



Public Health
England

NHS
England



NHS RightCare Commissioning for Value Focus Pack

Cancer and tumours
May 2016

RightCare 

NHS North East Lincolnshire CCG

OFFICIAL
Gateway ref: 04940

- Introduction: Welcome to your focus pack
- The cancer strategy and dashboard
- NHS RightCare
- Why act?
- Commissioning for Value
- Your most similar CCGs
- Your data
 - Pathways on a page
 - Spend and activity
 - Opportunities
 - Further analysis
- Next steps and actions
- Further support and information
- Useful links
- Annexes

Welcome to your focus pack on cancer and tumours. The information contained in this pack is personalised for your CCG and should be used to support local discussions and inform a more in-depth analysis around cancer. There is a page of useful links at the end and there is a video guide to the pack too.

Each of these focus packs provides detailed information on the opportunities to improve in the highest spending programmes previously covered by Commissioning for Value packs. They include a wider range of outcomes measures and information on the most common procedures and diagnoses for the condition in question.

By using this information, together with local intelligence and reports such as your Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, your CCG will be able to ensure its plans focus on those opportunities which have the potential to provide the biggest improvements in health outcomes, resource allocation and reducing inequalities.

One of the main focuses for the Commissioning for Value series has always been reducing unwarranted variation in outcomes. NHS England, Public Health England and CCGs have legal duties under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 with regard to reducing health inequalities. Commissioners should continue to use these packs and supporting tools to drive local action to reduce inequalities in access to services and in the health outcomes achieved.

A number of different tools are available to help CCGs and local health economies identify areas for improvement on cancer. A new integrated cancer dashboard, including key outcomes and performance data from CCGs and providers will help these organisations, along with Cancer Alliances, to see how they are contributing to the national ambitions set by the independent Cancer Taskforce, and identify key areas of focus for improvement.

This sits alongside tools like the Commissioning for Value packs, which take some of the same metrics and put them alongside more detailed activity and spend data to support commissioners to make informed decisions about the services they are purchasing for their communities.

Links to the dashboard, the National Cancer Strategy and the cancer implementation plan are included in the 'Useful links' page at the end of this pack.

The primary objective for NHS RightCare is to maximise value:

- the value that the patient derives from their own care and treatment
- the value the whole population derives from the investment in their healthcare

The approach has been tested and proven successful in recent years in a number of different health economies. The programme focusses on improving population value including improving outcomes, quality, and releasing capacity and resources for future investment.

To build on the success and value of the RightCare programme, NHS England and Public Health England are taking forward the RightCare approach to ensure it becomes embedded in the new commissioning and public health agendas for the NHS. It is now referenced in the Mandate to NHS England, the NHS Planning Guidance, the CCG Improvement and Assessment Framework and the Quality Premium for 2016/17.

The RightCare programme includes the Commissioning for Value packs and tools, the NHS Atlas series and a number of casebooks. NHS England has committed significant funding to rolling out the RightCare approach to all CCGs over the next two years. Wave 1 has 65 CCGs and these are now receiving early support from one of ten RightCare Delivery Partners. The remaining CCGs are in Wave 2 and will receive support from an expanded team of Delivery Partners later in 2016.

“ What Commissioning for Value does is shine an honest light on what we are doing. The RightCare approach then gives us a methodology for quality improvement, led by clinicians. It not only improves quality but also makes best use of the taxpayers’ pound ensuring the NHS continues to be one of the best value health and care systems in the world.”


Professor Sir Bruce Keogh
National Medical Director, NHS England

“ The data and evidence available through tools such as Commissioning for Value will help commissioners make the most important decisions in delivering concrete and sustainable clinical and financial benefits across the NHS. We expect that the roll-out of the RightCare programme will drive up the quality of care while contributing significantly to meeting the efficiency challenge set out in the Five Year Forward View.”

Paul Baumann
Chief Financial Officer, NHS England

“ The independent Cancer Taskforce gave us a clear blueprint for delivering world-class cancer outcomes, and our implementation plan, published in May, has set out how we will take the strategy forward. Delivering truly world-class services needs everybody to play their part and Commissioning for Value provides invaluable tools for CCGs to understand how they can use their budget most effectively to ensure all cancer patients get the care and support they need, when they need it.”

Professor Chris Harrison
National Clinical Director for Cancer, NHS England



Commissioning for Value is a partnership between NHS England and Public Health England. The *Where to Look* packs produced in January 2016 support the first phase of the NHS RightCare approach.

The *Where to Look* packs begin with a review of indicative data to highlight the top priorities or opportunities for transformation and improvement for your CCG.

These focus packs help CCGs to begin work on phase two *What to Change* by using indicative data along a pathway to identify improvement opportunities.

Your CCG is compared to the 10 most demographically similar CCGs. This is used to identify realistic opportunities to improve health and healthcare for your population. The analysis in this pack is based on a comparison with your most similar CCGs which are:

- Barnsley
- Thanet
- Bassetlaw
- Darlington
- Warwickshire North
- West Lancashire
- Hardwick
- Newark & Sherwood
- Doncaster
- St Helens

To help you understand more about how your most similar 10 CCGs are calculated, the Similar 10 Explorer Tool is available on the NHS England website. This tool allows you to view similarity across all the individual demographics used to calculate your most similar 10 CCGs. You can also customise your similar 10 cluster group by weighting towards a desired demographic factor.

In addition to the similar 10, there are CCG cluster groups which have been constructed using the same variables (eg deprivation) as the similar 10. This larger cluster group is used in the opportunity tables, represented by a green triangle. Your CCG is in the following cluster group:

- Traditional communities with deprived areas and poorer health

This focus pack presents analysis of a wide range of indicators focussing on spend, activity, quality and outcomes. The indicators have been chosen with advice from key stakeholders including the National Cancer Intelligence Network.

The data in this pack are the latest available*. The charts identify the metadata for each indicator and the full metadata set will be available on the Commissioning for Value pages of the NHS England website shortly. Data quality has been assessed and only indicators which are sufficiently robust have been included in the pack.

The data are presented as an exploration, starting with the pathways on a page, then moving to elective and non-elective spend, admissions, prescribing and procedures.


Should you have any queries about the indicators or the data, please refer to the contact details on the 'further information and support' page at the end of this pack.

*As the spend indicators have been updated since the publication of the 2016 refreshed 'Where to look' packs, figures for spend rates and potential opportunities may differ slightly from those packs.

The three pathways on the following pages now have an additional indicator to show the number of emergency presentations for that cancer. Otherwise, the pathway indicators are unchanged from the cancer related 'pathways on a page' from the previous Commissioning for Value packs. The spend data has also been updated. The intention of these pathways is not to provide a definitive view on priorities but to help commissioners explore potential opportunities. These help commissioners to understand how performance in one part of the pathway may affect outcomes further along the pathway. Each indicator is shown as the percentage difference from the average of your 10 most similar CCGs.

The indicators are colour coded to help you see if your CCG has 'better' (**green**) or 'worse' (**red**) values than your peers. This is not always clear-cut, so (**blue**) is used where it is not possible to make this judgement without understanding the local context. For example low prevalence may reflect that a CCG truly does have fewer patients with a certain condition, but it may reflect that other CCGs have better processes in place to identify and record prevalence in primary care. **Blue indicators could show significant opportunities for improvement.**

Even where an indicator is **green** there may still be an opportunity to improve. The programme opportunity tables, starting on page 43, identify the opportunities that exist for your CCG to improve to a level which matches the average of the best five of your similar 10 CCG group. Please note: The variation from the average of the similar 10 CCGs is statistically significant for those indicators where the confidence intervals do not cross the 0% axis.




NICE Guidance:

<http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/familial-breast-cancer>


<http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/advanced-breast-cancer>

<http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/early-and-locally-advanced-breast-cancer>



NICE Guidance:

<http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/gastrointestinal-cancers>



NICE Guidance:


<http://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/lung-cancer>

The intention of the following pages is to provide a more in-depth view of the spend and activity for the clinical areas included in this pack compared to your 10 most similar CCGs. The charts show the rate for your CCG (yellow bar), the average of the best five comparator (blue bar) and also the absolute difference (the 'how different are we?' column). They should be used to explore key lines of enquiry to identify potential opportunities for improvement.

The opportunity tables, starting on page 43, identify the best CCG in your similar 10, who you may want to contact – either directly, or through your Delivery Partner if you are in a Wave 1 CCG.

Prescribing and interventions have been chosen to reflect highest spend. Clinical experts have advised on the chemical groupings of drugs used to treat certain conditions within a pathway. Annex A gives further detail.

For some indicators, the difference between the value for your CCG and the Best 5 is marked as Not Statistically Significant (NSS). This means that we cannot say with confidence (statistically defined as >95% confidence) that any difference between your CCG and the Best 5 is not simply due to chance. Values for these cases have been included in order to provide detailed information for use in considering whether to explore an area further.




*For 88% of Cancer and Tumours total expenditure CCGs are the responsible purchaser

 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Spend on Elective Admissions

Condition Group




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Spend on Non-Elective Admissions

Condition Group


17



| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Admissions - Head and Neck


per 100,000 age-sex weighted population



How different are we?


95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

per 100,000 age-sex weighted population




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Admissions - Lower GI




95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Admissions - Lung




95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Cancer and tumours - Admissions - Breast



95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators


per 100,000 age-sex weighted population



| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators


Cancer and tumours - Admissions - Urological

per 100,000 age-sex weighted population




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

per 100,000 age-sex weighted population




95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

per 100,000 age-sex weighted population



95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Primary Care Prescribing Spend - Breast Cancer




Medicines Optimisation Dashboard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/pe/mo-dash/>

Innovation Scorecard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/innovation-scorecard/>

95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
*Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Primary Care Prescribing Spend - Hormone Therapy




Medicines Optimisation Dashboard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/pe/mo-dash/>

Innovation Scorecard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/innovation-scorecard/>

95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Primary Care Prescribing Spend - Hormone Therapy continued




Medicines Optimisation Dashboard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/pe/mo-dash/>

Innovation Scorecard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/innovation-scorecard/>

 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Primary Care Prescribing Spend - Immunosuppressants




Medicines Optimisation Dashboard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/pe/mo-dash/>

Innovation Scorecard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/innovation-scorecard/>

 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators


Primary Care Prescribing Spend - Other




Medicines Optimisation Dashboard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/pe/mo-dash/>

Innovation Scorecard: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/innovation-scorecard/>


┆ 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
*Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators



| 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators



95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators




 95% confidence intervals
NSS Not statistically significant*
 *Where an opportunity is 'NSS' CCGs can investigate further whether this reflects a true opportunity e.g. by looking at more than 1 year's data or triangulating with other indicators

Scatter Plot Analysis

The Commissioning for Value Explorer Tool allows the comparison of two indicators, the diagram below is an example. This is an invaluable tool to enable users to assess how one indicator relates to another. The similar 10 can be highlighted too. It is important to remember that correlations do not imply causation but the relationships can help target where to look.

<http://www.england.nhs.uk/resources/resources-for-ccgs/comm-for-value/>



The opportunity tables present all focus pack indicators for five aspects of the pathway.


• **Risk** • **Prevalence and detection** • **Service and quality** • **Spend** • **Outcomes**

The width of the spine chart shows the England range. Your CCG is benchmarked against its similar 10 group. The shaded area of the spine chart within the table shows the range for the similar 10 group. Where the CCG is highest or lowest compared with its similar 10 group it is shown as outside that group range. This has been done to clearly show where the CCG is in relation to the similar 10 and the England worst/highest and best/lowest values.

Opportunities have been calculated for all indicators apart from those that relate to recorded prevalence and some risk factors. Where an indicator can be clearly interpreted as worse or better the spine charts show the position of the CCG, the best five average, and the wider cluster best CCG. The opportunity is quantified where the CCG is worse in relation to the Best 5 average.

Where an indicator needs to be locally interpreted (for example elective spend) and the CCG is higher than the average of the 5 CCGs with the lowest values, the opportunity table shows the potential opportunity. By calculating the potential opportunity it is possible to answer the question “Is it worth investigating this further?” The Best 5 average and the cluster best are not shown on the spine chart for these indicators.

Opportunity table: Interpretation




‡ The wider cluster group best CCG is not always in the similar 10. It is included to indicate a 'stretch' target. Your wider CCG cluster group is identified on page 8.

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

- Overall index of multiple deprivation
- Obesity prevalence, 16+
- Smoking prevalence, 18+
- Estimated prevalence of binge drinkers, 16+



Please note: For smoking, obesity, physical inactivity and binge drinking opportunities are not presented due to difficulties calculating these, rather than because they need local interpretation.

* No opportunity is calculated for risk and reported prevalence indicators

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

Breast Cancer Prevalence (%)


Colorectal Cancer Prevalence (%)

Lung cancer prevalence (%)

Incidence of breast cancer (**)

Incidence of colorectal cancer (**)

Incidence of lung cancer (**)



* No opportunity is calculated for risk and reported prevalence indicators

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Activity and quality

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population



Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Activity and quality

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

| Indicator | CCG Value | Legend | | | Best/Lowest 5 Opportunity | Similar 10 Best | Page |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| | | ● CCG | ◆ Best 5 | ▲ Best in Cluster | | | |
| | | England Worst or Highest | | England Best or Lowest | | | |
| Cancer, Gynaecological - Average length of stay-emergency (bed days) | 18.3 | | | | 88 Bed days (NSS) | | |
| Cancer, Urological - Day case admissions (**) | 187.9 | | | | 210 Adms | | |
| Cancer, Urological - Average length of stay-elective (bed days) | 3.0 | | | | 84 Bed days (NSS) | | |
| Cancer, Urological - Average length of stay-emergency (bed days) | 12.1 | | | | 109 Bed days (NSS) | | |
| Cancer, Haematological - Day case admissions (**) | 606.7 | | | | 717 Adms | | |
| Cancer, Haematological - Average length of stay-elective (bed days) | 4.1 | | | | | | |
| Cancer, Haematological - Average length of stay-emergency (bed days) | 12.6 | | | | 264 Bed days | | |
| Other Cancers and Tumours - Day case admissions (**) | 1240.5 | | | | 1092 Adms | | |
| Other Cancers and Tumours - Average length of stay-elective (bed days) | 4.1 | | | | 291 Bed days | | |
| Other Cancers and Tumours - Average length of stay-emergency (bed days) | 9.2 | | | | 219 Bed days (NSS) | | |
| Emergency presentations for breast cancer (age STD per 100,000) | 6.2 | | | | | Warwickshire North | p.56 |
| Emergency presentations for lung cancer (age STD per 100,000) | 16.0 | | | | | West Lancashire | p.57 |
| Emergency presentations for colorectal cancer (age STD per 100,000) | 35.9 | | | | | West Lancashire | p.58 |
| Rate of urgent GP referrals (all cancers) (**) | 2266.3 | | | | | | |
| % First definitive treatment within 2 months (all cancer) | 85.0 | | | | 4 Pats (NSS) | St Helens | p.59 |
| % who received 2nd/subseq. treatment within 1 month (surgery) | 96.2 | | | | 4 Cases (NSS) | Bassetlaw | p.60 |
| % who received 2nd/subseq. treatment within 1 month (chemo) | 99.7 | | | | 1 Cases | Barnsley | p.61 |
| % who received 2nd/subseq. treatment within 1 month (radiotherapy) | 96.7 | | | | 10 Cases | Bassetlaw | p.62 |
| % received 1st treatment within 2 months after decision to upgrade | No Data | | | | No Data | Warwickshire North | p.63 |
| %patients with cancer who had a review 6 months after diagnosis | 83.6 | | | | | North East Lincolnshire | p.64 |

Please note: Opportunity for emergency presentations are not presented due to unavailability of denominators


Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Activity and quality

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

| | |
|---|--------|
| % of women aged 50-70 screened for breast cancer in last 3 years | 70.4 |
| Females,50-70,screened for breast cancer in 6 months of invite(%) | 71.6 |
| % of breast cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2) | 68.8 |
| Number of 2 week wait referrals for suspected breast cancer (**) | 543.2 |
| % 1st outpatient apt within 2 wks-breast cancer not init. suspected | 99.1 |
| Females,25-64,attending cervical screening within target period (%) | 78.9 |
| % 60-69 who were screened for bowel cancer (previous 30 months) | 58.6 |
| % 60-69 screened for bowl cancer within 6 months of invite | 58.8 |
| % of colorectal cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2) | 36.8 |
| Number of 2 week wait referrals for suspected lower GI cancers (**) | 409.2 |
| % of lung cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2) | 21.9 |
| Number of 2 week wait referrals for suspected lung cancer (**) | 94.3 |
| Patient's rating of care `excellent` / `very good` (%) | 87.6 |
| Saw GP once/twice before being told had to go to hospital (%) | 73.9 |
| Given easy to understand written information about test (%) | 91.4 |
| Patient given written information about side effects (%) | 83.3 |
| Patient given written information about the operation (%) | 78.4 |
| Given clear written information about what to do post discharge (%) | 79.1 |
| Patient offered written assessment and care plan (%) | 26.2 |
| Smoking - successful quitters 16+ (**) | 1996.8 |



* No opportunity is calculated for 2 week wait referrals

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

| Indicator | CCG Value | England Worst or Highest | England Best or Lowest | Best/Lowest 5 Opportunity | Similar 10 Best | Page |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Rate of colonoscopy procedures and flexisigmoidoscopy procedures (per 10,000 pop) | 153.8 | | | NA* | | |
| Rate of computed tomography (CT) colonoscopy procedures (per 10,000 [pop]) | 20.6 | | | NA* | | |
| GP Exception Rate - Cancer (%) | 14.0 | | | NA* | | |

Please Note: Opportunity for colonoscopy procedures are not presented due to unavailability of denominators


* No opportunity is calculated for exception rates

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Spend

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator




Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Spend

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator



Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Spend

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

CCG Value

● CCG ◆ Best 5 ▲ Best in Cluster

England Worst or Highest England Best or Lowest

Best/Lowest 5 Opportunity

Similar 10 Best

Page

| | |
|---|------|
| Prescribing spend - Sirolimus (***) | 35 |
| Prescribing spend - Mycophenolate Sodium (***) | 24 |
| Prescribing spend - Octreotide Acetate (***) | 19 |
| Prescribing spend - Lanreotide (***) | 10 |
| Prescribing spend - Mercaptopurine (***) | 55 |
| Proc.- Wire guided partial excision of breast (*) | 628 |
| Proc.- Partial excision of breast Not elsewhere classified (*) | 632 |
| Proc.- Total mastectomy Not elsewhere classified (*) | 215 |
| Proc.- Skin sparing mastectomy (*) | 446 |
| Proc.- Lobectomy of lung (*) | 777 |
| Proc.- CT - pulmonary arteries (*) | 94 |
| Proc.- Endobronchial ultrasound examination of mediastinum(*) | 62 |
| Proc.- Anterior resection-rectum;anastomosis-colon to rectum(*) | 311 |
| Proc.-Right hemicolectomy,anastomosis-ileum to trans.colon(*) | 464 |
| Proc.- Fibreoptic endoscopy - colon; biopsy - lesion of colon(*) | 404 |
| Proc.- Unspecified diagnostic endoscopy - colon(*) | 313 |
| Proc.- Anterior resection of rectum and exteriorisation of bowel(*) | 97 |
| Proc.- Abdominoperineal excision of rectum and end colostomy(*) | 295 |
| Proc.-Rectosigmoidectomy+closure of rectal stump,exter. of bowel(*) | 266 |
| Proc.- Endoscopic resection of lesion of bladder(*) | 1112 |



Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

Cancer - Opportunity table - Spend

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

CCG Value

● CCG ◆ Best 5 ▲ Best in Cluster

England Worst or Highest England Best or Lowest

Best/Lowest 5 Opportunity

Similar 10 Best

Page

| | |
|--|---------|
| Proc.- Endoscopy snare resection of lesion of colon(*) | 373 |
| Proc.- Endoscopy-upper GI tract;biopsy-lesion of upper GI tract(*) | 280 |
| Proc.- Endoscopic insertion of prosthesis into upper GI tract(*) | 57 |
| Proc.-Unspecified diagnostic fiberoptic endoscopy-upper GI tract(*) | 271 |
| Proc.- Unspecified diagnostic endoscopy - bladder(*) | 570 |
| Proc.- CT - Not elsewhere classified(*) | 1150 |
| Proc.- CT - Head(*) | 614 |
| Proc.- MRI - Not elsewhere classified(*) | 232 |
| Proc.- MRI - Head(*) | 313 |
| Proc.- Excision of lesion of external nose(*) | 181 |
| Proc.- Unspecified other excision of lesion of skin(*) | 352 |
| Proc.- Excision of lesion of skin of head/neck-Not elsewhere classified(*) | 287 |
| Proc.- Total excision of prostate and capsule of prostate(*) | 433 |
| Proc.- Excision of lesion of tissue of frontal lobe of brain(*) | 310 |
| Proc.- Re-excision of skin margins - Not elsewhere classified(*) | 253 |
| Proc.- Total abdominal hysterectomy - Not elsewhere classified(*) | 1050 |
| Proc.- Continuous IV infusion of therapeutic substance(*) | 1326 |
| Proc.- IV blood transfusion of packed cells(*) | 729 |
| Proc.- Unspecified other blood transfusion(*) | 71 |
| Proc.- Unspecified blood withdrawal(*) | No Data |




| |
|------------|
| |
| £9k (NSS) |
| |
| £22k |
| £88k |
| |
| £7k (NSS) |
| £2k (NSS) |
| £26k |
| |
| |
| £14k (NSS) |
| £33k (NSS) |
| £18k |
| £6k (NSS) |
| £194k |
| £120k |
| £11k |
| No Data |

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

Indicator

CCG Value



Similar 10 Best

Page

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

* per 1,000 age/sex weighted population
 ** per 100,000 age/sex weighted population
 *** per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population

| Indicator | CCG Value | England Worst or Highest | CCG | Best 5 | England Best or Lowest | Best in Cluster | Best/Lowest 5 Opportunity | Similar 10 Best | Page |
|--|-----------|--------------------------|-----|--------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| One year survival (breast, lung, colorectal) (%) | 68.7 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | | Newark & Sherwood | p.93 |
| One year survival for colorectal cancer (%) | 78.3 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | | North East Lincolnshire | p.94 |
| One year survival for lung cancer (%) | 28.9 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | | Newark & Sherwood | p.95 |
| One year survival for breast cancer (%) | 94.6 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | | Barnsley | p.96 |
| <75 mortality from lung cancer (**) | 42.7 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | 15 Lives | Newark & Sherwood | p.97 |
| <75 mortality from breast cancer (**) | 29.1 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | 8 Lives | Hardwick | p.98 |
| <75 mortality from colorectal cancer (**) | 11.6 | | ● | ◆ | | ▲ | 2 Lives (NSS) | Newark & Sherwood | p.99 |

Please Note: Opportunity for one year survival indicators are not presented due to unavailability of denominators

Please refer to slide 42 for full guidance on interpretation of this table of opportunities

The following pages provide a further analysis of a range of indicators in the focus pack. The indicators selected are those where we have been able to assign a judgement on whether a lower or higher value is *better* eg a lower value is better for mortality, and a higher value better for case finding.

Top chart:

The opportunity box from the spine chart is shown in the top right of the blue banner. The top chart shows the whole England distribution together with the highlighted Similar 10 group (grey bars) and your CCG (yellow bar). The England average is shown by the dashed blue line. The England value and the Best 5 average values are shown below this chart.



Bottom chart:

Shows your CCG and the Similar 10 group together with their indicator values. The Best 5 CCG average is shown by a dark blue line.

The full indicator name, source and time period are shown at the bottom left.


The analysis presented in the following pages can be replicated for *all* indicators in the focus pack using the Commissioning for Value Focus Pack Tool. The tool is available on the Commissioning for Value web pages. The link is shown on page 103.

Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for breast cancer (per 100,000 pop)




Definition: Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for breast cancer - DSR per 100,000 women
 Source: Hospital Episode Statistics (HES), The National Cancer Intelligence Network
 Year: 2006-2013

Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for colorectal cancer (per 100,000 pop)





| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 17.7 | Best 5 | 15.2 |
|---------|------|--------|------|



Definition: Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for colorectal cancer - DSR per 100,000
 Source: Hospital Episode Statistics (HES), The National Cancer Intelligence Network
 Year: 2006-2013

Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for lung cancer (per 100,000 pop)

58




Definition: Routes to diagnosis - emergency presentations for lung cancer - DSR per 100,000
 Source: Hospital Episode Statistics (HES), The National Cancer Intelligence Network
 Year: 2006-2013


% of cases (all cancers) receiving first definitive treatment within two months of urgent referral from GP

4 Pats (NSS)

59



| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 83.2 | Best 5 | 85.8 |
|---------|------|--------|------|



Definition: % (all cancers) receiving first definitive treatment within two months of urgent referral from GP



Source: Commissioner-based cancer waiting statistics 2014/15, NHS England

Year: 2014/15

% of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month (surgery)

4 Cases (NSS)

60



Definition: Percentage of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month where the treatment is surgery



Source: NHS England Cancer Waiting Times Database

Year: 2014-15

% of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month (chemo)

1 Cases

61



Definition: Percentage of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month where the treatment is an anti-cancer drug regimen



Source: NHS England Cancer Waiting Times Database

Year: 2014-15

% of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month (radiotherapy)

10 Cases

62



Definition: Percentage of cases (all cancers) who received second or subsequent treatment within one month where the treatment is radiotherapy


Source: NHS England Cancer Waiting Times Database

Year: 2014-15


% who received 1st treatment within 2 months following consultant's decision to upgrade

No Data

63




| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 89.2 | Best 5 | 88.5 |
|---------|------|--------|------|



Definition: Percentage of cases (all cancers) who received first treatment within two months (62 days) following a consultant's decision to upgrade a patient's priority to first treatment for all cancers
 Source: NHS England Cancer Waiting Times Database
 Year: 2014-15


% of patients with cancer who have had a review 6 months after diagnosis

64



England 80.1

Best 5 80.3



Definition: The percentage of patients with cancer, diagnosed within the preceding 15 months, who have a patient review recorded as occurring within 6 months of the date of diagnosis



Source: Quality and Outcomes Framework

Year: 2014/15

% of women aged 50-70 screened for breast cancer in last 3 years

1354 Ppl

65



Definition: % of women aged 50 - 70 screened for breast cancer in last three years



Source: Cancer Commissioning Toolkit

Year: 2014

Females,50-70,screened for breast cancer in 6 months of invite(%)

848 Ppl

66





Definition: Females aged 50-70 screened for breast cancer within 6 months of invitation (uptake)
 Source: Cancer Services, Fingertips
 Year: 2014/15

% of breast cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)

9 Pats

67





Definition: % of breast cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)

Source: Public Health England CAS1403 Stage by CCG data

Year: 2013


% receiving first outpatient appointment within two weeks for patients referred with breast symptoms where cancer was not initially suspected 68




Definition: % age receiving first outpatient appointment within two weeks for patients referred with breast symptoms where cancer was not initially suspected
 Source: NHS England Cancer Waiting Times Database
 Year: 2014-15

Females, 25-64, attending cervical screening within target period (%)

69



| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 73.5 | Best 5 | 77.6 |
|---------|------|--------|------|




Definition: Females, 25-64, attending cervical screening within target period (3.5 or 5.5 year coverage, %)
 Source: Cancer Services, Fingertips
 Year: 2014/15

% 60-69 who were screened for bowel cancer (previous 30 months)


526 Ppl

70



England 57.8

Best 5 61.3




Definition: % of people aged 60-69 who were screened for bowel cancer in the previous 30 months
 Source: Commissioning Toolkit
 Year: 2014


% 60-69 screened for bowel cancer within 6 months of invite

150 Ppl

71



| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 57.6 | Best 5 | 60.4 |
|---------|------|--------|------|




Definition: Persons 60-69 screened for bowel cancer within 6 months of invitation (uptake %)
 Source: Cancer Services, Fingertips
 Year: 2014/15

% of colorectal cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)


1 Pats (NSS)

72



England 36.8

Best 5 37.3




Definition: % of colorectal cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)

Source: Cancer Commissioning Toolkit

Year: 2013


% of lung cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)

73



England 20.3

Best 5 19.8





Definition: % of lung cancers detected at an early stage (1 or 2)
 Source: Public Health England CAS1403 Stage by CCG data
 Year: 2013

Patient's rating of care 'excellent' / 'very good' (%)

160 Pats

74




Definition: Patient's rating of care 'excellent' / 'very good'
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14


Saw GP once/twice before being told had to go to hospital (%)

161 Pats (NSS)

75




| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 74.8 | Best 5 | 78.3 |
|---------|------|--------|------|



Definition: % Saw GP once/twice before being told had to go to hospital
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14


Given easy to understand written information about test (%)

76



England 87.2

Best 5 89.5




Definition: % Patients given easy to understand written information about test
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14

Patient given written information about side effects (%)


50 Pats (NSS)

77



England 82.3

Best 5 84.7




Definition: % Patients given written information about side effects
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14

Patient given written information about the operation (%)


96 Pats (NSS)

78



England 75.5

Best 5 81.0




Definition: % Patients given written information about the operation
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14

Given clear written information about what to do post discharge (%)


403 Pats

79



England 84.9


Best 5 90.2




Definition: % Patients given clear written information about what should / should not do post discharge
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14

Patient offered written assessment and care plan (%)

80



| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 21.9 | Best 5 | 25.2 |
|---------|------|--------|------|




Definition: % Patients offered written assessment and care plan
 Source: 2014 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey
 Year: 2013/14


Successful quitters, 16+ (per 100,000 pop)

420 Ppl

81



| | | | |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| England | 2839.4 | Best 5 | 3241.9 |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|





Definition: Smoking quit rates (successful quitters), per 100,000 population aged 16yrs+
 Source: Mid-year population estimates from Office for National Statistics
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer - Total non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£3k (NSS)

82





Definition: Cancer - Total spend on non-elective admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Head and Neck- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£26k

83





Definition: Cancer, Head and Neck - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Upper GI- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£15k (NSS)



84



Definition: Cancer, Upper GI - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15



Cancer, Lower GI- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

85



Definition: Cancer, Lower GI - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Lung- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)





Definition: Cancer, Lung - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Skin- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£1k (NSS)

87





Definition: Cancer, Skin - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Breast- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)


£5k (NSS)

88




Definition: Cancer, Breast - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Gynaecological- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)



| | | | |
|---------|-------|--------|-------|
| England | 332.0 | Best 5 | 211.0 |
|---------|-------|--------|-------|





Definition: Cancer, Gynaecological - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Urological- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£13k (NSS)

90





Definition: Cancer, Urological - Total non-elective spend per 1,000 admissions population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Cancer, Haematological- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£63k (NSS)

91





Definition: Cancer, Haematological - Total non-elective spend admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

Other Cancers and Tumours- non-elective spend (£ per 1,000 pop)

£44k (NSS)



92



Definition: Other Cancers and Tumours - Total non-elective spend on admissions per 1,000 population
 Source: Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart)
 Year: 2014/15

One year survival (breast, lung, colorectal) (%)

93




Definition: One-year survival index (%) for three-cancers combined all adults (aged 15 to 99 years)

Source: Office for National Statistics


Year: 2013 (2011)

One year survival for colorectal cancer (%)

94




| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 77.7 | Best 5 | 76.9 |
|---------|------|--------|------|




Definition: One year survival for colorectal cancer
 Source: Office for National Statistics
 Year: 2013 (2011)

One year survival for lung cancer (%)

95




| | | | |
|---------|------|--------|------|
| England | 35.4 | Best 5 | 35.3 |
|---------|------|--------|------|



Definition: One year survival for lung cancer
 Source: Office for National Statistics
 Year: 2013 (2011)


One year survival for breast cancer (%)

96



England 96.7

Best 5 96.7





Definition: One year survival for breast cancer
 Source: Office for National Statistics
 Year: 2013 (2011)

<75 mortality from lung cancer (per 100,000 pop)

15 Lives

97



Definition: Mortality from lung cancer: under 75 directly age-standardised rates (DSR) per 100,000 European Standard Population


Source: Primary Care Mortality Database, HSCIC

Year: 2011-13

<75 mortality from breast cancer (per 100,000 pop)


8 Lives

98





England 19.8

Best 5 18.6



Definition: Mortality from breast cancer: under 75 directly age-standardised rates (DSR) per 100,000 European Standard Population
 Source: Primary Care Mortality Database, HSCIC
 Year: 2011-13



Definition: Mortality from colorectal cancer: Under 75 Directly age-standardised rates (DSR) per 100,000 European Standard
 Source: Primary Care Mortality Database, HSCIC
 Year: 2011-13

Commissioners can take the following actions now:

- Identify the key opportunities for improvement within the pathways included in the cancer focus pack for your population and compare with current reform activity and improvement plans
- Engage with clinicians and other local stakeholders, including public health teams in local authorities and commissioning support organisations and explore the opportunities along the pathways further using local data
- Revisit the Commissioning for Value web pages regularly as new content, including updates to tools to support the use of the Commissioning for Value packs, is regularly added
- Watch the focus pack videos, and explore other clinical resources
- Always consider risk factor reduction (e.g. smoking prevalence) as an opportunity to improve population health and reduce disease prevalence
- Discuss the opportunities highlighted in this pack as part of the STP planning process and consider STP wide action where appropriate
- For Wave One CCGs, speak to your Delivery Partner about other practical steps for your locality
- For Wave Two CCGs, start to identify and act to improve the opportunities highlighted

The Commissioning for Value benchmarking tool, explorer tool, full details of all the data used, and links to other useful tools are available on the Commissioning for Value pages of the NHS England website.

The NHS RightCare website offers resources to support CCGs in adopting the Commissioning for Value approach. These include:

- Online videos and 'how to' guides
- Case studies with learning from other CCGs

If you have any questions or require any further information or support you can email the Commissioning for Value support team direct at: england.healthinvestmentnetwork@nhs.net

There are further resources on key surgical pathways and data available at The Royal College of Surgeons National Surgical Commissioning Centre. All the resources listed below are freely available at the website shown on page 103.

- **Commissioning guides** have been developed through a NICE accredited process and outline the ‘high value’ care pathway for a particular surgical complaint. Further information on the development of the commissioning guides is available online. Guides related to cancer conditions include: Emergency surgery (for acute abdominal pain); Rectal bleeding; Asymptomatic scrotal swelling; and Lower urinary tract symptoms in men
- **Data tools linked to commissioning guides** use Hospital Episode Statistics (HES). All the tools have been developed with input from a multidisciplinary guideline development group and clinical coders and the technical definitions and guidance on navigating the tools are available to download. The data within these tools should be used as a start of a conversation between commissioners and their providers to examine possible areas for improved efficiency and quality improvement
- **The Quality Dashboards and Procedure Explorer Tool (PET):** There are 30 separate quality dashboards which show quality indicators for surgical procedures commissioned by commissioners. The PET tool shows further detailed information on individual procedures. Related data tools are:
 - Emergency laparotomy and surgical treatment of large bowel obstruction
 - Colonoscopy / Flexible sigmoidoscopy
 - Surgical treatment of testicular cancer
 - Surgical treatment of prostatism

Commissioning for Value pages of the NHS England website:

<http://www.england.nhs.uk/resources/resources-for-ccgs/comm-for-value/>

Commissioning for Value Similar 10 Explorer Tool:

<https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/cfv-16-similar-10-explr-tool.xlsm>

Supporting videos for the CFV focus packs:

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL6IQwMACXkj1e17bcMvaHuy1gd9XrZT92>

NHS RightCare website:

<http://www.rightcare.nhs.uk/index.php/commissioning-for-value/>

Royal College of Surgeons National Surgical Commissioning Centre:

<http://www.rcseng.ac.uk/surgical-commissioning>

National Cancer Strategy:

http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/achieving_world-class_cancer_outcomes_-_a_strategy_for_england_2015-2020.pdf

National Cancer Strategy implementation plan:

<https://www.england.nhs.uk/2016/05/cancer-strategy/>

Cancer dashboard:

<https://www.cancerdata.nhs.uk/dashboard/#?tab=Overview>

National Cancer Intelligence Network:

<http://www.ncin.org.uk/home>

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence:

<https://www.nice.org.uk/>

Annex A: Procedure and drug codes and descriptions

| Programme Category Name | Programme Category Code |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cancer, Head and Neck | 02A |
| Cancer, Upper GI | 02B |
| Cancer, Lower GI | 02C |
| Cancer, Lung | 02D |
| Cancer, Skin | 02E |
| Cancer, Breast | 02F |
| Cancer, Gynaecological | 02G |
| Cancer, Urological | 02H |
| Cancer, Haematological | 02I |
| Cancers and Tumours (Other)* | 02X |

* This includes Tumours of the Nervous System which are included within the Cancer and Tumours programme budget category, but covered in more detail in the Neurological Focus Pack

Highest spend procedures mapped to Programme Budget Codes: 02A, 02B, 02C, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02I, 02X . The Programme Budget Code where the majority of spend falls is indicated.

| OPCS Procedure Code | Full procedure description | Short name in focus packs |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| B285 | Wire guided partial excision of breast (Majority PBC = 02F) | Wire guided partial excision of breast |
| B282 | Partial excision of breast NEC (Majority PBC = 02F) | Partial excision of breast NEC |
| B274 | Total mastectomy NEC (Majority PBC = 02F) | Total mastectomy NEC |
| B276 | Skin sparing mastectomy (Majority PBC = 02F) | Skin sparing mastectomy |

Highest spend procedures mapped to Programme Budget Codes: 02A, 02B, 02C, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02I, 02X . The Programme Budget Code where the majority of spend falls is indicated.

| OPCS Procedure Code | Full procedure description | Short name in focus packs |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| E543 | Lobectomy of lung (Majority PBC = 02D) | Lobectomy of lung |
| U354 | Computed tomography of pulmonary arteries (Majority PBC = 02D&02X) | Computed tomography of pulmonary arteries |
| E632 | Endobronchial ultrasound examination of mediastinum (Majority PBC = 02D) | Endobronchial ultrasound examination of mediastinum |

Lower GI cancers procedures

108

Highest spend procedures mapped to Programme Budget Codes: 02A, 02B, 02C, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02I, 02X . The Programme Budget Code where the majority of spend falls is indicated.

| OPCS Procedure Code | Full procedure description | Short name in focus packs |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| H333 | Anterior resection of rectum and anastomosis of colon to rectum using staples (Majority PBC = 02C) | Anterior resection - rectum;anastomosis- colon to rectum w/ staples |
| H072 | Right hemicolectomy and side to side anastomosis of ileum to transverse colon (Majority PBC = 02C) | Right hemicolectomy,side to side anastomosis -ileum to trans. colon |
| H221 | Diagnostic fiberoptic endoscopic examination of colon and biopsy of lesion of colon (Majority PBC = 02C&02X) | Diagnostic fiberoptic endoscopy - colon; biopsy - lesion of colon |
| H229 | Unspecified diagnostic endoscopic examination of colon (Majority PBC = 02C&02X) | Unspecified diagnostic endoscopy - colon |
| H336 | Anterior resection of rectum and exteriorisation of bowel (Majority PBC = 02C) | Anterior resection of rectum and exteriorisation of bowel |
| H331 | Abdominoperineal excision of rectum and end colostomy (Majority PBC = 02C) | Abdominoperineal excision of rectum and end colostomy |
| H335 | Rectosigmoidectomy and closure of rectal stump and exteriorisation of bowel (Majority PBC = 02C) | Rectosigmoidectomy+closure of rectal stump, exteriorisation of bowel |

Cancers and tumours: All other procedures

109

Highest spend procedures mapped to Programme Budget Codes: 02A, 02B, 02C, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02I, 02X . The Programme Budget Code where the majority of spend falls is indicated.

| OPCS Procedure Code | Full procedure description | Short name in focus packs |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| U212 | Computed tomography NEC (Majority PBC = All) | CT - Not elsewhere classified |
| Q074 | Total abdominal hysterectomy NEC (Majority PBC = 02G & 02X) | Total abdominal hysterectomy - Not elsewhere classified |
| U051 | Computed tomography of head (Majority PBC = 02X) | CT – Head |
| X292 | Continuous intravenous infusion of therapeutic substance NEC (Majority PBC = 02I) | Continuous IV infusion of therapeutic substance |
| M421 | Endoscopic resection of lesion of bladder (Majority PBC = 02H) | Endoscopic resection of lesion of bladder |
| S069 | Unspecified other excision of lesion of skin (Majority PBC = 02E&02X) | Unspecified other excision of lesion of skin |
| S065 | Excision of lesion of skin of head or neck NEC (Majority PBC = 02E) | Excision of lesion of skin of head/neck - Not elsewhere classified |
| H201 | Fibreoptic endoscopic snare resection of lesion of colon (Majority PBC = 02X) | Fibreoptic endoscopy snare resection of lesion of colon |
| W365 | Diagnostic extraction of bone marrow NEC (Majority PBC = 02I) | Diagnostic extraction of bone marrow - Not elsewhere classified |
| M611 | Total excision of prostate and capsule of prostate (Majority PBC = 02H) | Total excision of prostate and capsule of prostate |
| X715 | Procurement of drugs for chemotherapy for neoplasm for regimens in Band 10 (Majority PBC = 02I) | Procurement of drugs for chemotherapy for neoplasm - Band 10 |
| G451 | Fibreoptic endoscopic examination of upper gastrointestinal tract and biopsy of lesion of upper gastrointestinal tract (Majority PBC = 02B) | Fibreoptic endoscopy-upper GI tract; biopsy-lesion of upper GI tract |
| X332 | Intravenous blood transfusion of packed cells (Majority PBC = 02I&02X) | IV blood transfusion of packed cells |

Cancers and tumours: All other procedures cont.

110

Highest spend procedures mapped to Programme Budget Codes: 02A, 02B, 02C, 02D, 02E, 02F, 02G, 02H, 02I, 02X .
The Programme Budget Code where the majority of spend falls is indicated.

| OPCS Procedure Code | Full procedure description | Short name in focus packs |
|---------------------|---|---|
| U211 | Magnetic resonance imaging NEC (Majority PBC = 02X) | MRI - Not elsewhere classified |
| U052 | Magnetic resonance imaging of head (Majority PBC = 02X) | MRI - Head |
| T462 | Drainage of ascites NEC (Majority PBC = 02X) | Drainage of ascites - Not elsewhere classified |
| S067 | Re-excision of skin margins NEC (Majority PBC = 02E) | Re-excision of skin margins - Not elsewhere classified |
| G459 | Unspecified diagnostic fiberoptic endoscopic examination of upper gastrointestinal tract (Majority PBC = All) | Unspecified diagnostic fiberoptic endoscopy - upper GI tract |
| X339 | Unspecified other blood transfusion (Majority PBC = 02I&02X) | Unspecified other blood transfusion |
| X369 | Unspecified blood withdrawal (Majority PBC = 02I) | Unspecified blood withdrawal |
| G011 | Oesophagogastrrectomy and anastomosis of oesophagus to stomach (Majority PBC = 02B) | Oesophagogastrrectomy and anastomosis of oesophagus to stomach |
| E091 | Excision of lesion of external nose (Majority PBC = 02E) | Excision of lesion of external nose |
| M341 | Cystoprostatectomy (Majority PBC = 02H) | Cystoprostatectomy |
| M459 | Unspecified diagnostic endoscopic examination of bladder (Majority PBC = 02X) | Unspecified diagnostic endoscopy - bladder |
| G441 | Fiberoptic endoscopic insertion of prosthesis into upper gastrointestinal tract (Majority PBC = 02B) | Fiberoptic endoscopic insertion of prosthesis into upper GI tract |
| T124 | Insertion of tube drain into pleural cavity (Majority PBC = 02X&02D) | Insertion of tube drain into pleural cavity |
| A021 | Excision of lesion of tissue of frontal lobe of brain (Majority PBC = 02X) | Excision of lesion of tissue of frontal lobe of brain |

| Individual drugs | BNF Category |
|----------------------|---|
| Goserelin Acetate | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Leuprorelin Acetate | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Triptorelin Acetate | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Triptorelin Embonate | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Bicalutamide | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Degarelix | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Cyproterone Acetate | Hormone antagonists - Gonadorelin analogues and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonists |
| Exemestane | Hormone antagonists - Breast cancer |
| Anastrozole | Hormone antagonists - Breast cancer |
| Letrozole | Hormone antagonists - Breast cancer |
| Tamoxifen Citrate | Hormone antagonists - Breast cancer |
| Diethylstilbestrol | Oestrogens |
| Octreotide Acetate | Hormone antagonists - Somatostatin analogues |
| Lanreotide | Hormone antagonists - Somatostatin analogues |

| Individual drugs | BNF Category |
|-------------------------|--|
| Azathioprine | Antiproliferative immunosuppressants |
| Mycophenolate Sodium | Antiproliferative immunosuppressants |
| Mycophenolate Mofetil | Antiproliferative immunosuppressants |
| Ciclosporin | Corticosteroids and other immunosuppressants |
| Sirolimus | Corticosteroids and other immunosuppressants |
| Tacrolimus | Corticosteroids and other immunosuppressants |
| Mercaptopurine | Antimetabolites |

SUS SEM code definitions

113

| Admission Method | Admission Method Description |
|------------------|--|
| 11 | 11: Waiting list |
| 12 | 12: Booked |
| 13 | 13: Planned |
| 21 | 21: Accident and emergency or dental casualty department of the health care provider |
| 22 | 22: General practitioner: after a request for immediate admission has been made direct to a hospital provider, i.e. Not through a bed bureau, by a general practitioner or deputy |
| 23 | 23: Bed bureau |
| 24 | 24: Consultant clinic, of this or another health care provider |
| 25 | 25: Admission via mental health crisis resolution team |
| 28 | 28: Other means, examples are: admitted from the accident and emergency department of another provider where they had not been admitted; transfer of an admitted patient from another hospital provider in an emergency; baby born at home as intended |
| 2A | 2A: Accident and emergency department of another provider where the patient had not been admitted |
| 2B | 2B: Transfer of an admitted patient from another hospital provider in an emergency |
| 2C | 2C: Baby born at home as intended |
| 2D | 2D: Other emergency admission |
| 31 | 31: Admitted ante-partum |
| 32 | 32: Admitted post-partum |
| 81 | 81: Transfer of any admitted patient from other hospital provider other than in an emergency |
| 82 | 82: The birth of a baby in this health care provider |
| 83 | 83: Baby born outside the health care provider except when born at home as intended. |

| Patient Classification | Patient Classification Description |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 1: Ordinary admission |
| 2 | 2: Day case admission |

| Person Gender Code | Person Gender Description |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 1: Male |
| 2 | 2: Female |

Annex B: High level metadata

Admissions spend indicators

115

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Analysis | Elective/Non-elective spend analysis |
| Time Period | 2014/15 |
| Age Group | 0 – 120 |
| Admissions method | Elective - 11, 12, 13** Non-Elective - 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 31, 32, 81, 82, 83** [Total spend indicators includes all elective and non elective admissions method codes] |
| Patient Classification | Elective - 1, 2** Non-Elective – 1** |
| Sex | 1, 2** |
| Coding scheme used | Programme Budget Category (PBC) |
| Numerator | Total spend on elective/non-elective admissions based on PBC/condition |
| Numerator Source | Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart) http://www.hscic.gov.uk/sus |
| Denominator | Age/Sex Standardised Population. Rate= (Numerator/Denominator) * 1000 |

**See annex for SUS SEM Code definitions

Secondary User Services Extract Mart (SUS SEM) data is used.
Only patients with a mandatory tariff recorded have been selected.

The fields that were pulled from SUS SEM include:

- CCG code (based on the GP practice code)
- Sex (this field is used for age/sex standardisation)
- Age_Quinary (Age Band)
- Number of spells
- Net_SLA_Payment (the cost before MFF is applied)

The data does not include CCGs which were not found in the official list of CCGs across England.

Age_Quinary field is presented in 5-year age bands (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, etc.) including the “85+” age band for people aged 85 and over. This field is used for age/sex standardisation.

Number of spells field counts all the patients admitted to hospital for a procedure and discharged in the financial year 2014/15 and groups into each age band. [Patients admitted in 2014/15 but not discharged until 2015/16 will not count towards the spend. A small number of patients admitted in 2013/14 but not discharged until 2014/15 will count towards the spend for 2014/15.]

Net_SLA_Payment field is the cost before Market Forces Factor (MFF) is applied. This field gives spend on elective/non-elective admissions for all patients in the age band in 2014/15.

The number of elective/non-elective admissions were suppressed where it was less than or equal to 5 at CCG level.

Day case admissions indicators

116

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Analysis | Day case admissions analysis |
| Time Period | 2014/15 |
| Age Group | 0 – 120 |
| Admissions method | 11, 12, 13 |
| Patient Classification | 2 |
| Sex | 1, 2 |
| Coding scheme used | Programme Budget Category (PBC) |
| Numerator | Number of day case admissions based on PBC |
| Numerator Source | Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart) http://www.hscic.gov.uk/sus |
| Denominator | Age/Sex Standardised Population. Rate= (Numerator/Denominator) * 100000 |

Secondary User Services Extract Mart (SUS SEM) data is used.

Only patients with a mandatory tariff recorded have been selected.

The fields that were pulled from SUS SEM include:

- CCG code (based on the GP practice code)
- Sex (this field is used for age/sex standardisation)
- Age_Quinary (Age Band)
- Number of spells

The data does not include CCGs which were not found in the official list of CCGs across England.

Age_Quinary field is presented in 5-year age bands (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, etc.) including the “85+” age band for people aged 85 and over. This field is used for age/sex standardisation.

Number of spells field counts all the day case admissions in 2014/15 and groups into each age band.

The number of day case admissions were suppressed where it was less than or equal to 5 at CCG level.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Analysis | Length of Stay analysis |
| Time Period | 2014/15 |
| Age Group | 0 - 120 |
| Admissions method | Elective - 11, 12, 13 Emergency - 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D |
| Patient Classification | 1 |
| Sex | 1, 2 |
| Coding scheme used | Programme Budget Category (PBC) |
| Numerator | Total number of bed days for elective/emergency admissions based on PBC/condition (not including day cases) |
| Numerator Source | Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart) http://www.hscic.gov.uk/sus |
| Denominator | Total number of elective/emergency admissions not including day cases based on PBC/condition. |

Secondary User Services Extract Mart (SUS SEM) data is used. Length of Stay data have been extracted at record level. Only patients with a mandatory tariff recorded have been selected. Data filtered by Length of Stay less than 180 days.

The fields that were pulled from SUS SEM include:

- APCS_Ident
- CCG code (based on the GP practice code)
- Spell_LoS (Length of Stay)

The data does not include CCGs which were not found in the official list of CCGs across England.

APCS_Ident field was later used to count the number of elective/emergency admissions since the data was extracted at record level. Spell_LoS field is the spell length of stay derived using Admission Date and Discharge Date.

Standard deviation has been calculated for each CCG in order to calculate confidence intervals using record level data. Length of Stay data was then grouped by CCG to get the total number of bed days (Sum of Spell_LoS field) and total number of elective/emergency admissions (count of APCS_Ident field) for each CCG.

The number of elective/emergency admissions were suppressed where it was less than or equal to 5 at CCG level.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Analysis | Procedures spend and activity analysis |
| Time Period | 2014/15 |
| Age Group | 0 – 120 |
| Admissions method | 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 31, 32, 81, 82, 83 |
| Patient Classification | 1, 2 |
| Sex | 1, 2 |
| Coding scheme used | Programme Budget Category (PBC), OPCS |
| Numerator | Total spend on discharges based on PBC and procedures |
| Numerator Source | Temporary National Repository – Hospital Admissions Databases, SUS SEM (Secondary User Services Extract Mart) http://www.hscic.gov.uk/sus |
| Denominator | Age/Sex Standardised Population. Rate= (Numerator/Denominator) * 1000 |

Secondary User Services Extract Mart (SUS SEM) data is used. Only patients with a mandatory tariff recorded have been selected.

For these indicators, spend on a procedure is the total cost of all spells where the procedure listed is the primary procedure in the spell, and where the primary diagnosis for the spell falls under the programme budget category listed. The figure for “How different are we?” converts the CCG’s spending rate above the benchmark spending rate into the equivalent number of procedures.

The fields that were pulled from SUS SEM for spend on procedures include:

- CCG code (based on the GP practice code)
- Sex (this field is used for age/sex standardisation)
- Age_Quinary (Age Band)
- Number of spells
- Net_SL_A_Payment (the cost before MFF is applied)

The data does not include CCGs which were not found in the official list of CCGs across England.

Age_Quinary field is presented in 5-year age bands (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, etc.) including the “85+” age band for people aged 85 and over. This field is used for age/sex standardisation.

Number of spells field counts all the patients admitted to hospital for a procedure and discharged in the financial year 2014/15 and groups into each age band. [Patients admitted in 2014/15 but not discharged until 2015/16 will not count towards the spend. A small number of patients admitted in 2013/14 but not discharged until 2014/15 will count towards the spend for 2014/15.]

Net_SL_A_Payment field is the cost before Market Forces Factor (MFF) is applied. This field gives spend on discharges for all patients in the age band in 2014/15.

The fields that were pulled from SUS SEM for procedures activity include:

- CCG code (based on the GP practice code)
- Number of spells (counts all admissions in 2014/15 and groups by CCG).

The number of admissions/discharges were suppressed where it was less than or equal to 5 at CCG level.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Analysis | Prescribing Spend |
| Time period | January 2015 - December 2015 |
| Numerator | Net Ingredient cost (NIC) of BNF Chemical Substance Net Ingredient cost (NIC) is the basic price of a drug as stated in Part II Clause 8 of the Drug Tariff |
| Numerator Source | ePACT.net – data provided by the NHS Business Services Authority |
| Denominator | CCG ASTRO-PU weighted population Age, Sex and Temporary Resident Originated Prescribing Units |
| Rate | Numerator / Denominator x 1000 (spend rate per 1,000 ASTRO-PU weighted population) |

We have presented a range of indicators grouping a selection of BNF chemical substances together and aggregating the total Net Ingredient cost. We have also presented individual BNF chemical spend indicators where the total spend is large enough and where advised by national clinical leads. The indicators have been standardised using the ASTRO-PU weightings and are shown per 1,000 ASTRO-PU population to allow fair comparison between CCGs.

Net Ingredient cost (NIC) is the basic price of a drug as stated in Part II Clause 8 of the Drug Tariff.

ASTRO-PU (Age, Sex and Temporary Resident Originated Prescribing Units) weightings have been used to weight the CCG population for age and sex to allow for better comparison of prescribing patterns. Further information regarding ASTRO-PU populations and other prescribing specific populations can be found at <http://www.hscic.gov.uk/prescribing/measures>

Annex C: Methodology

The potential opportunity highlights the scale of change that would be achieved if the CCG Value moved to the Benchmark Value of the average of the 'Best 5' or 'Lowest 5' CCGs in its group of similar 10 CCGs.

Generally, where a high CCG Value is considered 'worse' then it is calculated using the formula:

$$\text{Potential Opportunity} = (\text{CCG Value} - \text{Benchmark Value}) * \text{Denominator}$$

The denominator is the most suitable population data for that indicator eg CCG registered population, CCG weighted population, CCG patients on disease register etc. The denominator is also scaled to match the Value. So if the CCG Value and Benchmark Value are given in "per 1,000 population" then the denominator is expressed in thousands, ie 12,000 becomes 12.

For procedures, the potential opportunity can be expressed in pounds, or dividing this by the unit cost then it can be expressed in the equivalent number of procedures.