

RESTRICTED: POLICY

Mr Dyson
PS to Perm Sec

From: J C Dobson, FP(A)-FPS

Date: 6 February 1996

cc	Dr Metters	DCMO
	Mr Garland	FP-FPS
	Mr Barton	F
	Mr Guinness	CA-OPU
	Dr Harding	EOR
	Dr Rejman	CA-OPU
	Mr Sharpe	HP4
	Mr Waterhouse	HCD-SCS(A)
	Mrs James	SOLB4
	Mr Brownlee	F1
	Mrs Marsden	FP-FPS

COMPENSATION FOR HAEMOPHILIACS WITH HEPATITIS C

Kevin Guinness forwarded to you earlier today a table we had prepared, which attempted to summarise the key points in the option appraisal in his draft submission. I attach a revised version of the table which takes his comments into account (mainly by dropping the attempt at a scoring system which, in this particular case, does not I think add much).

2. The main purpose of this minute is to give Permanent Secretary (and colleagues) a little more background on the reason for producing the table. As you will be aware, Secretary of State has asked for all submissions involving major expenditure to be scrutinised by a "major business case team"; it appears that he is also interested in the idea of a standardised form of presentation so that ministers can quickly go to the key figures they need in making a decision. At a meeting of members of the team the week before last it was agreed that the ideal of a completely standardised presentation was probably not achievable. We did however think that it might be worth experimenting with the idea of a standard "summary table" showing the various options considered on one dimension, and their "scores" against the chosen appraisal criteria on the other. The attached table represents an attempt to produce such a summary table for the Hepatitis C option appraisal.

3. I would be very interested in colleagues' views. My own tentative conclusion is that this example shows that the "summary table" idea can be made to work; in this particular case I don't personally think it adds much value, mainly because the option appraisal is relatively straightforward (the more expensive the scheme, the more political peace it buys in the short-term but the more problems it stores up for the longer term). Since this particular submission has not been exposed to the full "major business case" process I suspect we might do better not to include the table in the submission which goes to PS(H) but hold our fire until we have an example in which it is more clearly of value.

J C Dobson
QH 1N24
Ext. **GRO-C**

Ref: feb2.2