University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust

Trust Board paper G10

Meeting title:	Trust Board
Date of the meeting:	11 September 2026
Title:	**Escalation Report from the Our Future Hospitals and Transformation Committee (OFHTC): 26 August 2026**
Report presented by:	David Moon, Non-Executive Director
Report written by:	Dr Andy Haynes, OFHTC Non-Executive Director Chair

Action – this paper is for:	Decision/Approval		Assurance	x	Update	
Where this report has been discussed previously	Not applicable					

To your knowledge, does the report provide assurance or mitigate any significant risks? If yes, please detail which
BAF Risk 6(1) – Digital Capability & Transformation BAF Risk 6(2) – Cyber Security & Digital Resilience BAF Risk 8(1) – Estate Safety, Compliance & Service Capacity
Impact assessment
N/A

Purpose of the Report

To provide assurance to the Trust Board on the work of the Trust's Our Future Hospitals and Transformation Committee (OFHTC).

Summary

OFHTC met on 26 August 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 OFHTC's level of assurance.

There are no items requiring formal recommendation to the Trust Board from the August 2026 OFHTC meeting.

This escalation report follows a 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, and any items referred to other Committees.

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
Positive Assurance taken	**Decisions taken**
BAF Risk (ref) • 05-OFH-03 - OFH Programme Directors Report – Moderate Assurance	The Committee noted the updated position re: NHP and the potential for our schemes to be brought forward 12 months. Also, the revenue consequences of future RtCS schemes will be tested prior to any expenditure on design and business case writing. Further the Committee received an update on progress re: nine recommendations from the clinical risk review.
Items recommended for Board approval:	
None	
Items referred to other committees:	
None	

SIGNIFICANT ASSURANCE	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
MODERATE ASSURANCE	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
LIMITED ASSURANCE	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
NO ASSURANCE	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