliacs and any response would need to be developed with and cleared by Bruce Keogh and our NHS colleagues.
3. Archer does not appear (at least from this submission) to have found any evidence that the Government at the time was at fault. This was the core purpose of the inquiry - it wasn't supposed to be about services for haemophilia patients - and it looks like good news from that point of view.

So on the whole the report looks like something we wouldn't want to spend a lot of time on.

I would have thought that it would be best therefore to aim to do only a brief response and get it out as quickly as possible (perhaps in about a month). The response should basically:

- set out our side of the story - all the steps taken to make the blood supply safer as soon as it was recognised there was a problem
- say we are pleased Archer recognises this (if I am right that he doesn't find fault with Gov actions at the time)
- set out all the services we provide for haemophiliacs and the compensation scheme - anything else positive we can say about what we are already doing
- politely reject the specific recommendations
- obviously it would be great if we could think of something to give them and we will need to think about that. The most likely I should think is the free prescriptions given that Government did recently announce free prescriptions for cancer patients and committed to rolling them out for other patients with long term conditions. I will discuss this with Felecity when I am back.

Did Archer actually write to ministers enclosing the report? The best way for the Government to respond would probably be by writing a letter back to him. We should avoid doing a formal stand alone Government response if possible since this was not an official inquiry or even a select committee report.

Hope this is a helpful steer from afar!

Regards

Liz

Message sent from a Blackberry handheld device.

Patrick Hennessy

**From:** Patrick Hennessy  
**Sent:** 24/02/2009 13:35 GMT  
**To:** Morven Smith  
**Cc:** Sarah Kirby; Penelope Irving; Marc McGonagle; Clare Montagu; Mario Dunn; Steven Pidgeon; Beatrix Sneller; David Harper; Mike De Silva; Elizabeth Woodeson; Ailsa Wight; Rowena Jecock; Murray Devine; Colin Phillips; Peter Bennett; Judith Moore; graham.kent@GRO-C; paula.cohen@GRO-C  
**Subject:** Archer report

As requested, I attach a note from Rowena Jecock giving the initial views of the blood

policy team on the recommendations of the Archer report. We will provide a fuller response for next Monday.



MS(PH) update on recommendations of Archer report 23 Feb 09.doc

Patrick Hennessy  
Consultant  
Health Protection Division  
517 Wellington House  
Tel: GRO-C  
GTN: