



**Baseline spending estimates
for the new NHS and Public
Health Commissioning
Architecture**

DH INFORMATION READER BOX		
Policy HR / Workforce Management Planning / Performance	Clinical Commissioner Development Provider Development Improvement and Efficiency	Estates IM & T Finance Social Care / Partnership Working
Document Purpose	For Information	
Gateway Reference	17129	
Title	Baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and Public Health Commissioning Architecture	
Author	Resource Allocation Team	
Publication Date	07 February 2012	
Target Audience	PCT Cluster CEs, SHA Cluster CEs, Directors of PH, Local Authority CEs, Directors of Finance, Local Authority Directors of Finance	
Circulation List		
Description	This document provides estimates of 2010-11 spend on services that will be allocated to different commissioners in the commissioning structure proposed under the Health and Social Care Bill.	
Cross Ref	N/A	
Superseded Docs	N/A	
Action Required	We would welcome feedback on the data or on our approach to the analysis.	
Timing	N/A	
Contact Details	Resource Allocation Team Policy, Strategy & Finance Directorate Department of Health 4W07 Quarry House Leeds LS2 7UE allocations@dh.gsi.gov.uk	
For Recipient's Use		

You may re-use the text of this document (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

© Crown copyright 2011

First published [February 2012]

Published to DH website, in electronic PDF format only.

www.dh.gov.uk/publications

Baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and Public Health Commissioning Architecture

Prepared by
Department of Health
Resource Allocation team

Contents

Contents.....	4
Summary.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Collections.....	9
Results of the analysis.....	13
Next steps.....	14

Summary

- 1.1. We have brought together two separate collections of 2010-11 Primary Care Trust spend that focused on public health and NHS Commissioning Board or Clinical Commissioning Groups to estimate how those resources would be deployed under the commissioning architecture proposed in the Health and Social Care Bill.
- 1.2. While these should be recognised as estimates at this stage, and further analysis is needed before 2013-14 allocations can be set, they do support initial planning by emerging Clinical Commissioning Groups and Local Authorities.

Introduction

- 1.3. At the moment over 80% of all NHS funding goes to primary care trusts (PCTs), who are then responsible for meeting health and public health needs. The government remains committed to real terms growth in health spending in each year of the current Parliament but the Health and Social Care Bill would create distinct responsibilities for commissioning different services. In particular:
 - The NHS Commissioning Board (NHSCB) would commission a number of services, such as specialised services, primary medical services and dental services. The NHSCB budget was previously estimated to be in the region of £20bn.¹
 - Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) would be responsible for commissioning most local services, by value, in particular hospital and community health services. We have previously estimated that they will control budgets of around £60bn.²
 - The total spend on Public Health Services, including Public Health England (PHE), was estimated to be in excess of £4bn.³
 - This also includes services provided or commissioned locally by local authorities (LAs), funded by a ring-fenced grant.
- 1.4. The Secretary of State would be responsible for setting the size of the budget available to NHSCB and PHE, as well as the size of the ring-fenced public health grants provided

¹ Transcript of oral evidence before Health Committee (HC 796-v): *Third Report into Commissioning*.

² *Ibid* 1

³ *Healthy Lives, Healthy People* – Consultation on the Funding and Commissioning Routes for Public Health.

to LAs. NHSCB would determine the size of the budget available to each CCG, from within the total NHS commissioning budget.

- 1.5. The estimates described above were high level. But a good understanding of baseline spend is critical to a smooth transition to the new commissioning architecture. It is the starting point for decisions on how much funding should be available in different parts of the system and how that funding should be distributed locally. We therefore needed to go beyond these high-level estimates and during September we completed two major collections of information from PCTs: one focused on the public health system and one focused on NHSCB and CCG responsibilities.
- 1.6. In this paper, we bring the results of these collections together with information from accounts and other sources to provide the best available estimate of how spend by PCTs during 2010-11, adjusted to a hypothetical break-even position, would map on to the new commissioning architecture. Our analysis is broken down to regional and individual PCT level. When uplifted to 2012-13 levels these offer a first indicative estimate of local baselines, supporting planning and the further development of the commissioning architecture.
- 1.7. The analysis also gives us the first reliable estimate of the current spend in areas that would be the responsibility of the public health system. Adding spend from central budgets to the spend by PCTs in Table 1, and adjusting for spend we believe it has not been possible to separate from CCG spend, we estimate that during 2012-13 the NHS will spend £4.6bn on public health services⁴. Of this, about £2.2bn will be spent on services that would fall in the future within the responsibilities of local authorities. This paper includes our estimates of how this baseline spend is distributed across local authorities.
- 1.8. The information we have collected has also allowed us to estimate the size of spend on future CCG responsibilities, around £64.7bn, as well as estimates of the spend in some significant areas that NHSCB will directly commission. However, our analysis does not include some areas that are currently funded through Strategic Health Authorities, such as primary care in prisons.
- 1.9. The aggregate breakdown for England is shown in **Table 1**. The estimated breakdown of 2010-11 spend by PCT and Strategic Health Authority is presented in the accompanying Excel workbook,⁵ while the estimated spend on public health in LA

⁴ Corresponds to the Local Authorities, NHS Commissioning Board and Public Health England lines in Table 2.

⁵ <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2011/12/pct-allocations>

areas (for relevant responsibilities) is shown in the Table at **Annex A**. The original data returns for each PCT are being placed on the Department of Health Website..⁶

⁶ Ibid 4

Table 1: Estimated spend 2010-11 by PCTs by future commissioning architecture

	Source of data	£000s	Uplifted to 2012-13 £000s
CCG list based responsibilities			
Secondary and community care ^{1,2}	(1) & (4)	52,124,374	
Out-of-hours primary care ^{1,2}	(1) & (4)	412,274	
Prescribing costs ^{1,2}	(1) & (4)	7,847,956	
Services currently commissioned through local enhanced services (excluding public health) ^{1,2}	(1)	392,663	
Total		60,777,267	63,984,056
CCG geographical responsibilities			
Secondary care for prisoners ^{3,4,9}	(1)	98,454	
Unregistered populations ^{3,4}	(1)	310,538	
Charge exempt overseas visitors ^{3,4}	(1)	39,495	
Non-rechargeable services ^{3,4}	(1)	66,079	
Adjustment for transfer of responsibilities for termination of pregnancy, sterilisation and vasectomy	(4)	151,534	
Total		666,101	700,756
NHSCB direct commissioning			
Specialised services ⁵	(1)	8,573,609	
Secondary dental care ⁵	(1)	485,847	
GP services excluding local enhanced services and out-of-hours services ⁶	(1),(2)	6,660,565	
General Dental Services (net of patient charges)	(2)	2,203,027	
General Ophthalmic Services	(2)	478,194	
Pharmaceutical Services (net of patient charges)	(2)	1,544,721	
Armed forces ^{5,10}	(1)	23,257	
Other Primary Care	(2)	124,650	
Total		20,093,870	21,152,829
Public health system			
LA responsibilities	(3)	2,112,456	
Commissioned through NHSCB ⁷	(3)	1,614,283	
PHE	(3)	17,828	
Total		3,744,567	3,941,912
Admin spend other than public health			
Admin ⁸	(2)	2,717,671	
TOTAL		87,999,475	
Reconciliation to PCT Revenue Resource Limit for 2010-11			
Total resource Limit for 2010-11	(2)	90,335,595	
Less transfer to LAs for social care of people with learning disabilities	(2)	1,294,173	
Revised total resources		89,041,422	
Unattributed spend/income		-1,041,947	
% unattributed spend/income		-1.2%	

Sources:

- (1) CCG focused returns
- (2) Accounts
- (3) Public health focused returns
- (4) DH analysis

Notes:

1. Expenditure net of (ie after subtracting) income from other NHS organisations and other organisations. Includes spend from both recurrent allocations, non-recurrent allocations and inter authority transfers.
2. Each row in this group was adjusted by increasing spend if the surplus was higher at the end of 2010-11 than 2009-10, or deficits lower, and reducing spend if the surplus was lower or the deficit higher. Similar adjustments were made for net lodgements.
3. Expenditure net of (ie after subtracting) income from other NHS organisations and other organisations. Includes spend from both recurrent allocations, non-recurrent allocations and inter authority transfers.
4. Each row in this group was adjusted by increasing spend if the surplus was higher at the end of 2010-11 than 2009-10, or deficits lower, and reducing spend if the surplus was lower or the deficit higher. Similar adjustments were made for net lodgements.
5. Expenditure net of (ie after subtracting) income from other NHS organisations and other organisations. Includes spend from both recurrent allocations, non-recurrent allocations and inter authority transfers.
6. Gross expenditure. Excludes estimated purchase of public health from primary care. Includes non-GMS services, eg secondary care, from GPs. Non –GMS spend was £135m in England.
7. We estimate that a further £420m of expenditure is included in CCG spend estimates, due to the difficulty of separating spend on different areas commissioned through a single contract.
8. Gross expenditure.
9. Working assumption on future commissioning route.
10. Precise route for armed forces for discharging commissioning responsibilities in association with CCG contracts to be determined

- 1.10. This paper does not discuss the advice of the Advisory Committee on Resource Allocation (ACRA), nor 'pace-of-change' policy (but see the section on Next Steps on page 14).
- 1.11. Baseline spend estimates for CCGs and NHSCB do not include administrative costs; they refer only to programme spend. Where 2010-11 administrative costs are included in PCT breakdowns this is only to facilitate the reconciliation of our estimates against resource limits.

Collections

- 1.12. The principal sources for our estimates are the collections run between August and September 2011. These provided us with information around how the 2010-11 spend by PCTs would have been distributed under the new commissioning architecture. However, to build a complete picture of current spend we have had to combine these returns with other data sources. For instance the returns did not include information on the main primary care contract spend and so this has been estimated using accounts data. We are also aware of a limited number of areas where an alternative data source suggests that the returns may have underestimated or misattributed spend and where possible, we have approximated an adjustment. The effect of such adjustments has generally been to increase our estimates of the spend on public health.

Public Health

- 1.13. Public health 2010-11 spend information was collected twice during 2011: as part of the end of year audit and again in August/September, after working with PCT Directors of Finance and Directors of Public Health to improve the design of the return and the guidance. A key part of this second return was that we also asked local authorities to write to us with details of any areas of concern about the information PCTs were providing.
- 1.14. Our analysis suggests that the second collection was of significantly better quality. However, consistent with some of the feedback we received from local authorities, there were still areas where there may have been an underestimation of public health spend. This may be consistent with, for instance, the difficulty of disaggregating services currently commissioned through a single contract. We also had to correct for changes in the range of services included in the responsibilities of the public health system. To give the most reliable estimate of 2010-11 spend in the public health system we therefore made a number of adjustments to the returns. These are described in detail at Annex B, but they included:
- Correction of responsibility for abortion, sterilisation and vasectomy services. These were not separately identified in the returns but were part of a broader category. At the time of the collection they were proposed to be part of LA responsibilities. They are now initially expected to be part of CCGs' responsibilities. This reduced the total spend on public health services by around £150m.
 - Some services were not included in the return but have been added to the specification of services to be delivered through the public health system subsequently. These have been estimated from other sources and add £168m to the total public health system spend⁷.
 - Imputing values where an unlikely zero value was reported. The returns included some services where zero spend was reported but we would expect all PCTs to be providing the service; it is also unlikely that the spend has been included in another category. In this case we have imputed the spend per head using the average of other PCTs in the same SHA. These add only around £34m to the total spend, suggesting that the returns are reasonably complete at least for high-spend categories.
 - For a small number of services a reliable alternative estimate, or part estimate, exists. Where this suggests a significant error in the total spend, we adopted this estimate. This is a significant adjustment, mainly in the cost of screening, adding

⁷ The £168m relates to services expected to be commissioned through the NHSCB .

approximately £430m to the total spend projected on to the public health system. We are unable to make a compensating correction to CCG spend estimates at a local level but as these services are expected to be commissioned through NHSCB this does not undermine this analysis as a tool for further planning.

- 1.15. For the relevant services, we have projected the spend on to LA areas to provide an estimate of baseline spend relevant to the ring-fenced public health grants. This is based on the proportion of registrations residing in each PCT's area living in each local authority.
- 1.16. The analysis discussed here focuses on revenue. Separate work is looking at the need for capital and we will make further updates at a later stage. However, local authorities' principal role will be as commissioners rather than providers of public health services, and so we would not expect their capital needs, typically, to be significant. This work also does not address the one-off costs of transition.
- 1.17. Most LAs highlighted one or more concerns about the information the PCT had returned to us. However, we do not believe, given the corrections suggested here, that most will have a large effect on the size of the ring-fenced grant.
- 1.18. Particular concerns included:
 - 2010-11 was atypical because some policies had not been fully rolled out: this does not affect the accuracy of 2010-11 figures as a baseline spend estimate and all years would have suffered from this to some extent. This will need to be considered when confirming the size of the actual budget in 2013-14, along with potential for efficiency savings and the pressures in other parts of the comprehensive health service.
 - Overheads costs have not been properly included: Most of the budget is for the commissioning of services from other bodies (such as sexual health services) and so do not require overheads. Other returns suggest that nationally public health's contribution to overheads is around £60m or 1½%. We therefore believe that any error on what is already a small component of the budget would not have a material effect on the size of the future ring-fenced grant.

CCGs and NHSCB

- 1.19. The second return focused on services that will in future be the responsibility of either CCGs or NHSCB. As CCGs have not yet been established we requested data at

practice level for future CCG commissioning responsibilities for their registered lists; we can then establish a baseline for whatever configuration of practice should ultimately be established. Spend on services that will be commissioned on the basis of CCGs' geographical areas (such as prison secondary care) or that will be the responsibility of NHSCB (such as specialised services) were collected at PCT level.

- 1.20. We asked PCTs to make an assessment of what the spend would have been in each area if they had been in balance in 2010-11, ie, no net change in their surplus or deficit position. This proved to be a technically difficult correction, where our own guidance could also have been clearer. We have therefore worked, in particular, with SHA clusters to understand the change in each PCT's position and then ensure that an appropriate adjustment is made; full details of this adjustment are at **Annex C**.
- 1.21. There were also uncertainties at the time of collection about which specialised services would be commissioned by NHSCB and that the available definitions of specialised services were not precise enough to get a good estimate of spend on these services. A comparison with HES data does suggest that in some areas specialised services spend has been underestimated, presumably with a compensating over-estimation in the estimates for CCGs' list based responsibilities. Since then the proposed scope of specialised services has increased further, making any under-estimation greater. In addition, some PCTs may have omitted from the returns spend on healthcare through pooled budgets arrangements with local authorities.
- 1.22. Many PCTs also reported difficulties in allocating spending on CCGs' list-based responsibilities to practices and so apportioned a significant amount of spending on a nominal population basis. Data at this level should therefore be used with caution.

Other information

- 1.23. To build a complete picture, our analysis also draws on information from accounts (for instance most spend on primary care services).
- 1.24. To test the validity of our estimates we have compared them with the PCTs' revenue resource limits. As some estimation has been required we do not expect a perfect reconciliation, but nationally we reconcile to 1.2% below the relevant revenue resource limit, and most PCTs are in the range 7% below to 2% above, although there are some outliers (the full range is 19% below - 6% above). This suggests that these estimates are generally robust and is testament to the high quality of information supplied by PCTs and SHAs.

Results of the analysis

- 1.25. The breakdown of each PCT's spend across the new commissioning architecture, and the reconciliation of our analysis against the relevant resource limit, is presented in the accompanying excel workbook. Non-NHS income has been deducted. Each PCT can be selected by entering its code. Aggregate information for SHAs can also be selected, or the aggregate position for England (by entering 'Eng'). Sub-totals have also been uplifted to approximate 2012-13 values using the relevant PCT recurrent allocation growth for 2011-12 and 2012-13, which is typically around 5¼%.
- 1.26. Each PCT's analysis also includes an estimated baseline for prospective CCGs in its area, based on future responsibilities for registered populations. All CCGs are shown that include one or more practice drawn from that PCT, and so some CCGs appear on more than one PCT's summary. CCGs whose proposed configurations have recently been rated as Amber or Green as part of the recent SHA risk assessment are included. CCGs whose proposed configurations were red-rated have been excluded unless SHAs have advised us that they are in the process of making minor adjustments to membership that they expect to deliver Amber or Green status. Unaffiliated practices have also been excluded.
- 1.27. The Table at Annex A shows the relevant part of the public health spend projected on to local authority areas. This is split between the different commissioning routes in Table 2 below. The detailed division of responsibilities between PHE and DH remains to be decided in some cases. Spend identified as 'Department of Health' includes a range of budgets that could also ultimately be held by PHE. However, it does not include the administration costs of public health functions currently within DH.

Table 2: Estimated 2010-11 public health spend (with adjustments to PCT survey)

Future commissioning route	Estimated baseline expenditure	Uplifted to 2012-13
Local Authorities	£2.1bn	£2.2bn
NHS Commissioning Board	£2.0bn	£2.2bn
Public Health England	£210m	£210m
Department of Health	£620m	£620m
Total	£5.0bn	£5.2bn

Notes:

1. Expenditure by PCTs has been uplifted in line with PCT recurrent allocation growth. Spend from central budgets in total has been assumed constant.. Central budgets includes grant-in-aid to organisations such as HPA..
2. These figures include the corrections discussed above and so do not necessarily match the values reported in Table 1.

Next steps

- 1.28. Understanding how 2010-11 spend projects on to the new architecture is an important step in implementing the transition proposed in the Health and Social Care Bill. But these figures do not necessarily represent the final budgets for 2013-14; these will need to take account of a number of other factors and final allocations for 2013-14 will be set later this year. We also expect to say more about ACRA's recommendations for how we should aim to distribute resources in the longer term in due course.
- 1.29. However, these do offer a sensible basis for initial planning, particularly when uplifted to 2012-13 values. In particular, we would not expect the LA public health ring-fenced grants to fall in real terms from the values in Annex A, other than in exceptional circumstances such as a gross error or following a technical adjustment with major consequences for budgets, such as a significant adjustment for NHS income, a change in planned responsibilities or a large shift in the incentive payment for drugs treatment. In particular, we may need to do further work to confirm the adjustment we have made to take account of abortion, sterilisation and vasectomy services initially being the responsibility of CCGs rather than LAs.
- 1.30. We are not planning to update the public health baseline described here through a repeat collection. However, where PCTs and LAs agree that significant errors have been made or our approach does not take sufficient account of local circumstances (such as how we project resources on to LA geographies) we will consider making appropriate updates.
- 1.31. For CCGs the position is more complex. Actual allocations will depend, for example, on the final configurations of CCGs and on final decisions on the balance of funding for nationally and locally commissioned services, both of which will be a matter for NHSCB. The likely underestimation of specialised and public health services has probably also led to an overestimation of CCG spend levels. Conversely, the addition of non-list based spend, estimated here for PCTs but not attributed to individual CCGs, would lead to an increase in the CCG baseline.
- 1.32. These and other uncertainties mean that CCG baselines need to be treated with caution. Nevertheless, we believe this analysis can be used for initial planning. We expect there to be a further collection of 2011-12 spend levels, not least to reflect GP practice changes, such as closures, mergers and new practices.
- 1.33. We would welcome feedback on our estimates, including updates to previously submitted information. These should be sent to allocations@dh.gsi.gov.uk. Any change to the data should be agreed by the PCT Cluster Chief Executive and Director

of Finance. For public health data changes, the relevant local authorities should also be involved.

- 1.34. In setting PCT allocations, we have adopted a process that includes estimating a long term aim for the most efficient distribution of resources, based on a formula set by an independent group of NHS managers, GPs and academics – currently the Advisory Committee on Resource Allocation (ACRA). The independence and influence of this group were praised in a recent Public Accounts Committee report on the use of allocation formulae in the public sector.⁸
- 1.35. During transition, the Secretary of State has asked ACRA to continue to provide advice, covering both allocations to CCGs and to LAs. They have completed their initial work and we are working through the implications of their recommendations, including a detailed comparison with the baseline spend estimated here. The full details of their recommendations and their implications are to be published in due course although we already know that there will be further work to do, such as considering how non-resident populations impact on the resources LAs need to provide public health services. We will welcome feedback on ACRA's recommendations.
- 1.36. It would however be too early to assess options for how quickly each area can be moved towards target; this will depend on the decisions about high level budgets that are not yet available. This will feed in to the final announcements of actual 2013-14 allocations for CCGs and local authority ring fenced grants, which are expected to be made around the end of the year.

⁸ *Formula funding of Local Public Services: Fifty-fifth Report of Session 2010-2012 – HOC 1502.*

Annex A: Relevant public health baseline spend projected on to local authority areas

Local Authority	2010-11		2012-13	
	Spend £000	Population* 1000s	Spend per head £	Spend £000
Hartlepool	7,300	91.3	80	7,685
Middlesbrough	14,136	142.4	99	14,872
Redcar and Cleveland	9,630	137.4	70	10,110
Stockton-on-Tees	11,318	192.4	59	11,914
Darlington	6,158	100.8	61	6,482
County Durham	40,755	510.8	80	42,905
Northumberland	10,419	312.0	33	10,969
Gateshead	13,806	191.7	72	14,496
Newcastle upon Tyne	17,348	292.2	59	18,213
North Tyneside	8,099	198.5	41	8,513
South Tyneside	11,400	153.7	74	11,970
Sunderland	18,508	283.5	65	19,468
North East	168,878	2,606.6	65	177,598
Halton	7,080	119.3	59	7,453
Warrington	7,520	198.9	38	7,917
Blackburn with Darwen	10,988	140.0	78	11,567
Blackpool	15,711	140.0	112	16,539
Cheshire East	10,181	363.8	28	10,704
Cheshire West and Chester	9,819	327.3	30	10,313
Bolton	15,126	266.5	57	15,924
Bury	5,778	183.8	31	6,082
Manchester	28,406	498.8	57	29,904
Oldham	8,854	219.8	40	9,306
Rochdale	11,836	205.2	58	12,460
Salford	13,507	229.0	59	14,220
Stockport	8,672	284.6	30	9,113
Tameside	8,857	216.9	41	9,324
Trafford	9,008	217.3	41	9,457
Wigan	17,712	307.6	58	18,646
Knowsley	14,478	149.1	97	15,202
Liverpool	32,537	445.2	73	34,159
St. Helens	10,533	177.4	59	11,088
Sefton	17,028	272.9	62	17,877
Wirral	21,207	308.8	69	22,264
Cumbria	11,979	494.4	24	12,611
Lancashire	43,626	1,169.3	37	45,891
North West	340,441	6,935.7	49	358,019
Kingston upon Hull, City of	19,154	263.9	73	20,164
East Riding of Yorkshire	7,058	338.7	21	7,430
North East Lincolnshire	8,344	157.3	53	8,762
North Lincolnshire	6,996	161.3	43	7,364
York	5,338	202.4	26	5,620
Barnsley	11,571	227.6	51	12,181
Doncaster	15,870	290.6	55	16,707
Rotherham	12,339	254.6	48	12,990
Sheffield	24,509	555.5	44	25,730

Baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and Public Health Commissioning Architecture

Local Authority	2010-11		2012-13	
	Spend £000	Population* 1000s	Spend per head £	Spend £000
Bradford	23,971	512.6	47	25,225
Calderdale	6,679	202.7	33	7,013
Kirklees	18,511	409.8	45	19,487
Leeds	28,740	798.8	36	30,255
Wakefield	17,797	325.6	55	18,736
North Yorkshire	15,562	599.7	26	16,382
Yorkshire and the Humber	222,438	5,301.3	42	234,046
Derby	10,897	246.9	44	11,636
Leicester	16,075	306.6	52	16,995
Rutland	861	38.6	22	906
Nottingham	22,011	306.7	72	23,422
Derbyshire	30,736	763.7	40	32,357
Leicestershire	15,412	648.7	24	16,225
Lincolnshire	23,452	703.0	33	24,689
Northamptonshire	21,511	687.3	31	22,645
Nottinghamshire	28,446	779.9	36	29,946
East Midlands	169,400	4,481.4	38	178,820
Herefordshire, County of	6,324	179.3	35	6,657
Telford and Wrekin	7,383	162.6	45	7,773
Stoke-on-Trent	17,596	240.1	73	18,877
Shropshire	6,798	293.4	23	7,156
Birmingham	46,010	1,036.9	44	48,348
Coventry	13,479	315.7	43	14,150
Dudley	15,473	307.4	50	16,288
Sandwell	17,094	292.8	58	17,995
Solihull	7,336	206.1	36	7,723
Walsall	12,499	256.9	49	13,143
Wolverhampton	13,989	239.4	58	14,726
Staffordshire	27,675	831.3	33	29,472
Warwickshire	18,822	536.0	35	19,815
Worcestershire	21,291	557.4	35	22,414
West Midlands	231,769	5,455.2	42	244,538
Peterborough	5,617	173.4	32	5,897
Luton	6,909	198.8	35	7,273
Southend-on-Sea	4,944	165.3	30	5,205
Thurrock	4,977	159.7	31	5,240
Bedford	4,921	160.8	31	5,207
Central Bedfordshire	7,783	255.2	30	8,234
Cambridgeshire	14,391	616.3	23	15,150
Essex	37,416	1,413.0	26	39,616
Hertfordshire	21,113	1,107.5	19	22,227
Norfolk	26,692	862.3	31	28,493
Suffolk	23,283	719.5	32	24,511
East of England	158,046	5,831.8	27	167,051
City of London	1,355	11.7	116	1,422
Barking and Dagenham	10,485	179.7	58	11,019
Barnet	11,236	348.2	32	11,796

Baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and Public Health Commissioning Architecture

Local Authority	2010-11		2012-13	
	Spend £000	Population* 1000s	Spend per head £	Spend £000
Bexley	4,435	228.0	19	4,669
Brent	15,247	256.6	59	16,007
Bromley	9,520	312.4	30	9,994
Camden	22,657	235.4	96	23,786
Croydon	16,222	345.6	47	17,078
Ealing	17,169	318.5	54	18,025
Enfield	9,847	294.9	33	10,367
Greenwich	13,521	228.5	59	14,195
Hackney	25,455	219.2	116	26,724
Hammersmith and Fulham	16,748	169.7	99	17,583
Haringey	13,935	225.0	62	14,630
Harrow	7,489	230.1	33	7,862
Havering	6,566	236.1	28	6,912
Hillingdon	10,653	266.1	40	11,184
Hounslow	8,744	236.8	37	9,179
Islington	19,877	194.1	102	20,867
Kensington and Chelsea	14,377	169.5	85	15,094
Kingston upon Thames	7,686	169.0	45	8,069
Lambeth	20,617	284.5	72	21,645
Lewisham	16,671	266.5	63	17,502
Merton	7,114	208.8	34	7,469
Newham	18,739	240.1	78	19,673
Redbridge	7,519	270.5	28	7,915
Richmond upon Thames	6,994	190.9	37	7,343
Southwark	17,448	287.0	61	18,368
Sutton	6,620	194.2	34	6,950
Tower Hamlets	27,756	237.9	117	29,139
Waltham Forest	8,145	227.1	36	8,550
Wandsworth	22,136	289.6	76	23,240
Westminster	25,816	253.1	102	27,102
London	448,798	7,825.2	57	471,360
Medway	9,882	256.7	38	10,403
Bracknell Forest	2,449	116.5	21	2,579
West Berkshire	3,925	154.0	25	4,132
Reading	3,942	154.2	26	4,150
Slough	2,778	131.1	21	2,925
Windsor and Maidenhead	3,078	146.1	21	3,240
Wokingham	4,139	163.2	25	4,357
Milton Keynes	5,459	241.5	23	5,747
Brighton and Hove	12,174	258.8	47	12,781
Portsmouth	14,123	207.1	68	14,868
Southampton	12,073	239.7	50	12,710
Isle of Wight	4,610	140.5	33	4,853
Buckinghamshire	7,624	498.1	15	8,026
East Sussex	20,302	515.5	39	21,318
Hampshire	26,829	1,296.8	21	28,244
Kent	34,669	1,427.4	24	36,484
Oxfordshire	19,906	648.7	31	20,899
Surrey	18,760	1,127.3	17	19,695
West Sussex	22,131	799.7	28	23,269

Baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and Public Health Commissioning Architecture

Local Authority	2010-11		2012-13	
	Spend £000	Population* 1000s	Spend per head £	Spend £000
South East	228,851	8,523.1	27	240,677
Bath and North East Somerset	4,986	179.7	28	5,235
Bristol, City of	16,590	441.3	38	17,465
North Somerset	4,989	212.2	24	5,352
South Gloucestershire	4,692	264.8	18	4,940
Plymouth	8,008	258.7	31	8,430
Torbay	6,162	134.3	46	6,486
Bournemouth	6,139	168.1	37	6,460
Poole	5,172	142.1	36	5,442
Swindon	6,261	201.8	31	6,591
Cornwall	16,018	535.3	30	16,863
Isles of Scilly	64	2.1	30	67
Wiltshire	11,272	459.8	25	11,866
Devon	16,014	749.9	21	16,840
Dorset	10,640	404.8	26	11,201
Gloucestershire	14,919	593.5	25	15,704
Somerset	11,910	525.2	23	12,538
South West	143,834	5,273.7	27	151,478
England	2,112,456	52,234.0	40	2,223,588

Notes: * Office for National Statistics 2010 Mid-year estimates for 2010-11 spend per head, rounded to nearest 100.

Annex B: Technical adjustments to public health returns

Imputing reported zeros

While the second public health survey reduced the number of functions where some PCTs implausibly reported zero spend, some remained. To test the importance of the implausible zeros we imputed values based on the average spend per head for the other PCTs within the SHA.

This imputation raised the total spend only modestly (around £34m⁹), so we are confident that the coverage of the survey is reasonably complete in areas of significant spend. Imputed values have been retained in our analysis, although it has not been possible to make a compensating correction to the CCG focused returns.

Variability in per capita spend

While implausible reported zeros can be easily identified, it is less easy to identify implausibly high or low reported per capita spend (which might include simple data entry errors), as we would expect spend in some functions to vary markedly between PCTs, eg drugs treatment and prison public health.

For example, for alcohol misuse services, the PCT with the 10th highest spend per head reported a spend sixteen times higher per head than the PCT with the 10th lowest spend per head. This is a high range, but there is a high correlation between deprivation and high per capita spend. It was therefore not clear how plausible the reported spend is.

Comparisons with other data sources

For some public health functions we have alternative estimates of total spend. These include, amongst others: NAO reports and academic studies. Expenditure on a few functions was not covered in the collection and accounts data were used for these.

We have compared these with the total national spend for each function as reported in the PCT return and for the functions shown in Table B1 we believe other sources are more reliable than the PCT estimate.

Table B1: Alternative and additional estimates

Public Health Function	Reported spend	Alternative estimate	Source & discussion
Non-cancer screening	£128m	£404m	Professor Adrian Davis at the Royal Hampstead NHS Trust has produced an estimate of total national spend. It includes a number of estimates e.g. % of patients requiring services and some staff costs.
Cancer screening	£271m	£377m	There is an alternative estimate from the National Audit Office.

⁹ Zero spend was imputed for: alcohol misuse, childhood immunisations, TD/IPV and HPV immunisation programmes; contraception additional service - GP contract; child health Information systems; preparedness, resilience and response for health protection incidents and emergencies; and PCT support for surveillance and control of infectious disease

QOF elements	-	£164m	Not included in survey. This is taken from accounts.
Seasonal flu and pneumococcal immunisation programme	£117m	£151m	The alternative estimate is drawn from accounts figures and a survey drawn from GP systems. We would have expected PCT estimates to be at least this high, since the alternative does not cover all aspects of this programme. However, the alternative estimate may still be an underestimate.
Contraception additional service GP contract	£68m	£85m	Accounts information suggest this has been slightly underestimated.
Alcohol DES	-	£3.6m	Taken from accounts as it was omitted from the survey

If all of the above alternative and additional sources are accepted, the total public health system budget would be increased by approximately £600m, entirely in functions due to transfer to the NHS Commissioning Board (this corresponds to the £168m (QoF elements and alcohol DES) and £430m alternative sources cited in paragraph 1.14). These adjustments therefore do not affect the breakdown of PCT spend and no compensating adjustment has been made to CCG or NHSCB-focused returns.

Abortion, sterilisation and vasectomy services

Spend on abortion, sterilisation and vasectomy services was not separately identified in the returns but was part of a broader category. At the time of the collection they were proposed to be part of LA responsibilities. They are now expected to be part of CCG's responsibilities.

An estimate of spend on these services was made by multiplying activity levels by the most appropriate payment by result national tariffs. The national tariffs exclude the market forces factor for unavoidable costs due to location so the MFF for each PCT was also included.

Since the collection from PCTs, expenditure in the returns for preparedness, resilience and response for health protection incidents and emergencies, and part of the expenditure for PCT support for surveillance and control of infectious diseases has been included in the local authority figures. In the collection from PCTs they were not assigned to a future commissioning route as this was not known at the time.

Administration spend

So far we have concentrated on total outturn, ie, programme plus administration, as this will be the basis of grants to LAs. Feedback from PCTs suggests that there is a significant risk of misallocation of estimated spend between programme and administration in the collection. Our estimates of the breakdown of PCT spend therefore rely on other work mapping PCT functions and the resources they deploy on those functions.

Annex C: Technical adjustments to NHSCB and CCG focused returns

The estimated 2010-11 baseline expenditure for GP practices, and hence CCGs, needs to reflect PCT 2010-11 expenditure under a hypothetical situation that the PCT was in financial balance: a situation where there was no difference between the surplus/deficit at the end of 2009-10 and the end of 2010-11, and similarly no difference between the lodgements at the end of 2009-10 and the end of 2010-11.

PCTs were asked to submit data on this basis (i.e. corrected for surplus/deficit and lodgements) in September 2011. Due to difficulties with the guidance the corrections were not made uniformly or correctly by all PCTs. Therefore, in November 2011 SHAs were asked to resubmit or confirm data on surplus/deficit and lodgements for PCTs in their areas.

If a PCT runs an increase in its surplus (or decrease in its deficit) from the start to the end of the financial year, then its expenditure on health care services needs to be adjusted upwards (i.e. the value of the increase in surplus needs to be added to net expenditure). Similar logic applies to the changes in lodgements with the SHA. Correspondingly, if a PCT had a higher deficit at the end of the year than at the start of the financial year, the PCT should have scaled down spend. In order to assure the data was correctly adjusted a number of steps were taken.

Quality Assurance using accounts

We have compared the total net surplus/deficit reported in the collection with information from PCT accounts information collated by DH. There were many significant differences. In some cases there are good reasons for the differences, since part of the net surplus may have been attributed to activities not covered in the collection, such as primary care; but this factor is unlikely to explain the scale of many of the differences. This led us to request additional verifying information from SHAs.

Re-submission or confirmation of deficit/surplus and lodgements position

SHAs were asked to re-submit or confirm data on surplus/deficit and lodgements for PCTs in their areas. Where the subsequent collection suggests that this correction has not been applied in the way we anticipated a correction has been made. In cases where the sign of the correction was incorrect, this adjustment can be significant.

Adjustments to the data

Where the original deficit/surplus and lodgements corrections were either of the wrong sign or magnitude and / or no apportionment was made across expenditure categories and a number of steps were taken in different cases:

- removing the original PCT correction from the expenditure returns
- re-applying a proportion of the re-submitted correction, based on the proportion of the total PCT primary and secondary care expenditure covered by the returns (compared to the totals in accounts)
- re-apportioning the estimates of the relevant categories of spend to each GP practice, within a PCT, proportionately to the estimates of GP expenditure originally submitted by PCTs in September 2011.