

**Boards in Common Paper E2**

<b>Meeting title:</b>	Boards of Directors of Kettering General Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (KGH), Northampton General Hospital NHS Trust (NGH) (University Hospitals of Northamptonshire NHS Group - UHN) and the University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust (UHL) Meeting together (Public)
<b>Date of the meeting:</b>	8 May 2026
<b>Title:</b>	<b>(3.4) Escalation Report from the UHL Finance and Investment Committee (FIC): 29 April 2026</b>
<b>Report presented by:</b>	Andrew Inchley, UHL FIC Non-Executive Director Chair
<b>Report written by:</b>	Andrew Inchley, UHL FIC Non-Executive Director Chair

<b>Action – this paper is for:</b>	Decision/Approval	Assurance	x	Update
<b>Where this report has been discussed previously</b>	Not applicable			
<b>To your knowledge, does the report provide assurance or mitigate any significant risks? If yes, please detail which</b>				
BAF Risk (03) Finance Short and Long Term BAF Risk (05 Estate 01)				
<b>Impact assessment</b>				
N/A				

**Purpose of the Report**

To provide assurance to the Trust Board on the work of the UHL Finance and Investment Committee (FIC).

**Summary**

Finance and Investment Committee met on 29 April 2026 and was quorate. The attached escalation report identifies any issues which the Committee either needs to recommend, or wishes to highlight, to the Trust Board, and sets out the FIC's level of assurance.

This escalation report follows the new quadrant template, focusing on assurance levels and aiming to provide an 'at a glance' report from the Board Committees. The template covers: **key escalations; actions to take outside the Committee; positive assurances, and decisions taken.**

The escalation report also sets out any items recommended for Trust Board approval (none on this occasion), and any items referred to other Committees (none on this occasion).

The report is not intended to be a narrative account of all issues discussed at the meeting.

Key escalations to notify the Board	Actions to take outside of the committee
None	None
Positive Assurance taken	Decisions taken
<p><b>BAF Risk (03 Finance – short term &amp; long term)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M12 finances – FY25/6 closed in line with latest commitments, focus now on FY26/7 delivery. Projected cashflow at acceptable levels but dependent upon deficit funding cash. Moderate assurance – plan is understood and risks being monitored / managed – see RDO for CIP.</li> <li>• RDO report – high level CIP plan ‘best case’ broadly aligned to target of £99m. Detailed planning for individual CIP still underway with CMGs – limited assurance given size of CIP ‘to find’ in bottom up plans.</li> <li>• Strategic planning group – update on governance and next steps for SPG. Discussed the importance of SPG ensuring individual business case reviews have quantified and measurable (not just directional) objectives. The SPG has already strengthened the capital programme in line with strategy, one of its key objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Moderate assurance – continue to monitor impact periodically over coming months.</p> <p><b>BAF Risk (05 Estate 01)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green plan delivery review – good progress on actions, with many achievable within budget. Agreed externally funded feasibility studies into electricity and heat reduction schemes, subject to final review by relevant TLT sponsors. Moderate assurance – good plan, some actions still to close out or tbc.</li> </ul>	
<b>Items recommended for Board approval:</b>	
None	
<b>Items referred to other committees:</b>	
None	

<b>SIGNIFICANT ASSURANCE</b>	Clear understanding of the issues with a robust, deliverable plan which will achieve the required outcomes. Only insignificant residual risk. There may be external evidence to corroborate this view
<b>MODERATE ASSURANCE</b>	Good understanding of the issues, a clear plan with timescales that are credible and deliverable but some action still required. The residual risk is more than insignificant
<b>LIMITED ASSURANCE</b>	Recognised material weaknesses which may be incomplete understanding of the issues or an action plan which is not comprehensive, credible or deliverable. A significant amount of residual risk remains
<b>NO ASSURANCE</b>	A fundamental failure to understand the issues. An action plan is inadequate with fundamental gaps, weaknesses or breakdown in compliance. A significant of residual risk remains and immediate action is required