

# Shaping Our Future Hospital Committee

Wed 09 March 2022, 09:00 - 11:00

## Agenda

---

### 1. Standing Items

*Rhian Thomas*

#### 1.1. Welcome and Introductions

*Rhian Thomas*

#### 1.2. Apologies for Absence

*Rhian Thomas*

#### 1.3. Declarations of Interest

*Rhian Thomas*

#### 1.4. Minutes of the previous Committee meeting – 12th January 2022

*Rhian Thomas*

 DRAFT - SOFHC minutes 120122MD.NF. RT.pdf (10 pages)

#### 1.5. Action Log following the previous meeting – 12th January 2022

*Rhian Thomas*

 Draft SOFHC - Action Log 090322MD.NF.pdf (1 pages)

---

### 2. Items for Review and Assurance

#### 2.1. Review of Hospitals Programme Update:

*Abigail Harris*

##### 2.1.1. General Update

*Abigail Harris*

##### 2.1.2. Outcome of Strategy Workshop

*Abigail Harris*

---

### 3. Items for Approval / Ratification

### 4. Items for Information and Noting

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:40:54

## 4.1. Review of Programme Risk Register

*Abigail Harris*

---

## 5. Agenda for Private Meeting:

i) Update on Workshop

---

## 6. Any Other Business

---

## 7. Review and Final Closure

### 7.1. Items to be deferred to Board / Committee

*Rhian Thomas*

**7.2. To note the date, time and venue of the next Committee meeting: Wednesday 28th June 2022 at 9.00am**

---

## 8. Declaration

*Rhian Thomas*

To consider a resolution that representatives of the press and other members of the public be excluded from the remainder of this meeting having regard to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, publicity on which would be prejudicial to the public interest [Section 1(2) Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960]

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

**Minutes of the Shaping Our Future Hospitals Committee  
12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 at 09.30am  
Via MS Teams**

<b>Chair:</b>		
Rhian Thomas	RT	Independent Member - Estates
<b>Present:</b>		
John Union	JU	Independent Member - Finance
Gary Baxter	GB	Independent Member - University
David Edwards	DE	Independent Member - IT
<b>Attendees:</b>		
Nicola Foreman	NF	Director of Corporate Governance
Abigail Harris	AH	Executive Director of Strategic Planning
Edward Hunt	EH	Programme Director – Strategic Planning
Navroz Masani	NM	Clinical Board Director
Catherine Phillips	CP	Executive Director of Finance
Geraldine Johnson	GJ	Operations Director for Future Hospitals Programme
<b>Observer:</b>		
Marcia Donovan	MD	Head of Corporate Governance
<b>Secretariat</b>		
Nikki Regan	NR	Corporate Governance Officer

Item No	Agenda Item	Action
<b>SOFHC 12/01/001</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Introduction</b>  The Chair thanked Navroz Masani (NM) for joining the Committee.	
<b>SOFHC 12/01/002</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>  <b>The Committee resolved that:</b>  a) No apologies were given.	
<b>SOFHC 12/01/003</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>  <b>The Committee resolved that:</b>  a) There were no Declarations of Interest.	
<b>SOFHC 12/01/004</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous Committee meeting – 13<sup>th</sup> October 2021</b>  Edward Hunt noted some minor amendments were required and that he would send the same through to the Corporate Governance team.  <b>The Committee resolved that:</b>	

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

	<p>a) Pending the above amendments, the minutes from the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.</p>	
<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/005</b></p>	<p><b>Action log following the previous meeting – No Action Log</b></p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) There was no Action Log.</p>	
<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/006</b></p>	<p><b>Verbal feedback on Infrastructure Investment Board</b></p> <p>The EDSP gave a verbal update on the Infrastructure Investment Board which included the following points: –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a Welsh Government (WG) panel which received business cases. That panel included colleagues that sat in other departments.</li> <li>• The team was grateful to WG who had put in place a dedicated schedule of meetings.</li> <li>• A detailed presentation was given on the scheme.</li> <li>• Responses were provided to all questions which had been raised in advance.</li> </ul> <p>The EDSP noted that all questions regarding transport, affordability, balance of potential cost of the scheme were answered. Clinical members of staff have said that the current building did not best meet the needs of patients.</p> <p>No formal feedback following the meeting with WG had been received yet.</p> <p>Edward Hunt (EH) noted the need for NHS Wales to benefit from the project.</p> <p>Navroz Masani (NM) and the Interim Executive Medical Director (IEMD) put forward the current issues with UHW to highlight the case for a new hospital as opposed to “making do” with the existing hospital.</p> <p>The Executive Director of Finance (EDF) noted the difficulty with reaching a funding solution. In particular, there was a lot of old estate at the UHW.</p> <p>The Independent Member for University (IMU) questioned the scope and the remit of the meeting and queried whether any partner organisations had been represented at the meeting?</p> <p>The EDSP answered the following: –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was agreed not to overcrowd the meeting and thus two primary partners had attended (the University and WHSSC).</li> </ul>	

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

- It was noted that the University had its own capital schemes and they were not able to say if it was the UHW site that was to be redeveloped at this stage.
- WHSSC attended given the Health Board's role as a specialist and tertiary provider.
- Due to the affordability and challenges across Wales it was questioned how can the Health Board could help Government.
- One suggestion was to have set out a 15-20-year structure plan. It would help to shape that on an all Wales basis.

The Independent Member for Digital (IMD) noted the effect a new hospital would have on a patient's welfare. He expressed concern should there be a significant delay with building the new hospital. He queried what more could be done and at what point should a different approach be taken.

The EDSP noted the need to follow the five-stage business case model and that it was important to get the Programme Business Case (PBC) endorsed. She noted further that it was the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) which would unlock the timescales and set out the options.

The EDSP noted further that: –

- It was the SOC that would take the team through the pathways.
- Bone marrow transplant and critical care needed to be addressed.
- We would need a plan for BMT.

NM noted there was work to be done on why the infrastructure was failing and the need to make the infrastructure fit for purpose. The Health Board should increase its Critical Care services urgently.

The EDSP suggested that NM worked with EH to consider matters and the importance of engaging with the stakeholders (e.g. WHSSC and the University) and other Health Boards with regards to the regional delivery of services.

The EDSP commented that a report was due to go to the WG Cabinet and that her team had hoped to have more information on Friday. She had understood that the paper to be presented on Friday would be to support the endorsement of the PBC.

**The Committee resolved that:**

- a) The verbal feedback regarding the Infrastructure Investment Board was noted.

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

## Lifesciences Commercial Opportunities

EH provided an update which had included the following points: –

- The PBC had proposed a research hospital for the future.
- Even though the PBC had not yet been endorsed by WG, the decision was made to do some early work on the matter.
- Hence Grant Thornton had been engaged and they had proposed to run 3 workshops, with the first workshop held on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2021.
- The feedback from the first workshop had been positive.
- The next workshop was due next month.

The Independent Member for University (IMU) said he was pleased to have seen the notion for a research hospital being strengthened.

The IMU noted that Grant Thornton were running a series of workshops. He questioned what experience Grant Thornton had and what other developments had they been involved with.

EH noted that their experience includes Cambridge, UCLH (University College London Hospitals) and Manchester.

The IMU noted the University had identified all the commercial life sciences operations in the South Wales region. He queried who could be involved in the opportunity?

The EDSP noted the following: –

- It represented a unique selling point.
- Part of the work was to tease out the government strategy.
- The strategy listed 8 areas of population health interest.
- The work was accelerating on the City Edge Life Sciences Park and in relation to the relocation of the Genomics and the laboratories.

EH questioned how the development of UHW 2 could stimulate growth.

The IMU suggested the need to focus upon the hospital as a facility not just for delivery of high-class healthcare but to enable and support clinical and basic Life Science research.

### **The Committee resolved that:**

- a) The Committee noted the development of the Life Sciences Commercial Opportunities work.

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

**Update on scoping of the SOC and the work of Grant Thornton**

EH provided an update with regards to the scoping of the SOC and the work of Grant Thornton. He highlighted the 4 areas of work, namely: –

- SOC Scope.
- Clinical Transformation.
- Buildings Survey Specification – the Health Board’s Director of Capital and Estates and Facilities would commission a survey.
- Digital Strategy refresh.

The Chair questioned how Grant Thornton were being funded. EH confirmed they were being funded from the from the reduction in expenditure due to COVID.

The Chair questioned whether a pot of money would be released when the PBC was approved. The Executive Director of Finance noted if the SOC was funded, it was not clear when the Health Board would receive the money. If it was received during Quarter 1, it would give some flexibility.

The Chair questioned how Grant Thornton were being evaluated in relation to providing value for money.

EH responded that: –

- The PBC was excellent.
- The Health Board did not have the capacity in house and thus were creating capacity by buying in the expertise.
- The Health Board was looking to maintain the modelling from Light Foot.

The EDSP explained that in relation to the next stages her team would be working closely with Procurement colleagues. The Health Board was also working closely with Hywel Dda Health Board as they were using an external consultant.

EH explained that the Independent Members had been contacted given that the spend had increased beyond what was originally envisaged and that spend had been confirmed by Executive colleagues.

**The Committee resolved that:**

- a) The approach described in the covering report was noted together with the advantage that early delivery of output could provide the Health Board whilst endorsement of the PBC was awaited.

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

**SOFHC  
12/01/009**

**Service Lines for the Clinical Transformation**

Navroz Masani gave a presentation and highlighted the following points: –

- There were 6 steps and noted that the seventh step would be the output.
- The Health Board did not have a specific Cancer Clinical Board, although conversations with Velindre would take place.
- The team would pick two service lines to work with and Grant Thornton would play a part to help move that forward.
- The major interventional groups were technology, workforce change, pathway improvement and channel change. That was work the Health Board could not do themselves without significant delay or investment.
- Specific implications – these were the same priorities that the team had identified as cross cutting themes.
- The intervention plan should align with work that the team were already doing.
- Grant Thornton did not want to take away existing plans.

The Chair noted there was an opportunity to discuss what would be done over the next few years.

The EDSP commented that the work that should be done irrespective of the SOC. Grant Thornton had made comments which were positive. Engagement was very important and her team would ensure that the patient’s voice was heard in the development of the pathways.

**The Committee resolved that:**

- a) The development of the Service Lines for Clinical Transformation work was noted.

**SOFHC  
12/01/010**

**Update on the Survey of the Infrastructure**

The Committee received the update on the Survey of the Infrastructure report.

EH provided an update on the following: -

- Conversations had taken place with the Capital Estates and Facilities team to provide an initial report regarding the structural state of the UHW site.
- There were particular areas of concern, with one being the tunnels under the hospital building.
- The hurdle to demolish buildings would be challenging and the possibility to re-use some of the buildings.
- Thought would be required with regards to how the buildings would meet “net zero” in terms of sustainability.

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

	<p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) the development of the Survey of the Infrastructure work was noted.</p>	
<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/011</b></p>	<p><b>Operational Lead Update</b></p> <p>Geraldine Johnson (GJ) presented to the Committee and commented upon the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focus would be upon multiple areas – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New hospital.</li> <li>- Shaping our Future Clinical Services (SOFCS)</li> <li>- Exploring design principles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The team were looking to start communication and engagement.</li> <li>• Work was being undertaken for transformation centres.</li> <li>• There was a plan to gather intelligence in relation to new hospitals which had been built over the last 5 years and ones that would be opening in the next 5 years.</li> <li>• Careful thought was required to future proof and to support the SOFCS programme.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair queried what were the priorities in Quarter 4.GJ responded that during the next Quarter a key issue was to ensure engagement with frontline staff.</p> <p>The IMU asked at what point should there be engagement with local residents. EH commented that the team had liaised with colleagues in Hywel Dda HB and they had engaged with their population around sites and had asked for nominations on sites. He stated the Health Board were proposing to undertake some engagement later in the year.</p> <p>The IMU commented that he would not want local residents to find out via the media.</p> <p>EH responded that nothing could be released at the moment as a site had not been confirmed but he would liaise with the Communications team again.</p> <p>The EDSP commented that her team were liaising with the Consultation Institute to guide the Health Board with its engagement strategy. She noted that if the PBC was endorsed, the Health Board would have to be ready with appropriate “comms”.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) The work planned for Quarter 4 2021/22 was noted.</p>	

Saunders,Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/012</b></p>	<p><b>Committee Terms of Reference - 2022/23</b></p> <p>The Director of Corporate Governance (DCG) noted the Terms of Reference (ToR) were presented to the Committee every year for review. There had been no significant changes to the ToR.</p> <p>The DCG noted that a slight amendment to the ToR would be made in order to show how the Programme Board reported to the Committee.</p> <p>The IMU noted that the word “Shaping” had been introduced on the title page but had been omitted in the body of the document.</p> <p>The DCG said she would update the draft ToR to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>EH noted there were terms of reference for the Programme Board and that he would liaise with the DCG to ensure the purpose of both sets of terms of reference were aligned.</p> <p>The Chair noted the delegated powers to the Committee via the ToR. That included to review and approve and provide assurance to the Board. She queried if there was sufficient control for the Committee. The DCG noted the Committee did not have sight of the business cases coming forward. The Committee should consider how those could be reported to the Committee.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Pending the amendments to be made by the DCG, - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The changes to the Terms of Reference for the Shaping Our Future Hospitals Committee were ratified; and</li> <li>(ii) The changes were recommended to the Board for approval.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NF</b></p>
<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/013</b></p>	<p><b>Committee Work plan - 2022/23</b></p> <p>The DCG presented the draft Committee’s draft Annual Work Plan 2022/23.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Committee work plan for 2022/23 was reviewed; and</li> <li>b) It would be recommended to the Board for approval on 31 March 2022.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>SOFHC 12/01/014</b></p> <p><i>Saunders, Nathan 03/02/2022 11:30:54</i></p>	<p><b>Committee Annual Report - 2021/22</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the report stated 3 Independent Members but ToR stated 4 members.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p>	

	<p>a) The draft Annual Report 2021/22 of the Future Hospitals Committee was reviewed; and</p> <p>b) The said Annual Report was recommended to the Board for approval.</p>	
<b>SOFHC 12/01/015</b>	<p><b>Programme Board Minutes – 02.11.2021</b></p> <p>EH noted that the Programme Board in December had not taken place, although the minutes from November’s Programme Board meeting were presented to the Committee.</p> <p>The EDF suggested that it would be helpful to have a brief update report presented to the Committee rather than minutes.</p> <p>EH agreed to provide a brief update report instead of the minutes of the Programme Board’s meetings.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) The programme Board minutes from November 2021 were noted.</p>	EH
<b>SOFHC 12/01/016</b>	<p><b>Review Programme Risk Register</b></p> <p>The Committee received the Review Programme Risk Register.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) The Programme Risk Register was noted.</p>	
<b>SOFHC 12/01/017</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>The Chair requested the slides that were shown to the Investment Board were shared with the Committee.</p> <p>The Chair noted that as a future agenda item it would be helpful to have a session which explained the purpose of the SOC, terminology relating to the green book business model etc. The DCG suggested that it would be a useful session for all Board members and that she recommended the session be delivered at a future Board Development Session.</p> <p>The Independent Member for Digital (IMD) commented that he would like to see a very high-level plan outlining potential timescales for such a large project.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved that:</b></p> <p>a) Any Other Business was discussed and noted.</p>	AH  NF
<b>SOFHC 12/01/018</b>	<b>Items to be deferred to Board / Committee</b>	

	<b>The Committee resolved that:</b>	
	a) No items were deferred.	
	To note the date, time and venue of the next Committee meeting: <b>Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 9.00am</b>	

Saunders, Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54

**Public ACTION LOG**  
**Following Shaping Our Future Hospitals Committee**  
**12<sup>th</sup> January 2022**  
(For the Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022)

MINUTE REF	SUBJECT	AGREED ACTION	DATE	LEAD	STATUS/COMMENT
<b>Actions Completed</b>					
<b>SOFHC 12/01/012</b>	Committee Terms of Reference	Nicola Foreman to update the draft Terms of Reference to reflect the changes proposed by members at during the last Committee meeting.	31st March 2022	Nicola Foreman	<b>COMPLETED</b> – draft Terms of Reference to go to Board for approval in March 2022.
<b>SOFHC 12/01/015</b>	Programme Board Minutes 02.11.2021	Edward Hunt to provide a brief report on the Programme Report instead of the minutes standing item on the agenda).	9 <sup>th</sup> March 2022	Edward Hunt	<b>COMPLETED.</b> Summary of matters discussed in Programme Board to be reported, in report format, to future Committee meetings.
<b>Actions In Progress</b>					
<b>SOFHC 12/01/017</b>	Presentations slides to Investment Board	Abigail Harris to share a copy of the slides which were presented to the Investment Board with the Committee	9 <sup>th</sup> March 2022	Abigail Harris	Update to be provided at the next Committee meeting
<b>Actions referred to Committees of the Board/Board Development</b>					
<b>SOFHC 12/01/017</b>	Training session on the five stage/Green Book business case – referred to Board Development Session	Nicola Foreman to arrange an appropriate date for Board members to receive a training session on the five stage/Green Book business case model.	28 <sup>th</sup> April 2022	Nicola Foreman	Date for a Board Development Session to include this item to be agreed and will be confirmed to this Committee.

Saunders Nathan  
03/02/2022 11:30:54