



"Re: FURTHER ADVICE REQUESTED ON THE MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LORD ARCHER'S REPORT ON PATIENTS WHO CONTRACTED HIV &/OR HEPATITIS C THROUGH NHS TREATMENT WITH BLOOD/BLOOD PRODUCTS."

Document Type:	Formal
File Title:	GHP - Blood Policy - Haemophilia - Archer report - follow-up and Government response
File Reference:	GHP/005/006/035
Protective Marking:	Restricted - Policy
Filed by:	Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB on 22/04/2009 at 18:37
Created by:	Morven Smith on 06/04/2009 at 17:15

Named Security Prior To Moving To Archive:

Who can edit?	Nobody
Who has edited?	Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB
Who can read?	All readers of the document database

Modification History Prior To Moving To Archive:

Modified Date and Time	Details
18/08/2009 15:06	Modified registered file

**Morven
Smith/POLICY/DOH/GB**
06/04/2009 17:15

ToRowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Elizabeth
Woodeson/CQEG/DOH/GB@GRO-C;
ccAilsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Beatrix
Sneller/OIS/DOH@GRO-C; Brian Bradley/HP-
SL/DOH/GB@GRO-C; David Harper/HPIHSD/DOH/GB@GRO-C;
Freya Lock/MPI-PPB/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Ian Matthews/PR-
OFF/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Judith Moore/OIS/DOH@GRO-C; Patrick
Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Penelope
Irving/OIS/DOH@GRO-C; Sarah Kirby/OIS/DOH@GRO-C;
Richard Murray/EOR3/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Richard
Douglas/FD/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Clare
Montagu/OIS/DOH@GRO-C; Mario Dunn/OIS/DOH@GRO-C;
Yemi Fagun/PH1/DOH/GB@GRO-C

bcc

Subject: Re: FURTHER ADVICE REQUESTED ON THE MAIN
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LORD ARCHER'S REPORT
ON PATIENTS WHO CONTRACTED HIV &/OR HEPATITIS
C THROUGH NHS TREATMENT WITH BLOOD/BLOOD
PRODUCTS.45AB2F6D1DBF66BD8025758A0034F8A9

Dear Liz and Rowena,

Thank you for your submission on the Archer Inquiry Recommendations. Thank you for pointing out the difficulties involved in MS(PH)'s preferred approach. However, in the submission's current form it does not address the Minister's concerns.

The Minister's objectives are as follows:

- A set of proposals that she can present to SofS as to what we can do to respond to the Inquiry's recommendations. These proposals will need to give options of how to approach each recommendation.
- She and SofS have already agreed that the UK-wide statutory committee is not a good idea, but they would like to pursue the idea of supporting the Haemophilia Society to have a greater advisory role. How do they best go about doing this?
- A way to put the Haemophilia Society on reasonably secure funding. She wants to know how to give them core funding in recognition of their work and wants agreement for DH to meet with them annually to discuss all issues relating to their cohort. I understand the difficulties regarding moving away from Government policy, but both SofS and MS(PH) want to do this. Can you please explore this idea? What the Minister really needs to know is how what she wants can be achieved, how much it would cost, the cons of doing so and what else could be done instead.
- She would like to know that the Haemophilia Society has been engaged as part of this process in responding to the recommendations.
- She would like the team to provide more information about how to redress insurance access imbalances.
- She is fully aware of Professor Gilmore's review.

What the Minister would really like are options on how to respond to the Archer Inquiry in the most positive way possible. She would like to see a submission which responds to her steers and sets out the options she prefers and how they might be achieved alongside the pros and cons. However, she would also like to see further options which might also provide a robust response to Lord Archer's recommendations.

I wonder if the Minister might have a clearer understanding of the options if the submission was structured differently. I think your work on the financial options was lost by it being in an Annex. It might be helpful if you structured the submission so that it takes each Archer recommendation in turn and then sets out:

1. Recommendation from Report
2. Option; Pros & Cons of Option; Financial Implications of Option; Presentation - how this will be received?;
3. Repeat for all other options
4. Your Recommendation of which option MS(PH) should pursue.

This structure will make it clearer for MS(PH) to evaluate each option whilst taking into account all implications and your advice on these options. I hope these suggestions are helpful.

Thank you for looking again at the financial questions around MFT, ET and SF. The Minister will consider these further alongside other options in a revised submission. Paragraph 4 is a good example of a con regarding the financial relief schemes, but it would be good to see what other cons and what pros there are.

Can you please get a revised submission to me **by 2pm on Thursday 16 April**?

If any of this is unclear or the deadline is not workable, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Morven Smith

Assistant Private Secretary
Minister of State for Public Health
Department of Health
Richmond House
GRO-C

****MS(PH)'s box closes at 2pm Monday to Wednesday and 12midday on Thursday.
Please note MS(PH) does not have a box on Friday.****

Rowena Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB

Rowena
Jecock/PH6/DOH/GB
31/03/2009 11:04

To Morven Smith/POLICY/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**
cc Penelope Irving/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Sarah Kirby/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Matthew Fogarty/EPD/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Katie Ratcliffe/PR-OFF/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Mike Davies/SC6/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Joanne Jones/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Clare Montagu/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Mario Dunn/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Freya Lock/MPI-PPB/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Beatrix Sneller/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; David Harper/HPIHSD/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Sian Jarvis/COMMS/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Richard Douglas/FD/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Richard Murray/EOR3/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Gareth Jones/HPIHSD/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Elizabeth Woodeson/CQEG/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Ailsa Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Jonathan Stopes-Roe/HP-SL/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Brian Bradley/HP-SL/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Michael Rogers/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Ian Matthews/PR-OFF/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Patrick Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Murray Devine/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Catherine Pearson/PR-OFF/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Richard Kelly/PR-OFF/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Olivia Carolyn Heaney/NUR-PPI/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Dilip Butterworth/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; Mary Chauhan/POLICY/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; John Sherriff/MPI-CCE/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Steve Pugh/HCSQ-S&SS/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Peter Bennett/SAT/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Stephen Dobra/SAT/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Richard Lawes/FPB-PFIC/DOH/GB@**GRO-C**; Ian Hudson@**GRO-C**; Nigel.Goulding@**GRO-C**; Judith Moore/OIS/DOH@**GRO-C**; "Kent Graham LEGAL GROUP DH LEGAL SERVICES" <Graham.Kent@**GRO-C**>, "Cohen Paula LEGAL GROUP DH LEGAL SERVICES" <Paula.Cohen@**GRO-C**>, sylvia.shearer@**GRO-C**, caroline.lewis@**GRO-C**, karen.simpson@**GRO-C**
Subject FURTHER ADVICE REQUESTED ON THE MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LORD ARCHER'S REPORT ON PATIENTS WHO CONTRACTED HIV &/OR HEPATITIS C THROUGH NHS TREATMENT WITH BLOOD/BLOOD PRODUCTS.

Morven,

Further advice on Lord Archer's recommendations, as requested by MS(PH), with many thanks to those colleagues who contributed.



MS(PH) re Archer final 31-March-2009.doc

Rowena