



**Individual Patient Funding Request (IPFR) Quality Assurance (QA)  
Group Audit  
12 November 2019**

**Meeting minutes**

**Present:**

<b>Group members</b>	<b>Observers</b>
Dr James Coulson (Chair)	Mrs Karen Samuels, AWTTC
Mrs Ann-Marie Matthews (lead IPFR co-ordinator)	Mrs Gail Woodland, AWTTC
Dr Matthew Prettyjohns (Health Technology Wales representative)	Ms Rosie Spears, AWTTC
Mr Chris Palmer (Lay representative)	
Ms Jayne Barnard (Lay representative)	

**Apologies:**

Dr Susan Myles (Health Technology Wales representative)

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am.

**Introduction:**

Members were welcomed and asked to sign confidentiality agreements and declare any interests. It was noted that Ann-Marie Matthews, as a member of the Aneurin Bevan IPFR panel, would not directly score her own Health Board submission. The meeting remained quorate.

**Feedback from previous QA meeting:**

The minutes of the August QA meeting were agreed and will be made available on the AWTTC website. Action points from the May QA meeting were revisited briefly.

- a) Grounds for independent reviews.  
Rosie Spears reported back to the group that there had been one review since the previous meeting, she will request information on the grounds for review and report back to the group at the next meeting.
- b) The selection process for QA cases.  
The group are satisfied that the number of applications reviewed per panel are appropriate and should remain unchanged.
- c) Panel reports, revised layout.  
The new panel report layout has been well received by panels.
- d) Group members to attend as observers at IPFR panel meetings.  
Ann-Marie Matthews will add this to the agenda for the next network co-ordinators meeting scheduled for December.
- e) Lay member training.

The group discussed the lack of training for lay members across panels in general. Gail Woodland has been provided with training materials from one Health Board. There will be a drive to develop a training pack for panel

members to be shared across health boards. Aligning lay member training with next IPFR Workshop.

- f) Evidence support for non-medicines.  
The communication of HTW advice was raised, Matthew Prettyjohns informed the group that they are currently auditing uptake of advice and will feedback the issues raised by the QA group. Requesting non-medicine summaries to support IPFR panels will be raised with co-ordinators at the December network meeting.

Gail provided feedback from a UHB in response to comments regarding the letters sent to applicant clinicians following panel decisions in the previous QA panel report. In order to meet the 5 day deadline an initial letter is sent to the clinician which provides the panel decision. A second letter is then sent including the rationale for the decision the full panel rationale for the decision included. The group considered that a full letter with rationale should be sent within 5 working days of the meeting.

### Consideration of the QA function:

The IPFR application and associated documentation had been provided to the QA members for one randomly-chosen anonymised application per IPFR panel. The period covered was between July to September 2019. The QA Group were being asked to consider the processes followed for those IPFR applications by assessing against previously agreed and defined criteria (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Criteria used for IPFR quality assessment audit**

Process	Evidence to assess whether the process has been adhered to	Criteria
Application process	IPFR application form, clinic letters/associated emails and IPFR panel minutes	Was this an appropriate request to consider via the IPFR route?
		Was the IPFR application form signed?
		Was there sufficient information provided for the case to proceed to panel?
	Date of receipt of IPFR versus date of IPFR meeting versus urgency ticked	Was the case taken to panel within the timescale stipulated on the application form?
Panel process	IPFR panel minutes	Was the panel quorate?
		Was the discussion held by the panel in line with the decision making guide?
		Was the decision and rationale for the decision clearly described in the minutes?
Decision process	IPFR panel minutes, IPFR decision letter to clinician, IPFR decision letter to patient, date on letter vs. date of meeting	Did the letter to the clinician clearly state the decision and explain the reason for the decision?
		Was the decision letter sent to the clinician within 5 working days of the panel's decision?
		Did the letter to the clinician state the review deadline date, and enclose the review form and guidance notes where applicable?
		Was the letter to the patient sent within 5 working days of the panel's decision?

**IPFR cases:**

The group went through each panel IPFR application in reverse alphabetical order. The group looked at each criterion in turn and were asked as to whether the criterion was met, not met, undecided or not applicable. For any criterion that wasn't met the group provided reasons for their opinion. The group were also encouraged to make general comments which could be shared across all panels, in particular examples of good practice and any common themes highlighted by this audit process.

No additional comments were received. Each IPFR panel will receive a copy of their individual report and actions which will be assessed at the next IPFR QA meeting.

**AOB:**

Gail Woodland informed the group that the IPFR Workshop has been scheduled to be held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2020 and encouraged all members of the QA to attend. The group discussed ideas for the Workshop including training sessions for applicant clinicians, new IPFR panel members and lay members. It was suggested that a patient and a clinician who had been through the process are invited to share their experiences of the IPFR process, the group agreed that this would be an interesting addition to the programme.

Training for applicant clinicians was discussed; the provision of online accredited educational material will be considered to provide continued professional development (CPD) credits for clinicians. Action: to contact the learning and Education department of Cardiff and Vale to investigate feasibility of this approach.

The frequency of QA group meetings and the option to hold the QA meetings as virtual consultations was discussed. It was agreed that that group would continue to meet quarterly for now to support less experienced members but would be reviewed at a later time point.

The next IPFR QA meeting is scheduled for 21 January 2020 at 9.30 am  
The Chair closed the meeting at 11.00 am.