

FOR INFO
FROM ISOBE

40115(b).

Carol Wood

From: "Dianne Leyland" <dianne@nacvs.org.uk>
To: <addlists@nacvs.org.uk>
Cc: "Dianne Leyland" <dianne@nacvs.org.uk>; <kevin@nacvs.org.uk>
Sent: 08 July 2003 17:34
Subject: Attn: Chief Officer/Health Lead re: PPI Forums

For the attention of Chief Officer/Health & Social Care lead
Please reply to dianne@nacvs.org.uk

Dear All

Thanks to everyone who has been in touch about their PPI Forum bids. It appears that bid interviews continue to follow the same pattern, and to date CVS responses are falling into two main camps (in very broad terms):

1) Withdraw from the process

- as a principled protest about the way it has been handled
- because the process has been flawed to date, and the CVS does not want to risk further difficulties
- because the Forums could not be provided to an appropriate standard with the funds available from CPPIH

2) Continue with the process

- because of the risk of damage to local relationships if the CVS pulls out
- because of a commitment to providing this service to patients, and concern that there are no other suitable providers locally
- because of concerns that the CVS will end up supporting any other organisation that was awarded the contract, with no financial compensation for this work. (For your information, several CVS have mentioned that they are aware that their local CAB are also bidding).

So far, responses suggest 1/3 in the first group, 1/3 in the second and 1/3 yet to decide.

Of those CVS who are likely to continue, most are attempting to revise their budget. There is a widespread feeling that a good quality service could not be provided for less than £45-£50k per Forum. Some CVS are proposing to reduce the activity level or scope of their Forums to fit the likely funding of £25k. It is worth noting that CPPIH seems to be more generous for Forums in the south, although they won't specify an exact amount.

Given these differing views, I don't feel it would be appropriate for NACVS to co-ordinate a mass withdrawal from this process – but do keep me informed about your decision, in case the tide turns over the next few days. I will write to CPPIH again next week to express our concerns, in particular about the 'shifting goalposts' in terms of the support available from regional CPPIH centres and the apparent degradation of the input expected of Forum providers. Several CVS are angry that what they originally thought would be an expert, community-focused role is now becoming little more than an administration function.

10/07/03

As mentioned in my last message, I am also in discussion with the Compact Advocacy team to consider useful ways of moving this issue up the Government agenda. This may include parliamentary questions or referral to an appropriate select committee. I will certainly copy my letter to the Chair of the health select committee.

You may wish to look at CPPIH's own risk assessment for the Forums, which you will find at:

<http://www.cppih.org/about250603agenda.html>

A few CVS have studied this and have raised the point that CPPIH appear to be passing many of the high and medium risk elements down to the network providers. This information may help you to decide whether you wish to proceed with your bid in return for limited funds.

I hope this information is helpful – please keep in touch.

Regards

Dianne

Please reply to dianne@nacvs.org.uk

NACVS
Arundel Court
Arundel Street
Sheffield S1 2NU

Tel : 0114 2786636

Fax: 0114 2787004

Web: <http://www.nacvs.org.uk>

10/07/03

22:21 588Z-101-01