

Healthwatch Oxfordshire Board of Directors

Date of Meeting: 24 th November 2015	Paper No: 10
--	---------------------

Title of Presentation: Draft Minutes of the Strategy, Planning & Finance Group

This paper is for	Discussion		Decision		Information	x
--------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------	--	--------------------	---

Purpose and Executive Summary (if paper longer than 3 pages):
--

Financial Implications of Paper: Proposed reduction in funding from April 2015

Action Required: The Board is asked to note the draft minutes of the Strategy Planning & Finance Group meeting held on 1 st October 2015
--

Author: Rachel Coney

	<p>resumed, the decision to make the strategy and plan two stand-alone documents could be reviewed, in order to reduce repetition. He also urged caution in setting over ambitious outcome targets. These concerns were noted.</p> <p>ED proposed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy, as amended by this meeting, should be presented to the Board Workshop for information • The Board workshop agenda should focus on considering options in the light of potential budget cuts, rather than looking in detail at the delivery plan. • The strategy in the form amended by today's meeting should then go to full Board for adoption in November, so that we have agreed in public a statement that sets out what we would do if our funding were maintained. <p>MVM seconded and all agreed.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>OCC Budget Cuts</p> <p>RC presented a verbal update on the situation and reminded the meeting that the 100k cut likely to be proposed for HWO will sit in the context of total planned service cuts of 130-140m (80m agreed last year to take effect from April 2016 and a further 50-60m of new cuts).</p> <p>The meeting agreed that in developing a response to this threat, we must start from the position of our strategic priorities and develop/assess options in terms of their impact on our ability to deliver those.</p> <p>RC informed the meeting that the 2 options she had already drawn up were based on the assumptions that we need to continue all 4 key work areas outlined in our strategy because they are all so connected. Both options assume we do less of everything rather than losing a whole category of activity, whilst trying to ensure we can continue to do enough of everything to keep a critical mass of each activity.</p> <p>After a lengthy discussion the next steps were agreed to be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. RC to work up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 options for a 100k cut • 1 option for a 50k cut • 1 option for a 70k cut • Options for future growth to secure replacement income. b. These to be emailed to PA and TR for comment and amendment, cc-ing in MVM. PA and TR will finalise with RC for presentation to Board workshop. c. ED and GS to start work on a negotiating strategy, and then to email to RC and PA and MVM for comment. This to be based on principle that whilst we make it clear we will mount a full campaign if 	<p>PA/TR/ MVM/RC</p> <p>ED/GS RC/PA/ MVM</p>

	<p>necessary, we will not go down the campaigning route until negotiation has failed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. RC to speak to HWE and to ask them to start lobbying on our behalf, keeping us fully informed at all stages e. RC to speak to Chair of HOSC to gauge level of political support for the proposed cut. f. RC to advise the Board that information on options would be presented at the next workshop and not sent out in advance given the tight timescales. RC also to make sure the Board is aware we will need to agree a preferred option for each cuts scenario at the workshop because of the timescales within which we will need to get into detailed negotiations with OCC. 	<p>TR/PA</p> <p>RC</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------