

25/04/2025 NN-ICB/25-1094

Dear Requestor

Re: Freedom of Information Request

Thank you for your request for information, received on 20 March 2025 and further clarification, regarding outsourcing of NHS Continuing Healthcare (CHC) reviews and assessmentst. We have processed your request in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Under the FOIA, public authorities like ours are required to respond to requests for information within 20 working days. In response to your request, I can confirm that we partially hold the information requested. However, please note that some / all of the information you requested has been withheld. Under the FOIA, certain exemptions may apply to protect sensitive information.

Details of your request:

I am writing to request information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 regarding the ICB's outsourcing of NHS Continuing Healthcare (CHC) reviews and assessments. My request is structured into key areas to ensure clarity and ease of response.

Please find below our response to your request:

| 1. Procurement & Contracting | 1. Procurement & Contracting | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Please provide information on all private companies contracted to conduct CHC reviews, fast-track | | | | | |
| decisions, and full CHC assessments within the last 5 years: | | | | | |
| The name of each company | UB Healthcare | Liaison | CHS Healthcare (T/A | | |
| contracted for CHC | | | Xyla) | | |
| reviews/assessments. | | | | | |
| The contract start and end | October 2024 – | December 2022 – to | August 2024 – August | | |
| dates. | October 2025 | date | 2027 | | |
| The total value of each | Case by case up to | Nil Value – gain | Nil Value – cost per claim | | |
| contract. | £40k | share based | | | |
| | | agreement | | | |
| Whether the contract was | Framework | Direct Award | Framework | | |
| awarded via a competitive | | | | | |
| tender process, direct award, | | | | | |
| or framework agreement. | | | | | |
| Whether the contract was cost | Cost per case | Shared Benefit | Cost per case | | |
| per case or a shared benefit | | | | | |
| agreement. | | | | | |

| The name of the procurement | Countess of Chester | N/A | SBS |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| framework used, if applicable. | Hospital - CPS | | |
| The job title of the individual | Chief Nurse | Chief Nurse | Chief Nurse |
| who signed the contract on | Overall budget | Overall budget | Overall budget manager |
| behalf of the ICB and whether | manager for all CHC | manager for all CHC | for all CHC expenditure |
| they had budget-setting | expenditure | expenditure | |
| responsibilities at the time. | | | |
| The organisation that provided | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| procurement advice for | | | |
| awarding the contract. | | | |
| A copy of the Key | Included as part of | Included as part of | Included as part of |
| Performance Indicators (KPIs) | contract so cannot | contract so cannot | contract so cannot be |
| set for the provider and details | be shared. | be shared. | shared. |
| of how their performance is | Measured though | Measured though | Measured though regular |
| measured. | regular contract | regular contract | contract review meetings. |
| | review meetings. | review meetings. | (* See exemption below). |
| | (* See exemption | (* See exemption | |
| | below). | below). | |
| Confirmation of whether the | Yes | No | Yes |
| contract was awarded via the | | | |
| NHS Standard Contract. | | | |

| 2. Due Diligence & Regulatory Compliance | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| To ensure the suitability of the providers, please provide: | | | | |
| | UB Healthcare | Liaison | CHS Healthcare | |
| Copies of any due diligence | The ICB does not | References taken | The ICB does not hold this | |
| reports conducted before | hold this information | from other | information | |
| awarding the contract. | as it uses a | commissioners. The | | |
| | Framework | ICB does not hold | | |
| | Agreement – | this information. | | |
| | Countess of Chester | | | |
| | Hospital. | | | |
| Confirmation of whether the | The ICB does not | Not completed | The ICB does not hold this | |
| ICB reviewed the provider's | hold this information | | information as it uses a | |
| Companies House | as it uses a | | Framework Agreement | |
| registration, SIC codes, and | Framework | | | |
| financial standing prior to | Agreement – | | | |
| appointment. | Countess of Chester | | | |
| | Hospital. | | | |
| Details of how the ICB verified | The ICB does not | Included in provider | The ICB does not hold this | |
| the provider's compliance with | hold this information | proposal | information as it uses a | |
| NHS CHC Framework | as it uses a | | Framework Agreement | |
| requirements. | Framework | | | |
| | Agreement – | | | |
| | Countess of Chester | | | |
| | Hospital. | | | |
| Confirmation of whether the | The ICB does not | The ICB does not | The ICB does not hold this | |
| provider is registered with the | hold this information | hold this information | information | |
| Care Quality Commission | as it uses a | | | |

| (CQC) and, if not, why this | Framework | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| was not a requirement. | Agreement – | | |
| | Countess of Chester | | |
| | Hospital. | | |
| A copy of any risk | The ICB does not | The ICB does not | The ICB does not hold this |
| assessments conducted | hold this information | hold this information | information |
| before outsourcing CHC | as it uses a | | |
| assessments to the provider. | Framework | | |
| | Agreement – | | |
| | Countess of Chester | | |
| | Hospital. | | |
| | References sought | | |
| | from existing UB | | |
| | Healthcare | | |
| | customers | | |
| Copies of any internal audit | The ICB does not | The ICB does not | The ICB does not hold this |
| reports or governance reviews | hold this information | hold this information | information |
| relating to outsourced CHC | | | |
| assessments. | | | |

| 3. CHC Assessment Outcomes & Financial Impact | | | | |
|---|------------|-------------|--|--|
| To understand the impact of outsourcing on CHC eligibility and costs, please provide: | | | | |
| UB Healthcare | July 2022- | April 2023- | April 2024- | |
| | March 2023 | March 2024 | Feb 2025 | |
| The total number of CHC | N/A | N/A | 25 | |
| assessments (reviews, fast | | | | |
| tracks, and full assessments) | | | | |
| conducted by outsourced | | | | |
| providers, broken down by | | | | |
| year and assessment type. | | | | |
| The percentage of | N/A | N/A | 84% - All CHC | |
| assessments that: | | | | |
| Maintained CHC | | | | |
| eligibility – please | | | | |
| breakdown by standard | | | | |
| CHC and fast tracks. | NI/A | N1/A | 00/ | |
| Were converted to | N/A | N/A | 0% | |
| Funded Nursing Care | | | | |
| (FNC). | NI/A | NI/A | 400/ | |
| Resulted in a transfer to | N/A | N/A | 16% – all under dispute | |
| local authority/social | | | | |
| care funding. Any reported cost savings | N/A | N/A | No cost sovings to report | |
| attributed to outsourcing, | IN/A | IN/A | No cost savings to report due to current ongoing | |
| including how savings were | | | disputes | |
| calculated (e.g., reductions in | | | uisputes | |
| care package costs, transfers | | | | |
| to social care, or other). | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Liaison | July 2022- | 13/02/2023 – | April 2024- |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | March 2023 | 10/07/2024 | Feb 2025 |
| The total number of CHC | N/A | 106 CHC reviews | N/A |
| assessments (reviews, fast | | completed, 49 of | |
| tracks, and full assessments) | | these triggered the | |
| conducted by outsourced | | CHC pathway and | |
| providers, broken down by | | resulted in a DST | |
| year and assessment type. | | | |
| The percentage of | N/A | Out of the 106 | N/A |
| assessments that: | | reviews, 57 did not | |
| Maintained CHC | | trigger the CHC | |
| eligibility – please | | pathway and | |
| breakdown by standard | | therefore remained | |
| CHC and fast tracks. | | CHC funded. Of the | |
| | | 49 DST's completed, | |
| | | 6 (12%) remained | |
| | | eligible for CHC | |
| Were converted to | N/A | Of the 49 DST's | N/A |
| Funded Nursing Care | | completed, 25 (51%) | |
| (FNC). | | remained eligible for | |
| - / | | CHC | |
| Resulted in a transfer to | N/A | Of the 49 DST's | N/A |
| local authority/social | | completed, 9 (18%) | |
| care funding. | | remained eligible for | |
| Jane ramanig. | | CHC | |
| Any reported cost savings | N/A | Liaison completed | N/A |
| attributed to outsourcing, | | several other pieces | |
| including how savings were | | of work for us during | |
| calculated (e.g., reductions in | | this period, but we | |
| care package costs, transfers | | do not have a | |
| to social care, or other). | | breakdown of | |
| | | savings specifically | |
| | | for the CHC reviews. | |
| CHS Healthcare | July 2022- | April 2023- | April 2024- |
| | March 2023 | March 2024 | Feb 2025 |
| The total number of CHC | 15 | 7 | 11 |
| assessments (reviews, fast | | | |
| tracks, and full assessments) | | | |
| conducted by outsourced | | | |
| providers, broken down by | | | |
| year and assessment type. | | | |
| The percentage of | 0 CHC | 0 CHC | 0 CHC |
| assessments that: | 0 fast track | 0 fast track | 0 fast track |
| Maintained CHC | | | |
| eligibility – please | | | |
| breakdown by standard | | | |
| CHC and fast tracks. | | | |
| Were converted to | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Funded Nursing Care. | | | |
| | | l . | |

| Resulted in a transfer to | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| local authority/social | | | |
| care funding. | | | |
| Any reported cost savings | Information not held | Information not held | Information not held |
| attributed to outsourcing, | | | |
| including how savings were | | | |
| calculated (e.g., reductions in | | | |
| care package costs, transfers | | | |
| to social care, or other). | | | |

| 4. Appeals, Complaints & Disp UB Healthcare | July 2022- | April 2023- | April 2024- |
|--|------------|--|------------------------------|
| | March 2023 | March 2024 | Feb 2025 |
| The total number of | N/A | N/A | We do not hold this |
| complaints received about | | | information in a format that |
| outsourced CHC | | | we can accurately report |
| assessments. | | | on. |
| The total number of CHC | N/A | N/A | We do not hold this |
| eligibility appeals related to | | | information in a format that |
| outsourced assessments. | | | we can accurately report |
| | | | on. |
| The number of ICB decisions | N/A | N/A | We do not hold this |
| overturned on appeal, and the | | | information in a format that |
| body responsible for the | | | we can accurately report |
| decision (e.g., NHS England, | | | on. |
| independent review panels). | | | |
| The number of interagency | N/A | N/A | 4 in progress |
| disputes (e.g., between ICBs | | | |
| and local authorities) resulting | | | |
| from outsourced assessments. | | | |
| Liaison | July 2022- | April 2023- | April 2024- |
| | March 2023 | March 2024 | Feb 2025 |
| The total number of | N/A | We do not hold this | N/A |
| complaints received about | | information in a | |
| outsourced CHC | | format that we can | |
| assessments. | | accurately report on. | |
| The total number of CHC | N/A | We do not hold this | N/A |
| | | VVC GO HOL HOIG IIIIS | |
| eligibility appeals related to | | information in a | |
| eligibility appeals related to outsourced assessments. | | | |
| • | | information in a | |
| • | N/A | information in a format that we can | N/A |
| outsourced assessments. | N/A | information in a format that we can accurately report on. | |
| outsourced assessments. The number of ICB decisions | N/A | information in a format that we can accurately report on. We do not hold this | |
| outsourced assessments. The number of ICB decisions overturned on appeal, and the | N/A | information in a format that we can accurately report on. We do not hold this information in a format that we can | |
| outsourced assessments. The number of ICB decisions overturned on appeal, and the body responsible for the | N/A | information in a format that we can accurately report on. We do not hold this information in a | |
| outsourced assessments. The number of ICB decisions overturned on appeal, and the body responsible for the decision (e.g., NHS England, | N/A | information in a format that we can accurately report on. We do not hold this information in a format that we can | |

| The number of interagency disputes (e.g., between ICBs and local authorities) resulting from outsourced assessments. | N/A | We do not hold this information in a format that we can accurately report on. | N/A |
|--|------------|---|-------------|
| CHS Healthcare | July 2022- | April 2023- | April 2024- |
| | March 2023 | March 2024 | Feb 2025 |
| The total number of | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| complaints received about | | | |
| outsourced CHC | | | |
| assessments. | | | |
| The total number of CHC | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| eligibility appeals related to | | | |
| outsourced assessments. | | | |
| The number of ICB decisions | NHSE – 1 | NHSE – 1 | ICB - 1 |
| overturned on appeal, and the | ICB - 5 | | |
| body responsible for the | | | |
| decision (e.g., NHS England, | | | |
| independent review panels). | | | |
| The number of interagency | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| disputes (e.g., between ICBs | | | |
| and local authorities) resulting | | | |
| from outsourced assessments. | | | |

| 5. Data Sharing & Patient Notification | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| To understand how patient data was managed when outsourcing CHC assessments: | | | | |
| | UB Healthcare | Liaison | CHS Healthcare | |
| Was patient data shared with | Data agreement | Data agreement | Data agreement verified | |
| the outsourced provider? If | verified by data | verified by data | by data controller. | |
| so, please confirm: | controller. | controller. | | |
| The legal basis under | In accordance with | In accordance with | In accordance with NHS | |
| which patient data was | NHS Standard | NHS Standard | Standard Contract | |
| shared. | Contract | Contract | | |
| The types of data | Personal data, most | Personal data, most | Personal Data, Clinical | |
| shared (e.g., clinical | recent DST | recent review | information if held by ICB | |
| records, care plans, | | document | | |
| financial assessments). | | | | |
| Whether the provider | Yes – in accordance | Yes – in accordance | Yes – in accordance with | |
| was required to comply | with Framework and | with Framework and | Framework and NHS | |
| with NHS Data Security | NHS Standard | NHS Standard | Standard Contract | |
| and Protection Toolkit | Contract | Contract | | |
| (DSPT) standards. | | | | |
| How were patients informed | Letter sent to all | Letter sent to all | Letter sent to all patients | |
| that their data would be | patients involved | patients involved | involved advising their | |
| shared with the outsourced | advising their data | advising their data | data would be shared with | |
| provider? | would be shared with | would be shared | provider | |
| | provider | with provider | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| What information was provided to patients (e.g., privacy notices, consent forms)? | Consent form from provider | Consent form from provider | Consent form |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Please provide copies of all patient-facing communications relate to data sharing, including letters, leaflets, emails, or any other notification methods. | attachment A. | Please see attachment B. | Please see attachment C. Please see attachment D. Please see attachment E. Please see attachment F. |
| How much notice were patients given before their data was shared' | | 7 days | Assessments completed on request |
| A copy of any Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) conducted before sharing patient data with an outsourced provider. | n Please see attachment G. | Please see attachment H. | Included as part of contract so cannot be shared. (* See exemption below). |

| 6. Equality Impact & Patient Consultation | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | UB Healthcare | Liaison | CHS Healthcare | |
| Please provide a copy of any | Included as part of | Included as part of | Included as part of the | |
| Equality Impact Assessment | the policies which | the policies which | policies which are | |
| (EIA) conducted in relation to | are available from | are available from | available from the ICB | |
| the outsourcing of CHC | the ICB website - Our | the ICB website - | website - Our Policies and | |
| assessments. | Policies and | Our Policies and | Procedures - NHS | |
| | Procedures - NHS | Procedures - NHS | Nottingham and | |
| | Nottingham and | Nottingham and | Nottinghamshire ICB | |
| | Nottinghamshire ICB | Nottinghamshire ICB | | |
| Has the ICB consulted patient | No | No | No | |
| groups, advocacy | | | | |
| organisations, or families | | | | |
| regarding the outsourcing of | | | | |
| CHC assessments? If so, | | | | |
| please provide copies of any | | | | |
| consultation reports or | | | | |
| feedback summaries. | | | | |

^{*}Exemption applied at Questions 1 and 5:

The ICB is unable to share this information as it is deemed commercially sensitive under Section 43 (2) of the Act.

Section 43 of the Act states that:

(1) Information is exempt information if it constitutes a trade secret.

- (2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).
- (3) The duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, compliance with section 1(1)(a) would, or would be likely to, prejudice the interests mentioned in subsection (2).

A **public interest test** was undertaken on 14 April 2025 in response to your request made under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) sets out public interest factors in favour of and against disclosure. Some of the factors in favour were as follows:

- Ensuring that the public authority can be held accountable for its decisions, particularly as to how it spends public money.
- Ensuring that a tender process is open and transparent.
- Providing insight into the nature of a procurement process and winning bids, so that other companies are encouraged to take part in the process and improve future bids.

Public interest factors against disclosure (and in favour of the maintenance of an exemption) included:

- There is an inherent public interest in the maintenance of the exemption, and of upholding private companies' expectations that commercially confidential information will be protected from disclosure when they engage in public authority tenders.
- Avoiding the discouragement of prospective tenderers from tendering for public sector contracts, for fear of disclosure of their commercially sensitive information to competitors, and that this may adversely affect both the quality of tenders for public sector contracts, and public authorities' ability to negotiate them effectively.
- Maintaining a competitive market and driving competition as this benefits public authorities and consumers, and which could be threatened by disclosure of companies' commercial information.

On balance of the factors considered above, along with relevant case law, we considered that the ICB would be entitled to withhold a copy of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) set for the provider and details of how their performance is measured and also withhold a copy of any Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) conducted before sharing patient data with an outsourced provider and that this would not be superseded by public interest considerations.

Due to an administrative error, the Data Protection Impact Assessment for UB Healthcare incorrectly stated that the legal basis for processing under UK GDPR was Article 6(1)(a) – Consent and Article 9(2)(a) – Explicit Consent.

The correct legal basis was Article 6(1)(e) – Processing necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest, and Article 9(2)(h) – Processing necessary for the purposes of preventive or occupational medicine, the provision of health or social care, or treatment.

If you are unhappy with the way in which your request has been handled, NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board (ICB) has an internal review procedure through which you can raise any concerns you might have. Further details of this procedure can be obtained by contacting Lucy Branson, Director of Corporate Affairs via lucy.branson@nhs.net or by writing to FOI Team at NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire ICB, Sir John Robinson House, Sir John Robinson Way, Arnold, Daybrook, Nottingham NG5 6DA.

If you remain dissatisfied with the outcome of the internal review, you can apply to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), who will consider whether the organisation has complied with its obligations under the Act and can require the organisation to remedy any problems. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire ICB. You can find out more about how to do this, and about the Act in general, on the Information Commissioner's Office website at: https://ico.org.uk/for-the-public/

Complaints to the Information Commissioner's Office should be sent to:

FOI/EIR Complaints Resolution, Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF. Telephone 0303 123 1113 or report a concern via https://ico.org.uk/concerns/

Yours sincerely

Freedom of Information (FOI) Officer on behalf of NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board

nnicb-nn.foi@nhs.net

All information we have provided is subject to the provisions of the Re-use of Public Sector Information Regulations 2015. Accordingly, if the information has been made available for re-use under the Open Government Licence (OGL) a request to re-use is not required, but the license conditions must be met. You must not re-use any previously unreleased information without having the consent of NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board. Should you wish to re-use previously unreleased information then you must make your request in writing (email will suffice) to the FOI Lead via nnicb-nn.foi@nhs.net. All requests for re-use will be responded to within 20 working days of receipt.