Finance Committee

Transplantation (Authorisation of Removal of Organs etc.) (Scotland) Bill

Submission from NHS Western Isles

Response

1. Did you take part in any consultation exercise preceding the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made?

No

2. If applicable, do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM?

N/A

3. Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise?

N/A

Costs

4. If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that they have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details.

The Bill appears to assume that all health boards would both suffer additional cost in terms of increasing numbers of transplants and also achieve savings in terms of e.g. reduced dialysis and medical management. This would not necessarily be the case for NHS Western Isles as the medical management of transplants is undertaken by other health boards who would simply recharge us the cost of the transplant.

5. Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM are reasonable and accurate?

The financial elements are very vague; it is not clear how much additional pressure the introduction of this Bill will create in the first instance, nor is it clear how much saving might accrue over subsequent years to offset these costs.

6. If applicable, are you content that your organisation can meet any financial costs that it might incur as a result of the Bill? If not, how do you think these costs should be met?

No I am not confident, as there are no offsetting savings that would accrue to NHS Western Isles for any transplants other than kidneys. Given that these costs will be
low volume and high unit cost, and unpredictable, it would seem reasonable for a budget to be held centrally to fund these cases as they arise, especially for small health boards.

7. Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill’s estimated costs and with the timescales over which they would be expected to arise?

The FM is vague, and presumably this reflects a level of uncertainty.

Wider Issues

8. Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures any costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom?

The FM captures the broad headings but as mentioned already the FM is vague.

9. Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs?

Not known.