BOB ICB BOARD MEETING

Title	Finance Report Mont	th 2 (May) 2023/2	24					
Paper Date:	26 June 2023	Meeting	Date:	18 July 2023				
Purpose:	Assurance	Agenda	Item:	09				
Author:	Jenny Simpson, Actin Head of Reporting	3	ad/ Senior sible Officer:	Matthew Metcalfe, Chief Finance Officer				
Executive Summary								
	ts out the financial po re System (ICS) at th			oard (ICB) and the wider				
	ould note that the ICE sector activity for opht	•		to date (YTD) due to s forecast to breakeven at year				
£10.9m worse targets at Oxf	e than plan at M2. The ord University Hospita	e variance is mai als. Further work	nly driven by u is required to	nned deficit of £12.4m i.e., nder delivery of savings ensure savings schemes ed across the whole system.				
				.8m at M2 reducing to £90.0m f approach and confidence in				
The ICS capit	al allocation is foreca	st to be on plan a	at year end.					
Action Requi	ired							
The board are	e asked to note the Y	TD position.						
Conflicts of Interest	Conflict noted:	conflicted party	can participate	in discussion and decision				
partners men	This report contains information including the financial performance of organisations our partners members work for. The perspective of these members is an important aspect to enable the Board to focus on where the ICB and system contribute to improvement.							
	f Committee/ ere Last Reviewed:	System Produc	tivity Committe	ee: 4 July 2023				



9. Finance Report

Month 02 2023/24 BOB ICS Finance Report

Executive Summary



This report has been amended from the format used in 2022/23 to focus on the ICB first followed by the System position.

ICB:

٠

- The ICB reported a YTD deficit at M2 of £0.9m and a breakeven forecast outturn as per plan.
- The ICB variance is due mainly to increased activity at Independent sector providers providing cataract surgery and audiology services, both driven by patient choice.
- The ICB delivered its financial targets apart from the YTD variance to plan and the Better Payment Practice Code (BPPC) which has slipped below target.

System:

- BOB ICS reported a YTD variance to plan at M2 of £10.9m but the forecast outturn has been held on plan. The YTD variance is the second largest in the SE Region.
- The variance was driven by: Oxford University Hospitals (OUH) over plan by £10.4m, the ICB by £0.9m and Royal Berkshire Foundation Trust (RBFT) by £0.5m, offset by small positive variances to plan reported by the other three providers (Buckinghamshire Healthcare Trust (BHT) £0.3m, Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust (BHFT) £0.4m and Oxford Health (OH) £0.1m).
- The YTD variance for OUH was driven mainly by savings delivery being behind plan as well as the impact of excess inflation and of industrial action. RBFT variance was driven by costs of industrial action and some costs related to the power outages experienced during April and May.
- £17.8m of savings were planned to be delivered by the ICS by M2 but only £11.1m were achieved ie £6.8m behind plan. OUH was the main driver for this, £7.0m under delivery against a savings target of £9.7m YTD, offset by over delivery of plan at other providers. Some of the variance is linked to profiling of savings delivery.
- Delivery of the planned forecast outturn for the system will be dependent on delivery of planned savings. There is a need to develop additional savings plans as well as consideration of other management actions and controls.

ICB Dashboard

Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board

Table 1 – ICB Dashboard of key financial duties as required by NHS E

Indicator	Target	RAG
Actual Year to Date	Breakeven	-
Reported Forecast outturn	Breakeven	✓
Running Costs Outturn vs allocation	Breakeven	 Image: A set of the set of the
ICB Capital outturn vs allocation	Breakeven	N/A
Cash balance at 31st May 2023 less than 1.25% of May cash drawdown	<1.25%	 ✓
Mental Health Investment Standard Achieved	6.99%	✓
Better Payment Practice Code - Non NHS (by value)	95%	—
Better Payment Practice Code - NHS (by value)	95%	-
Note: Cash draw down as % of Maximum Cash Drawdown	100.00%	100.0%

- The ICB has reported a YTD variance of £873k and is therefore rated as amber YTD.
- The running cost FOT is currently reported as on plan. There is a risk that the ICB could overspend its running cost allocation if all
 posts in the new organisational structure were to be recruited. The ICB also needs to plan ahead for a running cost reduction of 20%
 in 2024/2525 and a further 10% in 2025/26.
- The ICB BPPC performance for both NHS and Non-NHS providers has fallen below target this month (92.7% and 88.4% respectively) and action needs to be taken to ensure the target is met in future months.

ICB Position M2

Table 2 – Financial position M2 – ICB Overview by service line



Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

Integrated Care Board

BOB ICB OVERALL by Service Line Monthly Performance Report	YTD Budget Month 2 £'000	YTD Actual Month 2 £'000	YTD Variance Month 2 £'000	Annual Budget Month 2 £'000	Forecast Outturn Month 2 £'000	Forecast Variance Month 2 £'000
Acute	275,785	277,177	(1,393)	1,662,683	1,662,683	0
Community Health Services	59,449	59,875	(426)	362,664	362,664	о
Continuing Care	30,289	30,372	(83)	181,736	181,736	О
Mental Health	54,028	54,028	0	325,862	325,862	(0)
Other Programme	(1,663)	(2,679)	1,016	(6,352)	(6,352)	0
Other Commissioned Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Primary Care	7,454	7,442	12	43,737	43,737	0
Pharmacy, Optometry and Dentistry (POD)	20,460	20,460	(0)	129,662	129,662	0
Prescribing, Central Drugs and Oxygen	44,991	44,991	0	269,949	269,949	0
Delegated Co-Commissioning	52,788	52,788	0	313,631	313,631	0
Total Programme Costs	543,581	544,454	(873)	3,283,572	3,283,572	(0)
ADMIN Costs	5,488	5,488	0	32,930	32,930	О
NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) before CIP	549,069	549,942	(873)	3,316,502	3,316,502	(0)
Unidentified CIP target	(1,167)	(1,167)	О	(7,000)	(7,000)	о
NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)	547,902	548,775	(873)	3,309,502	3,309,502	(0)

• The main drivers of the £873k overspend for the ICB at M2 are cataracts (acute) and audiology/equipment (community).

• There are offsetting variances reported for Acute and Other Programme due to mis-alignment of the SCAS 111 and PTS budgets and actual spend c£1m.

ICB Risks to Forecast

Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

ICB Risks at M2 include:

- Not all contracts are signed off particular risks for SCAS and Frimley contracts
- Savings delivery in CHC and Prescribing most of the ICB savings plans are in CHC £6.1m, Prescribing £5.9m and a
 further £7m of savings that were required but not identified at the plan stage in order to deliver a breakeven position. The
 majority of the unidentified savings are now identified and are considered low risk. The savings schemes in Prescribing and
 CHC could however easily be offset by further cost pressures arising during the year. This will need close monitoring.
- National Elective Recovery Fund (ERF) clawback and impact on system

System wide under/(overspend) by organisation



Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

Integrated Care Board

The overall financial position of the ICS is shown below.

The movement in month and final outturn is analysed below, by organisation:

Table 3 – System under/(overspend) by organisation

		Year to Date				'n
ICS Body	Plan	Actuals	Variance	Plan	Actuals	Variance
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Berkshire Healthcare	(0.5)	(0.1)	0.4	1.3	1.3	0.0
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	(6.4)	(6.1)	0.3	(12.1)	(12.1)	0.0
Oxford Health	0.6	0.7	0.1	3.3	3.3	0.0
Oxford University Hospitals	(2.4)	(12.8)	(10.4)	(2.9)	(2.9)	0.0
Royal Berkshire Hospital	(3.8)	(4.3)	(0.5)	(10.1)	(10.1)	0.0
ICS Providers	(12.4)	(22.5)	(10.0)	(20.4)	(20.4)	0.0
BOB ICB	0.0	(0.9)	(0.9)	0.0	(0.0)	(0.0)
BOB ICS Bodies	(12.4)	(23.3)	(10.9)	(20.4)	(20.4)	0.0

System Wide Under/(overspend) by expenditure type



Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

Integrated Care Board

Table 4 – System under/(overspend) by type of expenditure

	Year to Date				Forecast Outturn			
Expenditure Category	Plan	Actuals	Variance	Plan	Actuals	Variance		
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m		
Income	593.1	598.6	5.5	3,589.5	3,605.4	16.0		
Pay	(360.7)	(370.9)	(10.3)	(2,150.9)	(2,167.0)	(16.1)		
Non - Pay	(232.2)	(238.6)	(6.5)	(1,382.9)	(1,382.5)	0.4		
Non - Operational Expenditure	(12.7)	(11.5)	1.2	(76.2)	(76.4)	(0.2)		
Total Expenditure	(605.5)	(621.0)	(15.5)	(3,609.9)	(3,625.9)	(15.9)		
NHS Providers	(12.4)	(22.5)	(10.0)	(20.4)	(20.4)	0.0		
BOB ICB	0.0	(0.9)	(0.9)	0.0	(0.0)	(0.0)		
BOB ICS Bodies	(12.4)	(23.3)	(10.9)	(20.4)	(20.4)	0.0		

Key points per body



Berkshire Healthcare :

• The Trust were £0.4m better than plan YTD with no significant issues to report at this stage of the year.

Buckinghamshire Healthcare :

- The Trust were £0.3m better than plan YTD.
- The Trust reported £41.7m of risk at M2 but has reported mitigations to cover.
- The Trust cash forecast indicates that the cash position will tighten as the year progresses.

Oxford Health :

- The Trust were £0.1m better than plan YTD.
- The Trust has reported one risk that is unmitigated related to underfunding of A4C pay award for the year of an estimated £2.1m.

Oxford University Hospitals :

- The OUH were £10.4m behind plan YTD driven mainly by slow start to delivery of savings plans profiled to deliver evenly in the year (£7m). There was also pressure from the costs of industrial action.
- The Trust has reported £80.4m of unmitigated risk at M2.
- The Trust cash forecast indicates that the cash position will tighten as the year progresses.

Royal Berkshire Hospitals :

• The RBFT were £0.5m behind plan YTD driven by costs of industrial action and some costs related to the power outages experience in April and May.

Common themes by type of expenditure

Provider Income : A YTD overachievement of £5.5m is reported. The main driver for this variance is accrual of income for the pay award due to be paid in M3.

Provider Pay Costs : A YTD overspend of £10.3m is reported. Agency and Bank spend drives this, some of which is linked to industrial action. Table 5 shows providers have spent £14.0m on agency/locums for the year to date (excluding Bank staff), £2.5m in excess of plan. As at M2 provider plans for pay related savings were £2.2m behind plan.

Non-Pay Expenditure : Overall non-pay expenditure is overspent by £6.2m at M2. An underlying issue is the slippage/non-delivery of CIPs in this area of expenditure which are £3.5m behind plan.

Table 5: Agency spend against plan and as a % of cap is shown below:

Provider name	Net Expenditure Net Expenditure		Net Expenditure	Net Expenditure
Actual 31/05/2023	Plan 31/05/2023	Actual 31/05/2023	Variance 31/05/2023	Variance 31/05/2023
YTD	YTD	YTD	YTD	YTD
ТЕХТ	£'000	£'000	£'000	%
Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	990	1,181	(191)	19.3%
Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust	2,714	2,195	519	(19.1%)
Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust	3,932	6,652	(2,720)	69.2%
Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	1,669	2,598	(929)	55.7%
Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust	2,190	1,355	835	(38.1%)
TOTAL Provider Agency Spend	11,495	13,981	(2,486)	21.6%
System level agency cap				
Agency spend as % of agency cap	13.7%	16.7%		

hire, Oxfordshire

Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

Integrated Care Board

Table 6 Provider pay costs variance byorganisation

	M2 Variance To Plan				
Provider	In Month	YTD			
	£m	£m			
Berkshire Healthcare	0.4	0.4			
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	0.3	0.3			
Oxford Health	0.1	0.1			
Oxford University Hospitals	(10.4)	(10.4)			
Royal Berkshire Hospital	(0.5)	(0.5)			
ICS Providers	(10.0)	(10.0)			

Table 7 Agency spend analysis by provider

	Ν	M2 Year To Date						
Provider	Plan	Actual	Variance					
	£m	£m	£m					
Berkshire Healthcare	1.0	1.2	(0.2)					
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	2.7	2.2	0.5					
Oxford Health	3.9	6.7	(2.7)					
Oxford University Hospitals	1.7	2.6	(0.9)					
Royal Berkshire Hospital	2.2	1.4	0.8					
ICS Providers	11.5	14.0	(2.5)					

Efficiencies

Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board

Overall

- A significant element in the delivery of the ICS's overall planned position at the year end is the delivery of CIP / Savings programmes.
- The ICS has a planned total of £171.2m (£143.3m in 2022/23) of savings to be delivered by year end. Of this £11.1m has been delivered to date ie £6.8m behind the planned £17.8m

By Organisation:

 Table 8 shows that OUH and OH under-delivered against their savings plans whilst RBFT over delivered and all others are on plan..

By Type of Expenditure:

- Table 9 shows provider CIP delivery to date analysed between pay, non-pay and income
- All categories of CIP are behind plan at M2

Table 8 – System Efficiencies

		M2 Year To Date			Forecast Outturn			
Provider	Plan	Actual	Variance	Plan	Actuals	Variance		
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m		
Berkshire Healthcare	1.8	1.8	0.0	14.1	14.1	0.0		
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	1.6	1.6	0.1	36.2	36.2	0.0		
Oxford Health	1.5	1.0	(0.5)	16.1	16.1	0.0		
Oxford University Hospitals	9.7	2.7	(7.0)	70.5	70.5	0.0		
Royal Berkshire Hospital	0.0	0.7	0.7	15.0	15.0	0.0		
ICS Providers	14.6	7.9	(6.8)	152.0	152.0	0.0		
ICB	3.2	3.2	0.0	19.2	19.2	0.0		
ICS Total	17.8	11.1	(6.8)	171.2	171.2	0.0		

Table 9 – System efficiencies by type of spend

		M2 YTD Variance							
Provider	Рау	Non Pay	Income	Total					
	£m	£m	£m	£m					
Berkshire Healthcare	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	(0.3)	(0.1)	0.4	0.1					
Oxford Health	(0.5)	0.0	0.0	(0.5)					
Oxford University Hospitals	(1.8)	(3.6)	(1.5)	(7.0)					
Royal Berkshire Hospital	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.7					
ICS Providers	(2.2)	(3.5)	(1.1)	(6.8)					
ICB	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					
ICS Total	(2.2)	(3.5)	(1.0)	(6.8)					

System risks

Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board

Table 10 – Total System risks are shown below as reported by providers/ICB at M2

Risk category	Gross Risk	Mitigations	Net Risk
	£m	£m	£m
Additional costs - winter pressures/capacity	(49.7)	8.3	(41.4)
Risk to delivery of savings plans	(31.5)	23.0	(8.5)
ERF funding potential national clawback	(17.0)	17.0	0.0
Additional Inflation risk	(15.8)	7.9	(7.9)
Income risk	(13.3)	2.7	(10.6)
Remaining Covid impacts	(12.0)	0.0	(12.0)
Contract risk	(10.0)	2.5	(7.5)
Underfunding of pay awards - A4C and Medical in Community and MH providers	(3.7)	1.6	(2.1)
Additional costs of industrial action	(3.0)	3.0	0.0
Other	(6.8)	6.8	0.0
ICS Providers	(162.8)	72.8	(90.0)

Further work will be undertaken to review the consistency of approach by organisations and the confidence levels around planned mitigations.

Further guidance is expected from NHS E re potential clawback of Elective Recovery Funding in M4.

Other includes risks in Primary care in the ICB, additional costs related to emergency incident at RBFT (power outages) and clawback of funding nationally for MS Licence costs.

Table 11 – System capital position – total charge against capital allocation (before impact of IFRS 16)

Integrated Care Board

	Plan	Actual	Variance		Plan	Forecast	Variance	
Organisation	YTD	YTD	YTD	YTD	FOT	FOT	FOT	FOT
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	£m	£m	%
Berkshire Healthcare	0.2	0.4	(0.2)	(80.3%)	11.5	9.6	1.9	16.1%
Buckinghamshire Healthcare	3.4	0.9	2.4	72.4%	21.3	21.3	0.0	0.0%
Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust	0.9	0.6	0.3	36.8%	12.1	12.1	0.0	0.0%
Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	1.3	1.3	0.0	2.9%	28.5	28.5	0.0	0.0%
Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust	4.6	0.7	3.9	84.4%	27.4	27.4	0.0	0.0%
ICS Total	10.4	3.9	6.5	62.5%	100.9	99.0	1.9	1.8%

ICS providers have underspent against ICS capital plan by £6.5m at M2. NB. The plan of £100.9m includes £2.3m over-programming which is allowed at plan stage but the system • will need to manage capital spend to £98.5m by year end.