NHS Health Check Provider Options for mixed model where GP practice is the predominant method of delivery Option 4 Mixed Model (A combination of predominant GP Practice Delivery and some community outreach delivery to key most likely to benefit groups)	Strengths	Challenges
<b>Option 1</b> Citywide coverage using individual GP practices via Direct Award under negotiated procedure for predominant NHS Health Check provision and focused community outreach	<ul> <li>All of the advantages of GP Practice provision (Option 1 Model document) apply for this.</li> <li>Use of existing IT infrastructure (Systm1, EMIS) input, extraction and recall. Patient data access ensures that eligibility is checked</li> <li>Current GP Practice model uses existing venous blood testing without additional incurred costs – more cost effective, higher quality assurance and referral opportunities</li> <li>Digital aspect of NHS Health Check can feed directly from and into the clinical system building on the pilot that has been developed by the GP Confederation. Some practices already established this.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Opportunity to improve outcome focused element serving key at r</li> <li>Opportunity for collaboration is economies of scale and efficience uniform processes.</li> <li>More difficult for commissioner with resource available across 96</li> <li>Negotiated Procedure with 90 pl procurement route.</li> </ul>
Citywide coverage using GP Confed as lead provider via	<ul> <li>The GP Confederation is a Member Led organisation that unites and represents over 90 GP Practices across the city. All of the advantages of GP Practice provision (Option 1 Model document) apply. However the following specifically apply to the Leeds GP Confederation as a lead Provider.</li> <li>Reduced management cost as only dealing with one provider</li> <li>Use of existing IT infrastructure (Systm1, EMIS) input, extraction and recall. Patient data access ensures that eligibility is checked</li> <li>Current GP Practice model uses existing venous blood testing without additional incurred costs – more cost effective, higher quality assurance and referral opportunities</li> <li>Digital aspect of NHS Health Check can feed directly from and into the clinical system building on the pilot that has been developed by the GP Confederation. Some practices already established this.</li> <li>Extended access appointments are able to offer flexible appointment times across evening and weekends if utilized. The GP Confederation manage the contracts for this provision. This service gives service users more options to obtain NHS Health Checks.</li> <li>There is much more control to deliver LCC's core values. There is much</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Contract managing a large service Although only one provider the prito over 90 Provider (GP practices)</li> <li>Majority of provision is still within priorities eg Covid vaccination primore flexibility with the addition</li> <li>Practicalities of managing budget GP activity based payment with set</li> </ul>

more ability to influence and commission on outcomes

omes is reduced due to lack of community at risk groups.

n is limited due to individual contracts. Also ency are reduced as more difficult to maintain

ner to manage and support contract delivery s 96 practices

0 plus Practices wouldn't be feasible as a

vice and budget to committed to one organisation. e provision of the activity is actually subcontracted ces), which mitigates this risk.

ithin GP Practices which can be affected by other n programme. However the contract could allow on of community outreach built into the contract. get envelope need to be considered I.e. splitting th some budget for community provision.

	<ul> <li>The GP Confederation have experience of developing, implementing and evaluating a pilot for community outreach in current contract, therefore in a good position to build on and manage a successful community outreach service.</li> <li>If there are any issues, they will be easier to resolve with one provider</li> <li>Negotiated Procedure will allow the opportunity to negotiate and build on outcomes and value for money.</li> </ul>	
Option 3	Testing the open market for innovation.	• The responses received would a
Competitive Tender Exercise for predominant NHS Health Check provision and focused community outreach		<ul> <li>Leeds to enable access to their population details, a systematic for people identified as being at data sharing agreements would</li> <li>NHS Health checks may not be a be reluctant to use the service I</li> <li>Additional significant financial of costs, costs of training staff. Cose enable access eligible populatio</li> <li>Potential fallout from some GP new Provider/consortia. Practic not delivering NHS Health Chec from experience elsewhere this disengage and not be willing to</li> <li>Practicalities of managing budg GP activity based payment with</li> <li>Would focus on opportunistic to therefore meeting OHID target</li> <li>limited provider interest from e during Review.</li> </ul>
Option 4	Gives LCC more flexibility	Challenge of correct governance     hotween CD Confederation pro-
Assuming Option 2 using Confed as lead Provider is adopted:	<ul> <li>All advantages listed in Option 2 using negotiated procedure with GP Confed and advantages of Option 3 in terms of testing the market for</li> </ul>	between GP Confederation pro require higher costs.
Separating above into two contracts to deliver:	innovation within the community outreach arm of the service.	<ul> <li>All the disadvantages listed in Confed and disadvantages of 0</li> </ul>
1) Predominant NHS Health Check provision		innovation within the commun
<ul> <li>Direct GP Confed as lead provider</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>limited provider interest from during Review.</li> </ul>

d all rely on co-operations with all GP practices in ir clinical systems, determine the eligible tic invitation process and appropriate follow up at high-risk of CVD. Information governance and Ild be required

e offered at GP Practices and service users may e based on Insight consultation undertaken.

I costs will affect the delivery of the service, eg IT Cost implication to purchase software solution to Cion and transfer data back to GP

P Practice if activity taken away and given to a tices still need to be part of the pathway even if eck. From feedback from the consultation and his would be a high risk process as GP's may to work as part of a consortium.

Iget envelope need to be considered I.e. splitting th some budget for community provision.

testing if eligible patient data wasn't provided et achievement would be reduced

expressions of interest exercise undertaken

nce and data sharing procedures being in place provider and Community Provider. This will

n Option 2 using negotiated procedure with GP f Option 3 in terms of testing the market for unity outreach arm of the service.

n expressions of interest exercise undertaken

	•	Lack of economies of scale for co
2) Focused Community Outreach	•	Lack of detailed evidence of app
- Competitive Tender		money as paying for duplication

Preferred Route and Rationale to Option 2, Citywide coverage using GP Confed as lead provider via Direct Award under negotiated procedure for predominant NHS Health Check provision and focused community outreach. (As part of the negotiated procedure, project team to determine whether it is best for Confed. to directly provide community outreach (ie appoint staff) or sub-contract this element out to a third party)

## **Recommendation:**

Seek approval to utilise the negotiated procedure without publication of notice under Regulation 32 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 to enter into negotiations with the Leeds GP Confederation to establish a new contract commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024 for a period of 5 years with the option to extend for 3 years for the provision of the NHS Health Check service. This is on the grounds that competition is absent due to the requirement for access to the GP patient records, which Leeds GP Confederation can provide, meaning no suitable alternative exists in addition with other strengths and weaknesses listed above.

or community service appropriate costings, likely to be less value for ion eg IT systems.