

# Commissioning of Urology Services?

Di Riley

# Developing the NHS Commissioning Board

“The purpose of the Board will be to use the £80bn commissioning budget to secure the best possible outcomes for patients.”

This can be done by:

- Supporting local clinical improvement
- Transforming the management of long-term conditions
- Providing more services outside hospital settings
- Providing a more integrated system of urgent and emergency care to reduce the rate of growth in hospital admissions

- Clinical Commissioning Advisory Groups:
  - Cancer (chair Sean Duffy)
  - Radiotherapy (chair Nick Slevin)
  - Radiosurgery - also National Stereotactic RT consortium group (chair Matthew Hatton)

# Cancer Networks

- Ministerial support for cancer networks but recognition that they have been of variable quality and effectiveness
- McLean Review of Clinical Networks (wider than cancer – e.g. Cardiac) recently published
- Establishment of Specialist Clinical Networks (~15)
  - likely reduction of management support
  - greater emphasis on clinical leadership
- Likely to play a major role in commissioning at local level (link to specialist advice to Cancer Commissioning Boards – GPs)

# Health & Well-being Boards

- Local authority chaired
- Bringing together primary & secondary care with public health and local authorities
- Heavy lay involvement
- May play an important role in public awareness campaigns in future

# Quality drivers

- **National Guidance (NICE, etc.)**
- **NICE Quality Standards**
- **Commissioning Outcome Framework indicators**
- **CQUINs (at Trust level)**
- **National Cancer Action Team & NCIN Service Profiles and Service Specifications (Specialist H&N Cancer MDT Service under development)**
- **‘Third Sector’ (charities, etc) & public pressure**

# Levels of Commissioning

- National level (<500 incidence)
- Specialized Commissioning Groups (~7.5m pop)
- Clinical Commissioning Groups (local)

# Commissioning Support Packs

KEY  
MESSAGES

[www.cancertoolkit.co.uk](http://www.cancertoolkit.co.uk)

SERVICE  
PROFILES

SERVICE  
SPECIFICATION



# Key messages on cancer (1)

- 1. The Incidence is rising:** - 250,000 new cases p.a. now; 300,000 by 2030
- 2. Cancer services and outcomes (survival and mortality) have improved** over the past 10–15 years. Much of the improvement has been in the hospital sector (MDTs etc)

# Key messages on cancer (2)

3. Despite this, **survival for many cancers remains poor** in comparison with other developed countries
  - 5,000 lives a year could be saved if we matched the European average (renal -350, bladder - 145)
  - 10,000 lives a year could be saved if we achieved the level of the best (renal -700, bladder - 290)
4. **Late diagnosis** is the major factor underlying the poor survival rates in this country

# Key messages on cancer (3)

5. This is not simply a matter of patients living a few extra months.
  - Life to years, not years to life!
  - It can often be the difference between early death and long term survival/cure
6. Initiatives to promote early diagnosis are likely to be highly cost effective

# Key messages on cancer (4)

## 7. Particular attention should be given to:

- Reducing emergency presentations (23% of all cancers) as these have very poor survival
- The elderly – who often present late
- **Ensuring that providers record staging and report this to their cancer registry**

# Routes to Diagnosis

All Persons	Screen detected	Two Week Wait	GP referral	Other outpatient	Emergency presentation	Unknown	Number of patients
Bladder		32%	28%	15%	18%	4%	7,665
Brain & CNS		1%	17%	14%	58%	6%	4,147
Breast	21%	42%	12%	9%	4%	12%	34,232
Kidney		20%	29%	18%	24%	6%	5,172
Lung		22%	20%	13%	38%	5%	29,420
Prostate		20%	38%	16%	9%	14%	28,362
Testis		48%	14%	16%	10%	10%	1,569

# RtD – 1 yr survival

All Persons	All routes	Two Week Wait	GP referral	Other o/p	Emergency
Bladder	72%	<b>82%</b>	<b>81%</b>	75%	<b>35%</b>
Brain & CNS	44%	51%	<b>60%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>32%</b>
Breast	97%	<b>98%</b>	96%	97%	<b>53%</b>
Kidney	66%	<b>81%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>33%</b>
Lung	26%	<b>36%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Prostate	95%	<b>97%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>54%</b>
Testis	98%	100%	98%	98%	<b>89%</b>

# Service Specifications

- These may be by pathway or clinical speciality
- Services may be commissioned locally or by Specialist Commissioning groups
- Challenge – different commissioners?
  - Prevention & awareness - local
  - Diagnostics – local
  - Treatment – local, specialist, national
  - Rehabilitation - local
  - Supportive & palliative care - local
- Specialist Urology Services specification – under disc.

# Key Service Outcomes

- Participation in National Audits
- Cancer waiting times
- Threshold for number of procedures, resection rates
- Length of stay/ readmission rates
- Recruitment into trials
- 30 day mortality, 1 & 5 year survival
- Registry data submissions – esp. staging
- National Cancer Patient Experience Survey



# Service Profiles – what are they?

- One strand of commissioning support.
- Trust level information for commissioners
- A wide range of information from multiple sources to support the Service Specification
- Issue for urology – local and specialist services as per the IOG (still under discussion)
  - Penile, testicular
  - Radical Rx – bladder, prostate

# Service Profiles – supporting commissioning

- Collate a range of information in one place.
- Define indicators in a well-documented and clinically robust way.
- Provide site-specific information tied-in to relevant guidance.
- Allow easy comparison across the ‘providers’.
- Allow comparison to national benchmarks.

# Targeted cancer-profiles



Cancer Service Profiles for Colorectal Cancer - 'Look and feel' mockup - dummy data  
(14 Sept 2011) Please direct comments and feedback to profiles@ncin.org.uk

National Cancer Action Team  
Part of the National Cancer Programme



Trust is significantly different from England mean  
 Trust is not significantly different than England mean  
 Statistical significance can not be assessed  
 England mean



Using information to improve quality of care & choice

Jo Bloggs NHS Trust

Select Trust/MDT

Lowest in Eng. Eng. 25th Percentile Eng. mean Eng. 75th Percentile Highest in Eng.

- GP Practice
- Hospital
- Specialist Team
- Through Input
- Waiting times
- Practice
- Recovery

Section	#	Indicator	No. of patients/cases or value	Trust	Proportion or rate		England	Trust rates or proportion compared to England mean			Source	Period
					Lower 95% confidence	Upper 95% confidence		Range	Eng. mean	Eng. 25th Percentile		
Demographics (based on new patients treated per year)	1	Number of new patients treated per year	90									
	2	Patients aged 70+	50	50%	49%	52%	60%	0%		100%	Cancer waits	2010
	3	Patients with recorded ethnicity	89	89%	86%	92%	94%	0%		100%	ANC	ANC
	4	Patients recorded as non white-British	15	15%	15%	15%	16%	0%		100%		
	5	Patients who are income deprived	Quintile 2	17%	16%	18%	18%	0%		100%		
	6	Male patients	2	2%	2%	2%	7%	0%		100%		
	7	Patients with a registered cancer stage	70	70%	68%	72%	77%	0%		100%		
	8	Patients with a Stage A or B disease at diagnosis	40	40%	39%	41%	46%	0%		100%		
	9	Patients with a Charlson co-morbidity index >0	34	34%	33%	35%	38%	0%		100%		
	10	The specialist team has full membership	Yes					0%		100%		
Specialist Team	11	Proportion of peer review indicators met	82%				0%		100%			
	12	Peer review: are there immediate risks?	No				0%		100%			
	13	Peer review: are there serious concerns	No				0%		100%			
	14	Patients reporting good availability of a CNS	92	92%	89%	95%	99%	0%		100%		
	15	Surgeons not managing 20+ cases per year	4	40%	39%	41%	45%	0%		100%		
Through Input	16	Number of two week wait referrals for cancer	42				0%		100%			
	17	Number and proportion of admissions that are emergencies	120	48%	47%	49%	52%	0%		100%		
	18	Patients referred via the screening service	17	17%	16%	18%	19%	0%		100%		
Waiting times	19	TWW referrals with suspected cancer seen within 2 weeks	37	88%	85%	91%	93%	0%		100%		
	20	TWW referrals treated within 62 days	41	98%	95%	101%	103%	0%		100%		
	21	TWW referrals diagnosed with cancer	7	7%	7%	7%	14%	0%		100%		
	22	Patients treated within 31 days of agreeing treatment plan	91	91%	88%	94%	93%	0%		100%		
Practice	23	Surgical cases treated laparoscopically	12	12%	12%	12%	21%	0%		100%		
	24	Patients resected for liver metastases	8	8%	8%	8%	16%	0%		100%		
	25	Patients undergoing a major surgical resection	29	32%	31%	33%	38%	0%		100%		
	26	Mean length of stay for elective admissions	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	0		100%			
	27	Mean length of stay for emergency admissions	5.7	5.5	5.9	5.7	0		100%			
	28	Surgical patients readmitted as an emergency within 28 days	4	4%	4%	4%	10%	0%		10		
Recovery	29	New to follow-up outpatients appointments	4	4%	4%	4%	10%	0%		10		
	30	Patients treated surviving at one year	90	90%	87%	93%	91%	0%		100%		
	31	Surgical patients who die within 30 days	1	1%	1%	1%	0%		100%			
	32	Patients reporting being treated with respect and dignity	92	92%				0%		100%		
	33	Cancer patient experience survey questions scored as "green"	3	87%				0%		100%		
	Cancer patient experience survey questions scored as "red"	6	4%				0%		100%			

# Cancer Service Profiles for Breast Cancer

Data displayed are for patients for which the trust of treatment can be identified. For a full description of the data and methods please refer to the 'Data Definitions' document. For advice on how to use the profiles and the consultation, please refer to 'Profiles guidance'. Please direct comments/feedback to [service\\_profiles@ncin.org.uk](mailto:service_profiles@ncin.org.uk)

- Trust is significantly different from England mean
- Trust is not significantly different from England mean
- ◊ Statistical significance cannot be assessed
- ◆ England mean



National Cancer Action Team  
Part of the National Cancer Programme



Select Trust/MDT

Section	#	Indicator	No. of patients/cases or value	Percentage or rate			Trust rate or percentage compared to England				Source	Period	
				Trust	Lower 95% confidence limit	Upper 95% confidence limit	England	Lowest	Range	Highest			
Size	1	Number of new patients treated per year, 2010/11	169						63		759	CWT	2010/11
	2	Number of newly diagnosed patients treated per year, 2009	124						8		754	CWT/NCDR	2009
Demographics (based on newly diagnosed patients treated, 2009)	3	Patients aged 70+	46	37%	29%	46%	30%	13%			57%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	4	Patients with recorded ethnicity	115	93%	87%	96%	91%	73%			99%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	5	Patients with recorded ethnicity which is not White-British	2	2%	0%	6%	9%	0%			71%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	6	Patients who are Income Deprived (1)		25%			14%	6%			29%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	7	Male patients	3	2%	1%	7%	1%	0%			2%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	8	Patients with a nationally registered Nottingham Prognostic Index (NPI)	8	7%	3%	13%	50%	0%			88%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	9	Patients with a nationally registered NPI in excellent or good prognostic groups	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	62%	39%			73%	CWT/NCDR	2009
	10	Patients with Charlson co-morbidity index >0 (to be included in later profile release)										CWT/NCDR	2009
	Specialist Team	11	Does the specialist team have full membership? (2)	PR	Yes								NCPR
12		Proportion of peer review indicators met	PR	91%				76%				NCPR	2010/11
13		Peer review: are there immediate risks? (3)	PR	No								NCPR	2010/11
14		Peer review: are there serious concerns? (3)	PR	Yes								NCPR	2010/11
15		CPES (4): Patients surveyed and % reporting being given name of a CNS (5,6)	n/a	n/a			94%	73%			100%	CPES	2010
16		Surgeons not managing 30+ cases per year	1	25%	5%	70%	40%	0%			80%	HES	2009/10
Throughput	17	Number of urgent GP referrals for suspected cancer	1,299						307		4,126	CWT	2010/11
	18	Patients with invasive cancer and treated at this trust	168	99%	97%	100%	92%	52%			100%	CWT	2010/11
	19	Patients with non-invasive cancer and treated at this trust	1	1%	0%	3%	8%	0%			48%	CWT	2010/11
	20	Episodes following an emergency admission (new and existing cancers)	167	55%	49%	60%	37%	10%			71%	HES	2009/10
	21	Patients referred via the screening service	3	2%	1%	7%	33%	0%			64%	WMCIU	2009
Waiting times	22	Q2 2011/12: Urgent GP referral for suspected cancer seen within 2 weeks	306	99%	97%	100%	97%	68%			100%	CWT	2011/12 Q2
	23	Q2 2011/12: Treatment within 62 days of urgent GP referral for suspected cancer	27	100%	88%	100%	97%	86%			100%	CWT	2011/12 Q2
	24	Urgent GP referrals for suspected cancer diagnosed with cancer (to be included in later profile release)										CWT	2010/11
	25	Cases treated that are urgent GP referrals with suspected cancer										CWT	2010/11
	26	Q2 2011/12: First treatment began within 31 days of decision to treat	48	100%	93%	100%	99%	88%			100%	CWT	2011/12 Q2
Practice	27	Q2 2011/12: Urgent breast symptom referrals (cancer not suspected) seen in 2 wks	316	99%	98%	100%	96%	61%			100%	CWT	2011/12 Q2
	28	Surgical cases receiving sentinel lymph node biopsy	84	55%	47%	63%	43%	0%			76%	HES	2010/11
	29	Day case or one overnight stay surgery	134	74%	67%	79%	72%	28%			96%	HES	2010/11
	30	Mastectomy patients receiving immediate reconstruction	17	23%	15%	34%	19%	0%			73%	HES	2010/11
	31	Major surgeries in breast cancer patients (including in-situ cases)	98	79%	71%	85%	74%	50%			87%	HES/NCDR	2009
	32	Surgical patients receiving mastectomies	72	52%	44%	60%	39%	22%			69%	HES	2009/10
	33	Mean length of episode for elective admissions	2.4				2.8	0.7			6.3	HES	2009/10
	34	Mean length of episode for emergency admissions	4.7				4.9	2.4			11.3	HES	2009/10
Outcomes and Recovery	35	Surgical patients readmitted as an emergency within 28 days	7	4%	2%	8%	4%	1%			15%	HES	2010/11
	36	Q2-Q4 2010/11: First outpatient appointments of all outpatient appointments	3,654	41%	40%	42%	43%	23%			71%	PBR SUS	2010/11 Q2-Q4
	37	Patients treated surviving at one year (to be included in later profile release)											
Patient Experience - CPES (4)	38	Patients surveyed & % reporting always being treated with respect & dignity (6)	n/a	n/a			82%	65%			95%	CPES	2010
	39	Number of survey questions and % of those questions scoring red						0%			70%	CPES	2010
	40	and green (7)						0%			72%	CPES	2010

Definitions: (1) Based on patient postcode and uses the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2010; (2) Peer Review (NCPR) source - IV=Internal Verification, PR= Peer Review, EA= Earned Autonomy; (3) The immediate risks or serious concerns may now have been resolved or have an action plan in place for resolution; (4) CPES = Cancer Patient Experience Survey; (5) CNS = Clinical Nurse Specialist; (6) Italic value = total number of survey respondents for tumour group. (7) Based on scoring method used by the Department of Health - red/green scores given for survey questions where the trust was in the lowest or highest 20% of all trusts. Questions with lower than 20 respondents were not given a score. Italic value displayed = the total number of viable survey questions, used as the denominator to calculate the % of red/greens for the trust.

n/a = not applicable or not available

# Clinical Aspects - Breast

<b>Practice</b>	28	Surgical cases receiving sentinel lymph node biopsy
	29	Day case or one overnight stay surgery
	30	Mastectomy patients receiving immediate reconstruction
	31	Major surgeries in breast cancer patients (including in-situ cases)
	32	Surgical patients receiving mastectomies
	33	Mean length of episode for elective admissions
	34	Mean length of episode for emergency admissions
<b>Outcomes and Recovery</b>	35	Surgical patients readmitted as an emergency within 28 days
	36	Q2-Q4 2010/11: First outpatient appointments of all outpatient appointments
	37	Patients treated surviving at one year (to be included in later profile release)

What do we need for urology services?  
What is local & specialist?

# Summary

- There is a new commissioning landscape in development
- Services will be commissioned at different levels some still to be determined
- Cancer networks and their clinical tumour groups will have a role to play
- The service profiles will be an important element within commissioning support – but need clinical input to fulfil their potential.