



**Shropshire, Telford  
and Wrekin**  
Clinical Commissioning Group

# THE INDIVIDUAL FUNDING REQUEST POLICY

## August 2021

<b>Author(s) (name and post):</b>	Michele Rowland-Jones Senior Pharmaceutical Advisor
<b>Version:</b>	V5
<b>Approval Date:</b>	Nov 2021
<b>Review Date:</b>	Aug 2024

## Document Control Sheet

<b>Title:</b>	The Individual Funding Request Policy		
<b>Electronic File Name:</b>	\\10.201.56.151\Shared\New SCCG Medicines Management\Policies, Procedures & Guidelines\Policies		
<b>Placement in Organisational Structure:</b>	Quality Directorate, Medicines Management Team, IFR		
<b>Consultation with stakeholders:</b>	Mills and Reeve Solicitors, Public Health		
<b>Approval Level:</b>	Strategic Commissioning Committee		
<b>Dissemination Date:</b>	23/11/2021	<b>Implementation Date:</b>	23/11/21
<b>Method of Dissemination:</b>	Website, Mills and Reeve Training Session, Presentation to Providers, Newsletter		

## Document Amendment History

Version No.	Date	Brief Description
1		History Unknown
2		History Unknown
3		History Unknown
4	7/2019	Updated to NHSE Policy approval by M&R LLP

The formally approved version of this document is that held on the NHS Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin CCG website: [www.shropshiretelfordandwrekinccg.nhs.uk](http://www.shropshiretelfordandwrekinccg.nhs.uk)

Printed copies or those saved electronically must be checked to ensure they match the current online version.

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Equality Statement</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Plain Language Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Individual Funding Requests Policy Overview</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Further explanation of the IFR criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Clinical Exceptionality</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Clinical Exceptionality: non clinical and social factors</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Clinical Effectiveness</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A Good Use of NHS Resources</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Experimental and Unproven Treatments</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Funding for Cases following a Clinical Trial</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Information submitted to the Shropshire, Telford &amp; Wrekin CCG IFR Team</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Summary of the IFR process</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Screening process for IFR requests</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Decisions on funding</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Review of the decision</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Urgent decisions for Individual Funding Requests</b>	<b>17</b>

## **Equality Statement**

Promoting equality and addressing health inequalities are at the heart of Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Clinical Commissioning Group (STW CCG) values. Throughout the development of this policy statement, we have:

- Had due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity, and to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic (as defined under the Equality Act 2010) and those who do not share it; and
- Had regard to the need to reduce inequalities between patients in access to, and outcomes from healthcare services and to ensure services are provided in an integrated way where this might reduce health inequalities.

## **Plain Language Summary**

Every year, the resources that STW CCG receive are allocated to the services and treatments provided for patients. STW CCG decide if the treatments they will invest in on an annual basis through a prioritisation process so that, as far as possible, funding is shared fairly and appropriately, considering the competing demands on STW CCG budgets. When a new service or a change to a service is proposed, it would not be fair for that to bypass the prioritisation process and be funded without comparing it to other possibilities for investment. Because of this, STW CCG default position is that a new service will not be routinely commissioned until it has been assessed through the full service development process. Very occasionally a development is of such importance that there should be no delay in its introduction.

On an individual basis, there may be situations where a clinician believes that their patient's clinical situation is so different to other patients with the same condition that they should have their treatment paid for when other patients would not. In such cases, NHS clinicians can ask STW CCG on behalf of a patient, to fund a treatment which would not usually be commissioned by the CCG for that patient. This request is called an Individual Funding Request (IFR).

Funding for additional treatments outside the prioritisation process can only be done by reducing the funding that is available for other established treatments. There is not an allocated separate budget to meet the costs of providing treatments agreed through the IFR process. It is because of this that very careful consideration is required before the decision is taken to fund a treatment for an individual that is not usually available.

## **When will Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin CCG consider funding in response to an IFR?**

STW CCG will only consider funding in response to an IFR, if they are satisfied that the case meets the following criteria:

There is evidence that the patient presents with exceptional clinical circumstances, that is:

- There is a STW CCG clinical commissioning policy, or a NICE Technology Appraisal (TA) guidance that either doesn't support the intervention or the patient doesn't meet

the criteria for treatment. It is believed that the patient is clinically exceptional and likely to receive additional clinical benefit from treatment compared to another patient with the same condition and at the same stage of disease progression.

OR

- There is not a relevant STW CCG clinical commissioning policy, or NICE Technology Appraisal (TA) guidance in place for the management of the patient's condition or combination of conditions, and the patient's clinical presentation is so unusual that they could not be considered to be part of a defined group of patients in the same or similar clinical circumstances for whom a service development should be undertaken.

AND

- There is a basis for considering that the requested treatment is likely to be clinically effective for this individual patient;

AND

- It is considered that the requested treatment is likely to be a good use of NHS resources and is affordable within the CCG's budget.

## **Individual Funding Requests Policy Overview**

1. Every year, the resources STW CCG receives are allocated to services and treatments that can be provided for patients, through development and review of commissioning policies which apply robust criteria to the question of how the services and treatments should be funded. Any additional calls on resources to fund an individual's treatment are, therefore, likely to mean reducing the funding that is available elsewhere. The decision to fund a treatment that is not usually provided is only taken after very careful consideration. STW CCG regards the matter of funding for an individual patient as an equity issue, in which they will consider whether they can justify funding a particular patient when others from the same patient group are not being funded for the requested treatment.

2. Very occasionally, a clinician may think that their patient's clinical situation is so different to other patients with the same condition that it is appropriate that they should have different treatments to others. In such circumstances, clinicians, on behalf of their patient, may make an Individual Funding Request (IFR) to STW CCG for a treatment that is not routinely commissioned by the CCG. IFRs may be made in respect of STW CCG directly commissioned services and indeed any services that are not commissioned. This route should only be used in exceptional circumstances and not as an alternative route to submitting a treatment for scrutiny through the Service Development process.

3. IFRs can be made in respect of any of STW CCG directly commissioned services. If, however, there is evidence that other patients with the same condition could derive a similar type and degree of benefit from the treatment, the request is really for a new development in services for that group of patients. In this case the clinician will need to consider

proposing this treatment for development of a clinical policy. So that the CCG can be fair to all patients, decisions on whether or not to fund this new development will be taken in line with the CCG's ethical framework. In these circumstances, the request will not proceed through the IFR process.

4. It is important to draw a distinction between the basis and approach in this IFR policy and process, which is part of an overall NHS prioritisation framework, and the access schemes which may be periodically offered by commercial companies or the manufacturers of treatments to introduce their products to market in cases where there may be some clinical effect. Those access schemes are a matter for their promoters and do not establish any precedent for IFR requests.

### **When will Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin CCG consider funding?**

5. STW CCG will only provide funding in response to an IFR, if they are satisfied that the case meets the following criteria: There is evidence that the patient presents with exceptional clinical circumstances, that is:

- There is a STW CCG clinical commissioning policy, or NICE Technology Appraisal (TA) guidance in place that either doesn't support the intervention or the patient doesn't meet the criteria for treatment. It is believed that the patient is clinically exceptional and likely to receive additional clinical benefit from treatment compared to another patient with the same condition and at the same stage of disease progression.

OR

- There is not a relevant STW CCG clinical commissioning policy, or NICE Technology Appraisal (TA) guidance in place for the management of the patient's condition or combination of conditions, and the patient's clinical presentation is so unusual that they could not be considered to be part of a defined group of patients in the same or similar clinical circumstances for whom a service development should be undertaken.

AND

- There is a basis for considering that the requested treatment is likely to be clinically effective for this individual patient;

AND

- It is considered that the requested treatment is likely to be a good use of NHS resources and is affordable within the CCG's budget.

6. STW CCG IFR team will carry out an initial screening as described in the section of this policy 'Screening process for IFR requests'. If the request proceeds beyond the screening stage, decisions on whether to fund the request will be made by the CCG's IFR Panel (Stage Two) Details of the IFR team, IFR Panel and the processes that are followed, are set out in the STW CCG Standard Operating Procedure: The Management of Individual Funding Requests (IFR SOP), which includes the Terms of Reference for the IFR Screening Group, IFR Panel and IFR Review Panel.

7. This policy explains each of the criteria outlined in turn.

## **Further explanation of the IFR criteria**

### **Clinical Exceptionality**

8. There can be no exhaustive description of the situations which are likely to come within the definition of exceptional clinical circumstances. The onus is on the clinician making the request to set out the grounds for clinical exceptionality clearly for the IFR Panel.

9. 'Exceptional' in IFR terms means a person to whom the general rule should not apply. This implies that there is likely to be something about their clinical situation which was not considered when formulating the general rule. Very few patients have clinical circumstances which are genuinely exceptional. To justify funding for treatment for a patient which is not available to other patients, and is not part of the established care pathway, the IFR Panel needs to be satisfied that the clinician has demonstrated that this patient's individual clinical circumstances are clearly different to those of other patients, and that because of this difference, the general policies should not be applied. Simply put, the consideration is whether it is fair to fund this patient's treatment when the treatment is not available to others. It should be stressed that an IFR is not a route to "have another look" at the general rule, or to protest that the general rule is ungenerous.

10. Where a 'not for routine commissioning' clinical commissioning policy is in place in relation to a treatment, STW CCG will have been aware when making that policy that in most studies, some patients will respond better than others to the treatment and indeed, a small group may respond significantly better than the average. This should have been taken into account in developing the policy. Consequently, in considering whether a request for an IFR should be made, the clinician should consider whether this individual patient is likely to respond to the treatment in a way that exceeds the response of other patients in the group to which the general policy applies, and whether there is evidence to support this view.

### **Clinical exceptionality: failure to respond to standard care**

11. The fact that a patient has failed to respond to, or is unable to be provided with, all treatment options available for a particular condition (either because of a co-morbidity or because the patient cannot tolerate the side effects of the usual treatment) is unlikely, on its own, to be sufficient to demonstrate exceptional clinical circumstances. There are common co-morbidities for many conditions. Again these considerations are likely to have been taken into account in formulating the general policy.

12. Many conditions are progressive and thus inevitably there will be a more severe form of the condition – severity of a patient's condition does not in itself usually indicate exceptionality. Many treatments have side effects or contraindications, and thus intolerance or contraindication of a treatment does not in itself, usually indicate exceptionality.

13. So, in order to support an IFR on the basis of failure to respond to standard care, the IFR Panel would normally need to be satisfied that the patient's inability to respond to, or be provided with, the usual treatment was a genuinely exceptional circumstance, which lies outside the natural history of the condition and is not characteristic of the relevant group of patients with the condition.

**For example:**

- If the usual treatment is only effective for a proportion of patients (even if a high proportion), this leaves a proportion of patients within the group for whom it is already known that the usual treatment is not available or is not clinically effective. The fact that this particular patient falls into that group is unlikely to be a proper ground on which to base a claim that they are exceptional as an individual.
- As regards side effects, as an example, all patients who are treated with long-term high-dose steroids will develop side-effects (typical and well-recognised) and thus developing these side effects and wishing to be treated with something else does not make the patient exceptional.
- If the usual treatment cannot be given because of a pre-existing co-morbidity which is unrelated to the condition for which the treatment is being sought under the IFR or is not unusual in the relevant patient group or generally, the fact that the co-morbidity is present in this patient and its impact on treatment options for this patient is unlikely to make the patient clinically exceptional. As an illustration, some co-morbidities are common in the general population, for example, diabetes which affects around 7% of adults, or asthma which affects at least 10% of the population. Diabetes and its treatments affect many other conditions; for example, steroids make glucose control more difficult. With any condition there will be a recognised proportion, who also have a co-morbidity which is common in the general population, and thus a patient cannot be exceptional by virtue of also having a comorbidity which is common in the general population.

14. If the proposed intervention is thought to offer a benefit to patients in these groups generally (i.e. those with more severe disease or those with common co-morbidities), the question is whether there is sufficient justification, including consideration of factors such as clinical effectiveness of the treatment in question, likely value for money, priority and affordability, for making a change to the clinical commissioning policy that covers the patient pathway. In this way, an improvement can be made to that policy to benefit the whole subgroup of patients of which the requesting patient is potentially just one such person. This change needs to be considered as a service development and not as an IFR.

**Clinical exceptionality: severity**

15. Should severity be cited by the requesting clinician as part of the argument for exceptionality, the application should make clear:

- Whether there is evidence that the patient's presentation lies outside the normal spectrum for that condition. Preferably, a recognised scoring or classification system should be used to describe the patient's condition;



- Whether there is evidence that the patient has progressed to a very severe form of the condition much more rapidly than the range of progression that is documented and usually observed within the natural history of the condition as well as;
- How the patient is expected to benefit from the treatment sought and in what quantifiable way;
- That there is evidence that the impact of the condition on this patient's health is significantly greater than its impact on the rest of the patient group, e.g. the condition is usually a mild disease but the presenting case is an extremely severe presentation; and
- That there is a plausible argument that the severity of the condition is prognostic of good response to treatment.

### **Clinical exceptionalality: genotypes**

16. When the argument for clinical exceptionalality is based on the patient having a specific genotype (genetic profile), the IFR Panel will require evidence of the prevalence of the genotype in the patient group. The applicant will need to show how the specific genotype would make the patient a) different to others in terms of clinical management and b) able to benefit from the treatment to a greater degree than others with the same or different symptoms of the condition.

### **Clinical exceptionalality: multiple grounds**

17. There may be cases where clinicians seek to rely on multiple factors to show that their case is clinically exceptional. In such cases each factor will be looked at individually to determine (a) whether the factor is capable, potentially, of making the case exceptional and (b) whether it does in fact make the patient's case exceptional. One factor may be incapable of supporting a case of exceptionalality (and should therefore be ignored), but it might be relevant as impacting upon another factor. That is a judgment within the discretion of the IFR screening group and IFR Panel.

18. If it is determined that none of the individual factors on their own mean that the patient's clinical circumstances are considered exceptional, the combined effect of those factors as a whole will be considered. In this way a decision can be reached on whether the patient's clinical circumstances are exceptional, bearing in mind the difference between the range of factors that can always be found between individuals and the definitions used here of exceptional clinical circumstances.

### **Clinical Exceptionality: non clinical and social factors**

19. The IFR process only considers clinical information. Although initially it may seem reasonable to fund treatment based on reasons grounded in a moral or compassionate view of the case or because of the individual's situation, background, ambition in life, occupation or family circumstances, these reasons bring into play a judgement of 'worthiness' for treatment. As a central principle, the NHS does not make judgements about the worth of different individuals and seeks to treat everyone fairly and equitably. Consideration of these non-clinical factors would introduce this concept of 'worth' into clinical decision making. It is a core value that NHS care is available - or unavailable -

equally to all. Whilst everyone's individual circumstances are, by definition, unique and on compassionate grounds, reasons can always be advanced to support a case for funding, it is likely that the same or similar arguments could be made for all or many of the patients who cannot routinely access the care requested.

20. Non-clinical and social factors have to be disregarded for this purpose in order for the IFR screening group and then the IFR Panel, to be confident of dealing in a fair manner in comparable cases. If these factors were to be included in the decision making process, STW CCG would not know whether they were being fair to other patients who cannot access such treatment and whose non-clinical and social factors would be the same or similar.

21. Consideration of social factors would also be contrary to STW CCG policy of non-discrimination in the provision of medical treatment. If, for example, treatment were to be provided on the grounds that this would enable an individual to stay in paid work, this would potentially discriminate in favour of those working compared to those not working. These are value judgements which the IFR screening group and IFR Panel should not make.

22. Clinicians are asked to bear this Policy in mind and not to refer to social or non-clinical factors to seek to support the application for individual funding. In order to avoid prejudicing the IFR process, such material will be edited out or applications returned to clinicians for editing by the IFR teams and on recommendation by the screening group.

### **Clinical Effectiveness**

23. Clinical effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which a treatment achieves pre-defined clinical outcomes in a specific group of patients.

24. Clinical evidence that considers the efficacy of a particular treatment will be carefully considered by the IFR screening group and IFR Panel. It is the sole responsibility of the referring clinician to provide this information and the IFR team will not be responsible for undertaking any evidence searches. Inevitably, the evidence base put forward in support of an IFR is unlikely to be as robust as in more common presentations of the condition or the more usual use of the treatment. However it is important that the referring clinician makes explicit linkages between the grounds under which exceptionality is claimed and the sections of the submitted research literature that are considered to support the clinician's view regarding the differences between the patient's clinical position and that of other patients in the group, and regarding the patient's anticipated response to the requested treatment.

25. When considering clinical effectiveness, the IFR Panel will consider:

- How closely the patient matches the patient population from whom the results are derived in any study relied on by the clinician
- The plausibility of the argument that the patient will achieve the anticipated outcomes from treatment, based on the evidence supplied

- The impact of existing co-morbidities on both the claim for exceptionality and treatment outcome
- Any complications and adverse events of the treatment including toxicity and rates of relapse. The panel will take account of side effects when considering the benefits from the treatment
- The likely impact of the treatment on quality of life using information as available
- Reported treatment outcomes and their durability over the short, medium and longer term, as relevant to the nature of the condition. The requesting clinician must demonstrate why they consider that the proposed treatment will be effective for the whole period for which it will be given.

### **A Good use of NHS Resources**

26. The requesting clinician will be expected to explain why they consider the treatment for which funding has been applied for will be a good use of NHS resources.

27. This criterion is only applied where the IFR Panel has already concluded that the criteria of clinical exceptionality and clinical effectiveness have been met. In considering this criterion the IFR Panel balances the degree of benefit likely to be obtained for the patient from funding the treatment against cost. Having regard to the evidence submitted and the analysis they have carried out when considering clinical exceptionality and clinical effectiveness, Panel members will consider the nature and extent of the benefit the patient is likely to gain from the treatment, the certainty or otherwise of the anticipated outcome from the treatment and the opportunity costs for funding the treatment. This means considering, for example, how significant a benefit is likely to be gained for the patient, and for how long that benefit will last. These factors need to be balanced against the cost of the treatment and the overall CCG budget.

28. When determining whether a treatment would be a good use of NHS resources it is very important to consider the length of time for which funding of a treatment is being requested, in relation to the duration of the evidenced efficacy of the treatment i.e. whether the clinical evidence indicates short, medium or long term effectiveness of a particular treatment.

29. Due to the very nature of the cases considered by the IFR Panel, the degree to which effectiveness can be considered certain is likely to be limited, and this will be a relevant factor when considering whether funding would be a good use of NHS resources.

30. However the IFR Panel should also take into account its ability to impose conditions on any funding it agrees, for example to monitor the impact of the funded treatment.

31. In applying this criterion Panel members will draw upon their professional and analytical skills and knowledge of the NHS system and how it works.

## **Experimental and Unproven Treatments**

This section outlines how the IFR criteria will be interpreted and applied where the treatment being sought is, in itself, experimental or unproven.

32. Where the case for clinical exceptionality has been accepted but the treatment is experimental or unproven, there is a particular need to scrutinise the likelihood that the treatment will be clinically effective and consider carefully whether funding the treatment would be a good use of NHS resources. This is because it is important that decisions on clinical practice and policy are based on sound clinical evidence. To ensure the effective and equitable use of NHS funding, experimental treatments have to be undertaken judiciously, responsibly and for clearly defined purposes.

33. When an individual case has been found to be exceptional, the treatment proposed might, by definition, be considered to be unproven, and this is why the IFR Panel must carefully consider whether funding of such treatments is a good use of NHS resources as described above. However this section of the policy applies to the particular categories of experimental or unproven treatment which are described below.

### **What is an experimental treatment?**

34. A treatment may be considered experimental where any of these points apply:

- The treatment is still undergoing clinical trials and/or is a drug yet to undergo a phase III clinical trial for the indication in question;
- The treatment does not have marketing approval from the relevant government body for the indication in question;
- The treatment does not conform to a usual clinical practice in the relevant field;
- The treatment is being used in a way other than that previously studied or that for which it has been granted approval by the relevant government body; or
- The treatment is rarely used, novel, or unknown and there is a lack of authoritative evidence of safety and efficacy.

### **How are IFRs for experimental treatments considered?**

35. The experimental basis of the treatment will become relevant when the IFR Panel assesses the likely clinical effectiveness of the treatment for the patient and then, primarily, when the IFR Panel considers the degree of confidence it has on the safety and efficacy of the treatment for the patient and whether it would be a good use of NHS resources.

36. Where evidence about the treatment is not yet available for public scrutiny, or there is limited evidence for one of the reasons set out above, the IFR Panel may have limited confidence in the evidence that has been presented.

37. As preliminary requirements before agreeing to fund an experimental treatment, STW CCG will need reassurance:

- That the decision to agree to an exception to the general policy on treatment for the condition is made for very clear and explicit reasons which are consistent with STW CCG priority setting principles;

and

- That funding experimental treatments is done in a way that will contribute to the knowledge base.

38. The IFR Panel will not fund treatment in response to an IFR if it considers that it would be more appropriate for the treatment to be the subject of research trials. Primary research into novel treatments should be progressed through the usual research funding routes and will not be funded through this IFR policy.

39. STW CCG will consider a funding request for an experimental treatment where there is either:

- Evidence from small and often heterogeneous case reports;
- Evidence solely of short term outcomes; or
- Evidence of effectiveness in a similar condition to the clinical circumstance under consideration

40. In assessing whether to fund treatment in these cases, STW CCG will make a decision having regard to:

- The potential benefit and risks of the treatment; and
- The biological plausibility of benefit based on other evidence; and
- An estimate of cost of the treatment and the anticipated value for money; and
- The priority of the patient's clinical needs compared to other competing clinical needs and unfunded developments.

41. The clinician will be expected to provide as much information as possible about the treatment, relevant research upon which the claim for biological plausibility of the treatment is based and costs, as well as clinically relevant information on the patient and factors that indicate a good response to treatment. In addition, the clinician must identify the clinical markers and clinical outcomes that will be monitored to assess treatment response.

42. The options for consideration by STW CCG in these instances are:

- Not to fund;

- Fund a trial of treatment but make on-going treatment subject to the demonstration of clinical benefit for the individual patient using criteria agreed in advance with the clinical team. This option is only available where there is a course of treatment or long-term treatment. It is not suitable for on one-off treatment such as a surgical intervention;
- In all cases, contribution to any relevant clinical database or population registry which is operating.

### **Funding for cases following a Clinical Trial**

43. Save in the most exceptional cases, STW CCG does not anticipate that a request will be agreed under this IFR policy to fund patients at the end of a clinical trial. This is because arrangements to continue treatments from which patients have benefited during a trial should be agreed with the sponsor of the research at the outset of the trial and information should have been given to patients as part of the process of patients signing up to participate in the trial. Even if this is not the case, patients coming out of a clinical trial will almost inevitably represent a group of patients for whom a policy should be developed under the Service Development Policy, because there will be a number of patients in broadly the same clinical circumstances, and so it is very unlikely that the patient will be able to show clinical exceptionality within this policy.

44. Details of funding for these types of requests can be found in the CCG's Commissioning Policies for ongoing funding following the completion of a clinical trial.

### **Information submitted to the Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin CCG IFR Team**

45. All applications must be on the CCG's IFR template, submitted electronically and accompanied by written support and evidence provided by the clinician treating the patient in line with the STW CCG IFR SOP.

46. It is the referring clinician's responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate and required information is provided to STW CCG in a timely fashion consistent with the urgency of the request. This includes full copies of all the published papers of clinical evidence that have been cited. The clinician must provide a list of the published papers that have been submitted and indicate which points within them are relevant in respect to the IFR application and criteria. This is to ensure the IFR screening group and IFR panel are clear about the points the clinician is making and the relevance to the case. If relevant information is not submitted, the application may be returned and the decision making will be delayed because the case cannot be fairly considered without adequate evidence. In all instances the referring clinician must state whether or not they consider there are likely to be similar patients in the same situation (in accordance with the definition set out in this policy) and, if so, how many such similar patients there are or are likely to be in the opinion of the referring clinician in the relevant CCG in any given 12 month period.

47. As outlined previously, information that is immaterial to the decision being made will not be considered.

48. STW CCG expects providers with which it contracts to have oversight of the applications submitted by their clinical staff. The CCG expects every IFR template to be sanctioned by the provider's Board-level Medical Director or equivalent and reserves the right to return unsanctioned IFRs to the provider and refer recurrent inappropriate funding requests to the Chief Executive (or equivalent) of the relevant provider.

49. Ultimately STW CCG IFR decisions are whether the CCG will reimburse a provider for a particular treatment intervention for the individual patient. However, that decision does not itself determine whether a clinician actually undertakes that treatment. The trust is at liberty to resource the treatment.

### **Summary of the IFR process**

The remainder of this policy summarises the key stages in the IFR process. Full details of the process are set out in the Standard Operating Procedure: The Management of Individual Funding Requests.

### **Screening process for IFR requests**

#### **Why are applications subject to screening?**

50. Being the subject of an IFR is an anxious time for patients and their carers and so it is important that neither patients nor clinicians should have their expectations raised that a treatment will be funded under the IFR policy unless the IFR Panel could properly come to the view that the criteria under this policy are met in an individual case.

51. The screening process described in this Policy is intended to be fair to all parties, including the other patients funded by STW CCG and the IFR Panel, by only sending cases to a panel meeting if there is some reasonable prospect that the IFR Panel will accept that the criteria under this policy are met in the individual case. This means the IFR Panel can then apply all of its time to those cases which have a prospect of success.

#### **Screening for Sufficient Information**

52. Any IFR applications will first be screened by STW CCG IFR team in accordance with the procedures set out in the CCG's IFR SOP to establish whether the request falls within the commissioning responsibility of the CCG and has sufficient clinical or other necessary information for it to be properly considered. Where the IFR team conclude that there is insufficient information, The IFR template will be returned to the referring clinician specifying the additional information required.

53. The IFR Panel can only consider funding if all of the criteria in the policy are satisfied. It follows that the IFR screening team should not allow an application to go forward to the IFR Panel unless there is information to support the contention that each of the essential criteria is met. A strong application on one part of the criteria cannot make up for an absence of proper evidence to support another of the tests that the IFR Panel must apply in order to make a decision that funding should be approved.

#### **Screening for service developments**

54. If, in the opinion of the IFR screening team considering a submitted IFR application in relation to a patient, there is likely to be a defined group of patients in similar clinical circumstances to that patient, the application will be classified as a request for development

of a new policy or service specification which needs to be considered under the Service Development Policy to determine whether it will be routinely commissioned. The requesting clinician will then be redirected to the relevant contact point to start the process in that policy. The request will not be progressed through the IFR route from that point.

### **Screening for clinical exceptionality**

55. All IFR applications submitted to STW CCG will be considered by the IFR screening team to determine whether the request appears to present an arguable case for clinical exceptionality. The IFR screening team is drawn from the clinical members of the IFR panel (as outlined in the IFR SOP) and their understanding of the information required by an IFR panel enables them to make these decisions. They have delegated authority from STW CCG to make these judgements and will seek additional clinical input at their discretion. If the screening team consider that it appears there is not an arguable case for clinical exceptionality, the IFR will not proceed further through the process and will be declined.

56. An IFR will be considered as indicating an "arguable case" for clinical exceptionality if the IFR screening team considers that there is some realistic prospect that the IFR Panel (properly applying the policy) would conclude that the patient is clinically exceptional. A case would be turned down only where the IFR screening team are confident that, based on the available information, if the IFR Panel properly apply this policy, they would come to a conclusion that the patient is not clinically exceptional.

57. If a case is returned to the applicant from the screening stage, the explanation provided may enable the requesting clinician to submit new clinical information to augment the original argument for clinical exceptionality. The IFR screening team will reconsider a case if new and relevant clinical information is provided.

58. Screening team can request advice, e.g. relating to a treatment pathway and lines of therapy within that from appropriate clinicians/CCG Managers.

### **Decisions on funding**

59. The IFR Panel work on behalf of STW CCG and make decisions in respect of funding for individual cases. The IFR Panel will work to the published STW CCG IFR Policy and each request will be processed by following the STW CCG IFR SOP. This will ensure that all requests are considered in a consistent, fair and transparent way, with decisions based on the available evidence presented by the treating clinicians and the STW CCG commissioning principles.

60. The referring clinician is advised to set out as clearly as possible and in detail the clinical evidence and the basis on which they consider that the patient's clinical circumstances are exceptional and fulfil the criteria in this policy.

61. The clinician should not assume particular knowledge of the IFR Panel for the condition from which their patient is suffering or the relevant area of medical practice. This is because the IFR Panel will contain a range of individuals with a variety of skills and experiences. The IFR Panel will not necessarily include a clinician with expertise in the condition for which treatment is being sought. This is appropriate because not only is the question one of



demonstrable exceptionality (resting on the differences between this patient and others with the condition) but the IFR Panel must consider whether it is appropriate to divert resources away from other services in order to fund the requested treatment.

62. The IFR Panel will make decisions based on the criteria in this policy with reference to any other STW CCG published clinical commissioning policies or NICE mandated guidance relevant to the application or interpretation of the criteria.

63. In reaching their decision, the IFR Panel will consider whether there are justifiable grounds for funding the requested treatment against the criteria in this policy and if so what those grounds are.

64. The IFR panel in all circumstances will take into account published evidence of clinical effectiveness and likely value for money relating to the proposed treatment.

65. It is also open to the IFR Panel to conclude, notwithstanding the screening decisions taken by the IFR screening team, that:

- The request should be properly classified as a service development. In this case the request will be refused and the applicant advised of the service development procedures; or
- Further information or evidence is required before the IFR Panel can take a decision on whether funding should be given, in which case further information will be requested through the IFR team. This can be sought from the clinician, from within the CCG's clinical advice structure or from other clinical advisers as considered appropriate.

66. In considering individual cases, the IFR Panel will take care to avoid identification bias. This term describes the effect on decision makers of being presented with the detail of an individual's life. In these circumstances, it is hard to separate from the emotion behind a decision. Decision makers are more likely to decide in favour of that individual, even when this is at the expense of others who cannot be identified as clearly (also see section on non-clinical factors, paragraphs 19-22).

67. The IFR Panel will also take care to avoid "rule of rescue". This is the imperative people feel to 'rescue' individuals facing avoidable death or ill health. For example, supporting the effort to prolong life where there is little prospect of improvement, or death is unavoidable or there is little published evidence to support the requested treatment option in relapsed/refractory stages of the individual's disease/condition. Where the IFR Panel considers that application of the rule of rescue would form the basis for treatment, funding will be declined.

68. The IFR Panel may consider written views expressed by the patient or the clinical team, if based on clinical factors, but will reach its own views on:

- The likely clinical outcomes for the individual patient of the proposed treatment; and

- The quality of the evidence presented to support the request.

69. The IFR Panel are entitled to approve the request contingent on the fulfilment of such conditions as it considers fit. These might include, for example, a specific outcome reporting frequency or the involvement of a specialist unit in the management of the case.

70. The IFR Panel are entitled but not obliged to commission reports from any duly qualified or experienced clinician, medical scientist or other person, concerning the evidence that the treatment is likely to be clinically effective in the case of the individual patient. Reference to nationally recognised evidence syntheses may be used where they address the specific issues under consideration.

71. The IFR Panel will give written reasons for its decisions to fund or not to fund a treatment in accordance with this policy.

### **Review of the decision**

72. Where the IFR Panel have not supported funding for a requested treatment or have approved the treatment subject to conditions, the patient or requesting clinician will be entitled to ask that the process which led to the decision of the IFR Panel be subject to review.

73. All requests for a review must be made within 28 days of the date when the decision is communicated to the patient. The request will be supported by the referring clinician who must explain his or her reasons for considering that the decision taken by the IFR Panel was either procedurally improper and/or failed to consider the medical evidence and/or was, in his or her opinion, a decision which no reasonable IFR panel could have reached.

74. The request for a review will be initially considered by a CCG Director not involved in the original IFR application. If they consider that, on the basis of the information provided, there is an arguable case for a review of the IFR process, a formal IFR Review Panel meeting will be recommended to the CCG's Accountable Officer.

75. If the Director reviewing the case does not accept the grounds put forward for a review, they will report the rationale for their decision to the CCG's Accountable Officer who will consider and, if in agreement, will ratify the decision. The CCG's Accountable Officer will then write to the referring clinician and/or the patient/patient representative explaining the reasons for the decision not to review the IFR Panel decision.

76. The role of the IFR Review Panel is to determine whether the IFR Panel has followed the procedures as written in the CCG's IFR SOP, and has considered the evidence presented to it and has come to a reasonable decision based on the evidence.

77. The IFR Review Panel will consider whether the process followed by the IFR Panel was fair and consistent, based on whether the decision reached:

- Was taken following a process which was consistent with the policy of Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin CCG;
- Was a decision which a reasonable IFR Panel was entitled to reach;

- Understood, took into account and weighed, all the relevant evidence; and
- Did not take into account any irrelevant factors.

78. In the event that the IFR Review Panel considers that there was any procedural error in the IFR Panel's decision, the IFR Review Panel will consider whether there was any reasonable prospect that the IFR Panel could have come to a different decision had that error not been made.

79. If the IFR Review Panel considers that there was no reasonable prospect of the IFR Panel coming to a different decision, then the IFR Review Panel will approve the decision notwithstanding the procedural error. If the IFR Review Panel considers that there was a reasonable prospect that the IFR Panel may have come to a different decision had the error not been made, the IFR Review Panel will require the IFR Panel to reconsider the decision.

80. The IFR Review Panel does not have power to authorise funding for the requested treatment but can require the IFR Panel to reconsider the case and make recommendations as to the IFR Panel's approach to that consideration.

81. In the circumstances of a formal legal challenge, an internal review of the process taken leading to a decision will automatically be triggered by STW CCG.

### **Urgent decisions for Individual Funding Requests**

82. An IFR Panel usually meets according to a schedule designed to provide frequent and timely opportunities to consider applications. Cases are screened when received and the IFR panel meets monthly. Consequently cases can be processed very quickly if necessary. Although it may seem that there should be a route by which certain cases could bypass the usual process and decisions could be taken on the same day, this has the potential to introduce unfairness into the process. This is because:

- Cases submitted outside the usual process are unlikely to have been able to gather the necessary research evidence upon which a decision can be properly taken
- In such circumstances the information on the probability of a response to treatment and the nature of that response is unlikely to be clear
- As a result of these uncertainties it is probable that decisions would be subject to the 'rule of rescue' in a way that cases considered in the usual process would not
- It would be impossible to convene a properly constituted panel in a very short timescale. Decisions taken by one or two panel members acting alone, increases risks of coming to the wrong decision

- Starting a treatment without advance confirmation of funding may present a financial risk to a Trust, as the CCG does not routinely support retrospective funding.

83. There is a provision for cases to be processed more quickly than the 30 working day standard (stated in the SOP). Providers must take all reasonable steps to minimise the need for urgent requests to be made through the IFR process, for example, by making requests promptly and providing all necessary information with a request. If provider clinicians are considered not to be taking all reasonable steps to minimise urgent requests to the IFR process, STW CCG may refer the matter to the clinician's Chief Executive or equivalent.

84. In the unlikely event that the case is so urgent that it requires a decision on treatment before the IFR Panel's next meeting (i.e. death or significant and irreversible loss of function is likely to occur before the meeting), the relevant provider will be advised to consider taking its own decision to commence treatment before the funding decision is made.

### **Documents which should be read in conjunction with this policy**

STW CCG Funding for experimental and unproven treatments – November 2021

NHS England – Commissioning Policy – Individual Funding Requests – November 2017

STW CCG Ethical framework for priority setting and resource allocation – September 2021

On-going access to treatment following a 'trial of treatment' which has not been sanctioned by NHS STW CCG for a treatment which is not routinely funded or has not been formally assessed and prioritized – September 2021

On-going access to treatment following the completion of a trial explicitly funded by NHS STW CCG – September 2021

STW CCG On-going access to treatment following the completion of industry sponsored clinical trials or funding – September 2021

STW CCG On-going access to treatment following the completion of non-commercially funded clinical trials – August 2021