

**"Skipton"**

Document Type:	<b>Formal</b>
File Title:	<b>GHP - Blood Policy - Skipton Fund</b>
File Reference:	<b>GHP/005/007 Vol 4</b>
Protective Marking:	<b>No Marking</b>
Filed by:	<b>Richard Gutowski/PH6/DOH/GB on 25/11/2004 at 09:12</b>
Created by:	<b>"Peter Stevens" on 19/11/2004 at 12:51</b>

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

Who can edit?	<b>Nobody</b>
Who has edited?	<b>Richard Gutowski/PH6/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
15/09/2006 09:35	Refiled from WRK/004/001
05/02/2009 12:10	Refiled from GHP/005/007
18/08/2009 14:50	Modified registered file
08/02/2012 15:48	Refiled from GHP/005/007 Vol 2 to GHP/005/007 Vol 4

**"Peter Stevens"**

&lt;peter@GRO-C&gt;

19/11/2004 12:51

To: Richard  
Gutowski/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C  
<Bob.Stock@GRO-C> "Bob Stock"

cc:  
bcc:  
Subject: Skipton

Richard and Bob

We are sending out the rejection letters today to "natural clearers" who showed no signs of chronic infection.

I attach an analysis of those who did. What it shows, quite clearly, is the discrepancy in treatment between different hospitals. Those who appear to believe that the distinction is ill-founded include (thinking only of Haemophilia Centres) the Royal Free (one Skipton director), Kent (another MFT director), Cardiff, Newcastle, Birmingham. Those who appear, in the RFH view, less well-informed about Hep C and therefore prepared to authorise £20,000 payments include Oxford, Manchester, Glasgow, St Thomas's, Belfast, the London.

I can see this getting out and "post-coding" hitting the headlines again. If we ask to see the evidence and, on the basis of the RFH opinion (which is, of course, part of our expertise) reject it, we will be setting hospitals at each others' throats.

To some extent we have already set this reaction in motion by today's letters, but at least at this stage those who have been turned down (and their doctors) have not seen other people get £20,000 on flimsy evidence. One of those rejected was from Newcastle, whose Centre director wrote the letter on her behalf from which I quoted in one of my messages to you on this subject. What does he do now? Send us a whole lot of applications that he does

not believe in for people who in his view merit the payment no more than the lady we've rejected? Or continue to hold up the lot, evne if, had they gone to Oxford, they'd have got the recommendation?

I think there's a mess looming. I know that you can both see the exit, so I'm not hopeful that you can give me any help, but at the very least your successors need to be warned of the problem.

We shall probably start dealing with those analysed on the attachment next week, for a start asking to see the evidence of chronic infection.

Have a good weekend.

Peter

PLEASE NOTE: THE ABOVE MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED FROM THE INTERNET.

On entering the GSI, this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSI) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Energis in partnership with MessageLabs.

DH users see Email virus scanning on the Notice Board under Security in DH, for further details. In case of problems, please call IT support helpdesk.



No, no, yes first cut 18 Nov.xls