

1. Welcome and introductions (REDACTED)

REDACTED welcomed attendees.

2. Review of minutes, actions and decisions (REDACTED)

March minutes were not discussed. To be sent out with April minutes for approval.

Actions were not discussed. All to update per email.

3. GPES Uplift

a. Procurement Approach for GPES Uplift – for approval.

Note this agenda item was updated to - for approval

REDACTED presented the Procurement Approach for GPES Uplift.

REDACTED noted the importance of recognising lesson to be learnt from previous programme negotiations and the key risks. It is essential that we carefully manage the suppliers within the process and look at how this will fit with the negotiation strategy and overall programme. REDACTED questioned the availability of alternative routes, REDACTED stated these have been explored and the option presented is the lowest risk solution.

REDACTED requested a specific risk management plan for GPES Uplift, to include mitigations and communications.

REDACTED noted it is important for openness and transparency of project progress & procurement. Transparency enables user groups to apply pressure if required and make suppliers aware they are being monitored by others separate to the contract. REDACTED needs to ensure that part of the risk management plan exposes the transparency of supplier delivery.

REDACTED questioned the availability of historic extracts that are not payment extracts. REDACTED stated it may be possible to collect these as they have previously been collected.

REDACTED highlighted the opportunity to ensure a better service and resolve current known issues when negotiating the new contract. REDACTED requested information on the expected benefits for users when delivery concludes.

REDACTED questioned how value for money would be ensured. REDACTED stated this would be tested across suppliers, OBC data will be utilised, however fewer suppliers will make it harder to benchmark though there are still tests that can be completed. REDACTED challenged the team to look at how we can better articulate value for money.

REDACTED asked if DDC had confirmed their ability to deliver. REDACTED confirmed a response had not yet been received but an indication has been made that DDC have the capacity, currently waiting for a response on ROM costs and resource.

REDACTED asked if the workload is known for GPES Uplift. REDACTED asked how work will be prioritised. REDACTED stated that this will be discussed as part of the supplier engagement sessions starting on the 6th April and in the individual sessions starting W/C 24th April, these sessions will include dependencies, constraints and timescales and can be feed back into the next board.

REDACTED noted that the W/C 10th April the Data Coordination Board are prioritising which GPES extracts will be started as the next financial year which could include three new extracts (non-payment), consideration should be given on how this may overlap.

REDACTED questioned how GPES Uplift is aligned with GPIT Futures commercials.

REDACTED stated this is not yet clear however work is ongoing.

REDACTED asked whether it is clear what service is being moved onto GPSoC. Does this involve a service that we buy around strategic data warehouse? REDACTED stated that GPES uplift can feed into strategic solution. REDACTED questioned whether hosting element is included in current GPES and needs to be part of Uplift.

REDACTED asked how GPES Uplift will be funded. REDACTED confirmed that GPES Uplift will be seeking approval through the FBC, and the DDC element is being funded via NDS. No additional funds are being requested.

REDACTED is happy to endorse the presented Procurement Approach with the caveat that above comments are incorporated and considered.

Action – REDACTED to look into how we can test value for money of the supplier's proposals.

Action – REDACTED / REDACTED complete a specific risk management plan for GPES Uplift.

Action - REDACTED to summarise what is paid for hosting.

b. Negotiation Strategy – for discussion

REDACTED informed not ready to discuss. REDACTED stated detail is there however an overall delivery plan needs to be complete, so that the Negotiation strategy can be aligned with the delivery plan.

REDACTED advised that if assistance is required to help suppliers understand the importance of GPES Uplift, REDACTED and REDACTED can aid with this, as can boards e.g. DCB, Cross Domain board. This also needs to be included in the risk management plan discussed earlier.

Action – REDACTED to present draft Negotiation Strategy with links to the delivery plan at the next board.

c. RACI for requirements – for approval

REDACTED presented the RACI for requirements.

REDACTED wanted clarity on the term GPES Uplift requirements. REDACTED explained that this is two sets of requirement documents. One is for GPSS and one for the Digital Delivery Centre and they explain the changes that are expected of them. These may need adjusting during the supplier engagement sessions. Suppliers will be asked to block up costing for requirements.

There was a discussion around practice authorisation. REDACTED stated that decisions to change this model should not be made without discussions with stakeholders and professional groups. REDACTED asked for ongoing engagement through REDACTED and REDACTED to determine future of Stage 1/2 authorisations. This needs to be included in the engagement approach.

REDACTED suggested SCCI should be informed rather than 'N/A' and list REDACTED as the name to include.

REDACTED stated the board do not currently have NHSE representation. REDACTED stated that governance discussions were required and suggested a quarterly sponsor-level board.

REDACTED asked how the requirements would be understood within the board. REDACTED stated that the approval being sought is that the correct consultation has been completed.

REDACTED wanted to understand the requirements further and asked for a slide deck to be brought to the next board.

REDACTED stated the presented RACI is approved.

Action – REDACTED / REDACTED to look into possible early engagement regarding stage 1 and 2s and what other engagement is currently ongoing through REDACTED and REDACTED. REDACTED to forward ongoing conversations onto REDACTED.

Action – REDACTED to provide a RACI for the overall project at the next Board.

Action – REDACTED to present an overview of requirements and what will be different and the benefits to customers at the next board.

Action – REDACTED - Discussions regarding governance arrangements to take place including REDACTED/REDACTED/REDACTED/REDACTED to take a proposal to the next cross domain board.

4. Procurement Approach for Standard GP Data Set* – for discussion

REDACTED presented Procurement Approach for Standard GP Data Set.

Commercial are confident in the approach, however there are risks that need acknowledging and mitigating appropriately.

REDACTED noted three top risks are value for money, challenge from other suppliers and limited timescales for negotiations (only 6 month will be available prior to Mar-2018 GPSoC deadline because specific conversations cannot be started until September)

REDACTED noted that if run through GPIT Futures there would be possibility to set Standard for the dataset. REDACTED stated that this may be an opportunity to resolve any supplier behaviour around data controllers.

REDACTED asked regarding the PAC what was highlighted in their report. REDACTED stated the report noted that we hadn't gone out to tender for the dataset at the time for GPET-E. REDACTED stated as we gave regulation 32 as a reason for this, why is this a problem? REDACTED stated that the report also noted that a recommendation was made to include an interface service as part of the bulk service. IM1 has been built for this, but is not seen to be appropriate.

REDACTED stated the need to acknowledge the lack of engagement with other markets. REDACTED requested a horizon scan to evaluate whether other supplier markets are actually capable of completing what is required, in order to create a robust case (defensible decision) for direct award and to clearly understand the risks for option A and B, and mitigations.

Action - REDACTED – Complete a horizon scanning piece of work to evaluate the wider supplier market.

5. GP Profession Engagement Approach* - for discussion

REDACTED presented GP Profession Engagement Approach.

REDACTED stated it was important to note the current data protection regulations that are coming into force next year, and the burden involved.

REDACTED suggested the need to look at the previous engagement with care.data and addressing where we fit into this. REDACTED stated this included the alignment with NHSE and DH.

REDACTED stated this is why there is a need for openness and transparency in order to manage expectations, including senior NHS Digital commitment and governance regarding data with GP Professions.

To include discussion around requirements on operating model?

REDACTED stated this should be taken to the next cross domain board to discuss with REDACTED and their line of work and what this means in terms of sequencing.

Action – REDACTED/REDACTED to look at engagement plan and sequencing and to put together a set of slides for the next cross domain board.

6. Highlight Report

Not presented. All to review for information.

7. Risk and Issues report

Not presented. All to review for information.

8. Plan on a Page

Not presented. All to review for information.

9. AOB

REDACTED gave a brief DSP update. REDACTED stated the OBC is going to the investment sub-group on the 10th April, the TDIB on the 12th May and is aiming for full approval from the cabinet office by June end. REDACTED asked for a DSP standing agenda starting from the next board.

Tech capability workstream – assumption standard set – how does DSP path link to capability created through Uplift. If work can start on the DSP element of the standard data set, what is the journey/ roadmap?

REDACTED wants a roadmap to get a sense of timing, combining different elements.

REDACTED confirmed that standard dataset requirements have been confirmed and are being developed by consultation as an ongoing piece of work.

REDACTED stated REDACTED is struggling with NHSE sponsor. REDACTED stated an executive sponsor is needed alongside and supporting the incoming SRO. Further governance discussions needed.

Action – REDACTED to present roadmap at the next board meeting.

Action – REDACTED to look into dependency mapping.

DSP to be included as a standing agenda item

*The Gateway review to be added as an agenda item at the next board

Open actions table		
Ref	Action	Owner

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>29/06/2016 A17</p>	<p>Plan on a Page – GP System Suppliers</p> <p>Consult with REDACTED on the reactive lines to take with external bodies on engagement regarding national data set at different stages in the project and REDACTED to speak to REDACTED to ascertain whether a strategic communications plan exists around the national data set. Update 19/01/2017 – Authorised to proceed but further understanding of engagement approach is needed prior to external communications. Further discussions are taking place – REDACTED with REDACTED and REDACTED with REDACTED.</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> REDACTED has been assigned as the Domain C communications lead. Meetings will be set up shortly with programme heads to discuss future action. REDACTED is due to meet REDACTED who is leading from NHS England REDACTED has asked REDACTED to draft the engagement approach to use with the GP Profession. NHS England is seeking to identify an SRO for the GP data set <p>Update 26/03/2017 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> REDACTED is working with the team on the upcoming supplier workshops – mainly ensuring that corporate communication messages on key areas are confirmed before these sessions Further work is still ongoing to define how NHS England / NHS England will be working together to deliver the communications for paperless 2020. There is an item on the agenda for the engagement approach with the GP profession <p>Close and add recurring agenda item - REDACTED – Comms for paperless 2020.</p>	<p>REDACTED/ REDACTED</p>
<p>04/08/2016 A29</p>	<p>GP Data for Secondary Uses Highlight Report</p> <p>REDACTED to speak to REDACTED about seeking a direction for the GP Dataset and what it would mean for the programme. Update 24/11/2016 – No further progression until go-ahead agreed with SCCI. In principal REDACTED happy to lead on work.</p> <p>Update 19/01/2017 - REDACTED expectation that a Direction is required. REDACTED to determine with REDACTED on how the decision on which organisation the direction comes through.</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 - Owner changed to REDACTED.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>

<p>14/09/2016 A36</p>	<p>Risks and Issues Report</p> <p>The Chair to ask James Hawkins for guidance on treatment of Type 1 objections and proceeding on the basis of the earlier board decision (D2). Update 24/11/2016 – Follow current assumption. Further action: If type 1s remain – what is impacted by type 1s remaining at source? What is needed? New scenario to be considered. Update 19/01/2017 – Pseudo at source moving forward internally, not tested externally. REDACTED working on identifying options. REDACTED has asked REDACTED to own the requirements that GP Data needs to implement in relation to Type 1 objection. There is an external dependency on REDACTED to confirm the working assumption.</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 - REDACTED confirmed REDACTED agreed to own the requirements that GP Data needs to implement in relation to Type 1 objection. Discussions ongoing currently with REDACTED's team, further clarity on assumptions to be given provided to SK w/c 13th March by National Opt-out programme.</p> <p>Update 26/03/2017 – Current assumption is that Type 1 objections will remain in the short-term. The National Opt-out programme has also communicated to the team that de-identification needs to be included within the scope of GP Data for Secondary Uses requirements to be discussed with suppliers. Clarity required on whether this applies to GPES</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>14/09/2016 A40</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Chair to speak with Programme Director REDACTED about which Board REDACTED should be involved in in terms of MIQUEST.</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 - REDACTED to attend Ops Board on the 16/3 and recommendations from the Ops Board to be taken to EMT on the 29/3. Formal decision to be circulated when agreed.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>24/11/2016 A52</p>	<p>Customer Facing Requirements</p> <p>REDACTED to talk to REDACTED and REDACTED regarding governance routes. Update 19/01/2017 – REDACTED has responsibility of GPES replacement – GP Data Implementation project delivers GPES replacement governed under REDACTED. REDACTED to take to the Domain C board to make structure clear. Update 01/03/2017 - To be discussed at the March Domain C Board.</p> <p>Update 05/04/2017 – REDACTED to talk to incoming SRO around sponsorship for the programme.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>

<p>24/11/2016 A56</p>	<p>Local standardised plan</p> <p>REDACTED/REDACTED to further discuss responsibilities regarding standardising local data flows.</p> <p>Update 19/01/2017 – REDACTED to pick up as a priority.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>19/01/2017 A60</p>	<p>Governance routes</p> <p>REDACTED to discuss with REDACTED decision and approval route for GPES Uplift outside of formal boards due to time limitations</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 – REDACTED to seek endorsement for contingency option 2b as per the slide deck from REDACTED by the end of March. Update 27/03/2017 – REDACTED has contacted REDACTED to confirm approval for next steps.</p> <p>Update 10/04/2017 – No response received from REDACTED prior to his retirement. REDACTED to discuss with new SRO once confirmed.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>19/01/2017 A62</p>	<p>Governance plan</p> <p>REDACTED to review governance plan required around dataset including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intent, activity, resource, process, dependencies and how they fit together. • Further work to understand the impact of providing information to the public, is it the right time to submit to DCB – who is responsible and accountable for this being completed correctly and in context with the projects overall set of objectives. REDACTED to seek advice from REDACTED. <p>Update 18/02/2017 – A meeting has taken place between REDACTED, REDACTED and REDACTED. The governance process is understood and agreed that it needs to be set out in the timeline for the GP Data options. Further work required regarding sponsorship and approval of the GP Data Set by REDACTED and the project team. REDACTED to start with REDACTED for NHS England and REDACTED for Public Health England. Update 01/03/2017 - Work ongoing to finalise sponsorship. REDACTED in discussion with PHE, PHE have asked for more time to confirm use cases. Ongoing work to confirm with NHS England – likely to be linked to decision on the SRO for GP data set.</p> <p>Update 26/03/2017 - We have NHS England use cases but situation remains the same that we have no sponsor and no one to approve the use cases at present. REDACTED and REDACTED continuing to raise through the appropriate meetings.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>

<p>19/01/2017 A64</p>	<p>Governance RACI</p> <p>REDACTED to circulate governance RACI – board to review and advise on any further groups that may need consulting. Update 18/02/2017 – A RACI has been drafted but will need to be reviewed following a Board decision on the preferred option for contingency.</p> <p>Update 01/03/2017 - RACI work ongoing, to be circulated to the board once deliverables for the next stage of the project have been agreed. Update 22/03/2017 – Agenda item to cover – to close.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>01/03/2017 A66</p>	<p>Customer Facing Requirements</p> <p>REDACTED/REDACTED to discuss the option of a broader engagement piece with NHS England in order to share plans for replacing GPES and the strategic direction.</p> <p>Update 27/03/2017 – REDACTED and REDACTED to review NHS England representation at the GP Data Project Board as a first step.</p>	<p>REDACTED/REDACTED</p>
<p>01/03/2017 A67</p>	<p>Customer Facing Requirements</p> <p>REDACTED to contact REDACTED around additional examples for the use case document (missing research agenda and winter pressures).</p> <p>Update 26/03/2017 – A discussion has taken place, and will be incorporated into document but a sponsor is still required. To close.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>01/03/2017 A68</p>	<p>GP Data Contingency Options</p> <p>REDACTED / REDACTED to complete further work on the fit between option 2b and potential commercial options. Update 22/03/2017 – Agenda item to cover this Covered – to close.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>01/03/2017 A69</p>	<p>GP Data Procurement Approach</p> <p>REDACTED to present Market Engagement strategy to the next board.</p> <p>Update 22/03/2017 – Agenda item to cover this – to close.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A70</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – Procurement Approach</p> <p>REDACTED to look into how we can test value for money of the supplier’s proposals.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>

<p>05/04/2017 A71</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – Procurement Approach REDACTED / REDACTED to complete a specific risk management plan for GPES Uplift.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A72</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – Procurement Approach REDACTED to summarise what is paid for hosting.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A73</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – Negotiation Strategy REDACTED to present draft Negotiation Strategy with links to the delivery plan at the next board. To be presented at June board.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A74</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – RACI for requirements REDACTED/REDACTED to look into possible early engagement regarding stage 1 and 2s and what other engagement is currently ongoing through REDACTED and REDACTED. REDACTED to forward ongoing conversations onto REDACTED.</p>	<p>REDACTED / REDACTED / REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A75</p>	<p>Overall Programme - RACI for requirements REDACTED to provide a RACI for the overall project at the next Board. To be presented at June board.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A76</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – RACI for requirements REDACTED to present an overview of requirements and what will be different and the benefits to customers at the next board.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A77</p>	<p>GPES Uplift – RACI for requirements REDACTED - Discussions regarding governance arrangements to take place including REDACTED/REDACTED/REDACTED/REDACTED to take a proposal to the next cross domain board.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A78</p>	<p>Procurement Approach for Standard GP Data Set REDACTED – Complete a horizon scanning piece of work to evaluate the wider supplier market.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
<p>05/04/2017 A79</p>	<p>AOB REDACTED to look into dependency mapping.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>

<p>05/04/2017</p> <p>A80</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>REDACTED to present technical capability roadmap at the next board meeting.</p>	<p>REDACTED</p>
--	---	------------------------

GP Data Implementation Project Board Decisions		
D1	A decision was made to approve the terms of reference (subject to the correction identified in action 9).	20 th May 2016
D2	A decision was made that the working assumption for the business case is that patient consent will be handled in a central platform, rather than at practice level.	20 th May 2016
D3	A decision was made to approve procurement with 3 rd party suppliers to support VfM comparisons on options developed in the business case.	20 th May 2016
D4	A decision was made to approve in principle a separate feed of aggregate data for payment purposes.	14 th September 2016
D5	A decision was made to endorse Tolerance Exception Report 1	14 th September 2016
D6	A decision was made to endorse OBC	19 th October 2016
D7	A decision was made to endorse contingency option 2b	01 st March 2017
D8	A decision was made to endorse Procurements Approach for GPES Uplift	05 th April 2017
D9	A decision was made to endorse the RACI process for the GPES Uplift requirements	05 th April 2017

GP Data Interim Strategy Board Assumptions		
A1	Seeking a direction for an extract and the SCCI process will remove the requirement for the current practice authorisation model (stage 1 and stage 2).	19 th January 2017
A2	QOF will continue for at least the next two years.	19 th January 2017
A3	MVP 1.0 will not be available before March 2019 and will contain functionality to meet the GP Data for Secondary Uses requirements (informal confirmation provided by John Mayo)	01 st March 2017
A4	Delivery of contingency option will be done in such a way that it can be consumed by the DSP	01 st March 2017

CONFIDENTIAL