



LANCASHIRE &  
MORECAMBE BAY LOC

Minutes of the Meeting held Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> October 2019

**Brockholes Reserve Preston PR5 OAG**

(Junction 32 M6/M55)

Present:	<b>Tim Bagot</b> <b>Sarah Bentley</b> <b>Nadya Booth</b> <b>Alan Bowen</b> <b>Teresa Broadhurst</b> <b>Mike Broadhurst</b> <b>Sean Buckley</b> <b>Vic Cottam</b> <b>Ruth Cuthbert</b> <b>Philip Harper</b> <b>Paul Hutchence</b>	<b>Michael Jackson</b> <b>Phil Jones</b> <b>Simon Kay</b> <b>Thomas Mackley</b> <b>Neil Pearson</b> <b>Jane Quinn</b> <b>Mike Ryan</b> <b>Jennifer Smith</b>  <b>Daniel Green (ABDO representative)</b>  <b>Joy Groome - minutes</b>
----------	--	---

	<u>Welcome</u>	ACTIONS
	VC opens the meeting and welcomes all.	
1.	<u>Apologies for Absence were received from</u> Riz Iqbal, Sally Ferguson, Val Hughes, Chris Dineen,	
2.	<u>Declarations of interest</u>  None recorded	
3.	<u>Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting</u> The minutes of the previous meeting in July 2019 were approved with a couple of typo/representative errors corrected - Proposed by TB and seconded by MB.	
4.	<u>Matters arising from previous meeting</u>  CHEC issues discussed at a later stage of the meeting.	



LANCASHIRE &  
MORECAMBE BAY LOC

5.	<p><b>Treasurers report</b></p> <p>MB presented his report and the complexities of reclaiming the monies overpaid to Cumbria LOC were discussed due to varying levy payments. TB explained – and declared at this point his interest concerning Cumbria LOC – being a member of both LOCs, that although a figure had been ringfenced by Cumbria, the lower levy being paid by the Cumbria practitioners along with the misunderstanding about the amounts paid to LOCSU, made the calculation of any outstanding monies very difficult to compute. TB suggested that an independent person may have to be involved to settle this. MB asks TB for the details of the treasurer of the Cumbria LOC.</p> <p>Treasurers report 31 Sept 2019.docx</p> <p>MB asks the committee if they could submit any invoices for LOC activity in a timely fashion to allow him to keep the finances as up to date as possible.</p> <p>MB asks the committee if anyone has any further questions – No response recorded.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>OA Report Lancashire and Morecambe Bay LOC October 2019</u></b></p> <p>OA Report Lancashire and Mor</p> <p>RC urged practitioners to fill in the reflective statement following CET events whilst accepting point. RC advised although this was not compulsory it was GOC favourable. RC also wanted to remind contractors that in line with NHS contracts any complaints must be completed online. PH agreed to send out an email to remind practitioners.</p>	



LANCASHIRE &  
MORECAMBE BAY LOC

7.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>LOCSU Report TM</u></b></p> <p>L&amp;MB Presentation NHS Changes - for LOC Needs Analysis Oct 2019 (NHS Chan L&amp;MB.docx (L&amp;MB).xlsx)</p> <p>TM opened his presentation by stating that there was no criticism of the L&amp;MB LOC and this was not an exercise to compare LOCs but more a look at how the LOC can evolve and operate more efficiently with greater communication and knowledge sharing. The needs analysis was discussed, and how everyone sitting on the committee should have a delegated role. Attracting new people into the committee was also advised through maybe a Locality lead. It was further suggested that there should be an IT lead taking charge of the website, a governance lead, comms lead, and several other suggestions such as a newsletter for practitioners/Facebook and blogging. MB highlighted the time factors and financial implication for the LOC around attending meetings. TM stressed the need to be present at any local PCN meetings to have any influence to be involved in any schemes – hence the need for a ‘sub team’ so that just a few people are not taking all the workload</p>	
8.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>LEHN report</u></b></p> <p>No report was submitted</p>	
9.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>PES report PH</u></b></p> <p>Report Lancashire and Morecambe Bay</p> <p>Phil H presented his report advising that there would shortly be an office in Manchester from which PES would be operating. Phil H reported that the patient satisfaction questionnaires ('PROMS') were failing with only a 30% take up and wanted LOC agreement to contact practices to remind all that this was part of their contract. The LOC had no objections to the proposal. TM advised the best way to obtain a good outcome was to give the patient the survey in their hand at the time of the appointment. It was discussed that the survey was too onerous and although the CCG had specified the content, the form needed revisiting to obtain a better result.</p>	



LANCASHIRE &  
MORECAMBE BAY LOC

10.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Secretary's Report</u></b></p> <p>a) <b><u>CHEC contract</u></b> – IR reply – PH asks committee how to proceed following the response from IR A discussion ensued around the need to keep records in the practice and the legalities around being told by CHEC that records were not required. MB stated that as CHEC had the NHS contract and the practitioners were sub-contractors then the responsibility for any 'problems' were solely the liability for CHEC. Many of the committee were not happy with this explanation and thought that there were GOC issues around the lack of record keeping. The lack of training was also raised as an issue. TM pointed out that the present contract will expire in 2020 and it may be worth approaching the CCG to propose a different service with more training and dialogue. SK thought that patient record keeping was a fundamental professional responsibility. It was agreed that TM would write to LOCSU re GDPR issues and the fact there was no detailed record access on the CHEC system.</p> <p>b) <b><u>LOCSU courses</u></b> – it was discussed and agreed that any that LOCSU courses attended that benefitted the LOC would be funded by the LOC.</p> <p>c) <b><u>Succession planning</u></b> – it was agreed that younger members should be encouraged to understand the LOC and therefore attend induction courses for personal development. MB suggested a training fund for this purpose and all agreed. TM suggested that all committee members should have a 'role'. TM agreed to give a list of suggested roles/jobs such as Website facilitator, Facebook/twitter account facilitator, communications lead etc.</p> <p>d) <b><u>LOC delegates to NOC</u></b> – After a short discussion it was agreed that Tom Mackley, Tim Bagot, Jennifer Smith and Michael Jackson would attend with only one full place and half another (TB) having to be paid by the LOC (due to TB representing two LOCs)</p> <p>e) <b><u>CCG Mergers and future of our LOC</u></b> – PH stated that there should be no impact of the CCG mergers on the LOC as the footprint would remain the same but there would have to be more communication with other LOCs going forward. MB pointed out that the geography of the area covered did not make it easy for liaison meetings as had been proved in previous years.</p>	
11.	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>A brief discussion took place around glaucoma care in the community. TM reported that higher certificates were needed to take this into community and with the course taking 13 days (out of</p>	



LANCASHIRE &  
MORECAMBE BAY LOC

practice) and costing £2K, it was not financially viable. TM advised that the future was not clear as yet but it looked like HCA (band 4) nurses were a more cost effective solution for the NHS.

12. **Dates of Future Meetings**

**8<sup>th</sup> January 2020, 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 AGM**

Signed:		Date:
	<b>Vic Cottam Chair</b>	