

**MCMILLAN BINCH LLP**

---

---

**The Case for New Healthcare Infrastructure in Canada**

**by Graham W.S. Scott, Q.C.**

**Prepared for: The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships**

**The 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Public Private Partnerships**

**November 25, 2003**

# The Case for New Healthcare Infrastructure in Canada

Graham W.S. Scott, Q.C.

The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships  
The 11th Annual Conference on Public Private Partnerships  
November 25, 2003

MCMILLAN BINCH LLP

---

# Our Healthcare Conundrum

- ◆ Province needs healthcare infrastructure redevelopment AND other healthcare investments
- ◆ Province lacks sufficient public capital funding to address all healthcare needs
  - This affects the effective, timely and safe delivery of patient care
- ◆ The sustainability of our system at 46% of Provincial budget

## Our Healthcare Conundrum (cont'd)

- ◆ Romanow says:

*“The system is as sustainable as we want it to be ...  
if we are prepared to act decisively.”*

- ◆ Is there a role for private participation in addressing our aging infrastructure?

# Current Health Capital Limitations

- ◆ Province must provide significant up-front investment to redevelop infrastructure
- ◆ Province has limited resources and significant investment needs
- ◆ Limited number of projects can proceed simultaneously
- ◆ Processes need to be streamlined

# Current Health Capital Limitations

- ◆ Process is structured around 5 review stages
- ◆ Several Ministry departments play a role
- ◆ Approximately 1,000 projects “on the books”
- ◆ Process:
  - is reactive/lacks strategic direction
  - results in inconsistencies
  - is weak on monitoring, evaluation
  - is hindered by delays, miscommunication
  - results in inefficient use of time, resources
  - unclear accountabilities

# What's the Alternative?

- ◆ Ministry of Health is working with Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Ontario Hospital Association and other stakeholders to:
  - develop a long term strategic vision for capital planning
  - streamline internal processes
  - develop a range of alternative financing options
  - get funds in the health sector sooner
- ◆ Health Capital Review Panel is working to:
  - advise on strengthening and streamlining the current health capital planning processes

# Can Private Investment Support the Public System?

- ◆ Public Private Partnerships used for 80%+ of UK's recent hospital capital projects transferring non-clinical responsibilities to private sector
- ◆ The structures can take several forms – the predominant form in health care is DBFO: design-build-finance-operate
- ◆ UK seems to believe PPP option is most promising for resolving capital pressures facing hospitals

# Will They Work in Ontario?

- ◆ Old Ontario Decision-Makers:
  - 2 Ontario hospitals planned redevelopment within a DBFO model
  - 6 others were given the go-ahead to proceed with a similar plan
- ◆ New Ontario Decision-Makers:
  - Is there room for private investment in infrastructure?
  - Yes

# How Will They Work?

- ◆ Public policy control and ownership
- ◆ Private sector will finance
- ◆ Private sector will share risk
- ◆ Private sector involvement will strengthen accountability
- ◆ Private companies will be accountable to hospitals

# First Principles: What Matters in Health Care?

- ◆ Cost
- ◆ Access
- ◆ Quality
- ◆ Outcomes

# Cost

- ◆ Critics say: *“private investment is more expensive because private sector can recover investment and earn a return...”*
- ◆ I suggest:
  - redevelopment can begin faster, on a larger scale
  - hospital can share risk with private project
  - hospitals do not have ad hoc teams leading the planning and construction
  - incentive for efficient operation to ensure return

## Cost (cont'd)

➤ more capital public funding can be directed to:

- purchasing major equipment
- developing new medical technologies
- developing information technology
- improving health care delivery
- investing in teaching and health research

# Access

- ◆ Critics say: “*private infrastructure investment leads to two-tiered health care...*”
- ◆ I suggest:
  - bricks and mortar is affected
  - non-clinical services affected
    - Many hospitals have already contracted out the delivery of these services (e.g. laundry, food services, etc.)
  - delivery of clinical services remains with the hospital
  - the *Canada Health Act* principles of **universality**, **comprehensiveness** and **accessibility** are protected

# Quality

- ◆ Critics say: “*hospital services will deteriorate...*”
- ◆ I suggest:
  - private sector role is limited to building hospital facilities and, perhaps, delivery of non-clinical services
  - hospitals are free to focus on providing health care
  - public resources are freed up for capital investment in other areas and quality of care could improve
  - potential to improve hospital service with risk of penalties and contract termination

# Outcomes

- ◆ Critics say: “*health care will be privatized...*”
- ◆ I suggest:
  - delivery of clinical services remain with public sector – no privatization
  - private infrastructure investment enables:
    - access to private sector capital, expertise
    - access to management skills and risk management
    - enhanced buying power; and
    - potential to speed up modernization of hospital infrastructure

## Outcomes (cont'd)

- hospitals can focus on health care delivery
- all of which could lead to better patient outcomes

# Characteristics of Successful Private Infrastructure Investment Projects

- ◆ Value for money
- ◆ Transfer of significant risk
- ◆ Private sector skills and innovation
- ◆ Large-scale redevelopment
- ◆ Community and hospital buy-in
- ◆ Compliance with *Canada Health Act*
- ◆ Improvement in health care delivery

# The Case for New Healthcare Infrastructure in Canada

Graham W.S. Scott, Q.C.

The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships  
The 11th Annual Conference on Public Private Partnerships  
November 25, 2003