

<BR>  
<INPUT TYPE=button onClick="javascript:history.go(-1)" VALUE="Back">  
<BR>

DH-PS Documents - Unformatted Document

**"Fw: Contaminated Blood Review: DA positions"**

File Reference:	PSU/039 Vol 8
File Title:	DH Perm Sec - Health Protection
Filed by:	Suzy Powell/OIS/DOH on 25/01/2011 at 15:10
Created by:	Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB on 24/01/2011 at 09:59
Recipients:	Suzy Powell; Ailsa Wight; Ben Cole (SendTo, CopyTo & BlindCopyTo if applicable)

, <- By default all readers can see document.

**Document Security:**

Who can read? All readers of this document database

Rowena  
Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB  
24/01/2011 09:59

ToSuzy Powell/OIS/DOH@GRO-C  
ccAilsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Ben Cole/HP-  
SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C  
bcc

SubjectFw: Contaminated Blood Review: DA positions

For Follow Up:

-- Spoke to Rowena and we agreed not to share the email chain --

Felicity,

Thanks for picking this up in Suzy's absence. This is the internal DH correspondence I just mentioned to you, which I am considering sharing with the Wales Office, subject to your and Mayerling's view.

On 10 Jan, SofS announced the outcome of a review into support for those infected (primarily with hepatitis C) following treatment with contaminated blood/blood products during the 1970s and 80s. He announced significant additional funding for those affected, but it only relates to England, as each administration separately funds its own share. Consequently, the DA Health Ministers are having to consider whether to adopt the same policy.

We had hoped to be able to share the review report with our DA colleagues before the announcement here, but did not have ministerial authorisation to do so ahead of HA clearance. Forwarding this internal correspondence might help the Wales Office minister to explain to Welsh MPs (who, I understand, are putting her under some pressure) that the review report could not be shared until HA clearance had been obtained. (Clearance was not finally received until 10 Jan - the day planned for the announcement).

Are you content that I forward to my policy contact in the Wales Office?

Grateful for advice asap.  
Thanks,

Rowena

----- Forwarded by Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB on 24/01/2011 09:41 -----

**Suzy Powell/OIS/DOH**

23/12/2010 15:18

To Frances Boyson/OIS/DOH@GRO-C  
cc Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Clara Swinson/PR-  
OFF/DOH/GB@GRO-C Debby Webb/HP-  
SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Paul Macnaught/DEL-  
GBT/DOH/GB@GRO-C Rowena  
Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Yemi  
Fagun/PH1/DOH/GB@GRO-C

Subject Re: Fw: Contaminated Blood Review: DA positions

Hi Rowena - thanks for this. Una is on leave, but I have forwarded this to her so she is aware. Until (if and when) I hear otherwise from her I think we're best to hold the current line as Frances says - ie, we cannot share as it is not HA cleared and therefore not yet Govt policy.

I'll let you know if anything changes.

Suzy

Suzy Powell (nee Austin)  
Assistant Private Secretary to the Permanent Secretary

PORTFOLIO – MS(CS), PS(PH), PS(Q) (Pharmacy only)

Room 423 | Richmond House | London | SW1A 2NS

GTN: GRO-C  
T: GRO-C  
BB: GRO-C

The Permanent Secretary's box closes at 4pm Monday-Thursday and 2pm on Friday.

Frances Boyson/OIS/DOH

**Frances Boyson/OIS/DOH**

23/12/2010 14:46

To Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C  
cc Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Clara Swinson/PR-  
OFF/DOH/GB@GRO-C Debby Webb/HP-  
SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Suzy Powell/OIS/DOH@GRO-C Yemi  
Fagun/PH1/DOH/GB@GRO-C Paul Macnaught

Subject Re: Fw: Contaminated Blood Review: DA positions 📎

Hi Rowena,

Thanks for copying me in. Regarding your final point, it seems to me that we should continue holding that line (ie we would not share the draft report until we are ready to proceed with an announcement).

Copying to Paul, who has been involved in this more than I have, for information.

Frances

Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB

Rowena  
Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB  
23/12/2010 13:58

To Suzy Powell/OIS/DOH@GRO-C  
cc Yemi Fagun/PH1/DOH/GB@GRO-C Frances  
Boyson/OIS/DOH@GRO-C Ailsa  
Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C Debby Webb/HP-  
SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C Clara Swinson/PR-  
OFF/DOH/GB@GRO-C  
Subject Fw: Contaminated Blood Review: DA positions



RESTRICTED - Policy

Suzy,

We briefly discussed this morning a request from Scottish blood policy counterparts for Perm Sec's email address, which you were content for me to supply (and I have now done so). I thought it might be helpful to let you have a brief note of the position, and am cc'ing to Yemi and Frances (in Clare MacDonald's absence on leave).

I mentioned that Ailsa Wight and I had a very difficult telecon with all 3 DAs yesterday in relation to the contaminated blood review. Scotland currently has an independent public inquiry (the Penrose Inquiry) underway into the deaths of a number of patients in Scotland from contaminated blood/blood products, and Scottish colleagues in particular are frustrated that no letters have come to their ministers from ours about intentions/decisions on how we plan to proceed. They are also concerned that our ministers may announce their intentions before UKHD minister(s) receive such correspondence. SoS' office has been holding signed letters for the DAs for some time, but has not sent, pending a response from HA Committee

Following a letter from PS(PH) asking whether they wished to participate in the review, both Scottish and Welsh ministers said they were content for their officials to keep a watching brief on the expert group and asked that their officials be fully involved in discussing how recommendations from the clinical expert group be taken forward. NI were content to be kept informed. Although we have spoken to all DAs about what options were under consideration, none has made any specific suggestions for other options that they would like to see considered, although all - understandably - have expressed concerns about cost implications.

To summarise: we have previously shared with the DAs the paper agreed by our clinical expert group, and have had telephone conversations with them on the options under consideration, likely direction of travel, and have provided them by email with our working assumptions and cost estimates for each of these options. Yesterday, we confirmed verbally with them what we expect to be announced here.

A further significant concern to DA colleagues is that we consider that we do not have authorisation to share the near-final report of the review that we have prepared. Grateful for advice on whether we should continue to hold that position in ministers' absence.

Many thanks,  
Rowena

---

(Content modified in mailfile prior to filing since first received on **24/01/2011 09:59**.  
Last modified in mailfile: **25/01/2011 14:58**)