

## Social Affairs Scrutiny Panel

Date: 3rd April 2006

Location: Le Capelain Room, States Building

Present	Deputy F.J. Hill, B.E.M., Chairman Deputy J.A. Martin, Vice Chairman Deputy D.W. Mezbourian Deputy A.E. Pryke Deputy S. Pitman
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs. K. Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager [Item 6] Mr. C. Ahier, Scrutiny Officer Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>1. Minutes of Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>The Panel approved the minutes of the meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006.</p>	
	<p><b>2. Matters Arising and Action Updates</b></p> <p>The Panel requested that the paper on Action Updates be made clearer in future for ease of reference to the original request for action.</p> <p>The Panel noted the following information had not been received in response to requests made on 9th January 2006 during meetings with the Ministers for Health and Social Services and for Home Affairs :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information relating to Longer-Term Care from the Department of Health and Social Services</li> <li>• Business Plan for HMP La Moye from the Department of Home Affairs</li> </ul>	<b>CA/WM</b>
[09/01/06, Item 2] [09/01/06, Item 2]		
[20/03/06, Item 4]	<p>The Panel noted that a request had been made for it to visit HMP La Moye but that no date had been finalised. The Panel requested that arrangements be made for the visit to occur on either 18th or 21st April 2006. The Officers were requested to confirm that the Chairmen's Committee would meet on 20th April 2006 thereby negating the possibility of a visit to the Prison on that day.</p>	<b>CA/WM</b>  <b>CA/WM</b>
[20/03/06, Item 4]	<p>The Panel noted that transcription costs for Public Hearings equated to £96.00 for each hour of work undertaken during transcription.</p>	
[20/03/06, Item 10b]	<p>The Panel noted correspondence received from Senator W. Kinnard, Minister for Home Affairs, on 27th March 2006 regarding <i>Sexual Offences (Jersey) Law 200-</i> (P.196/2005). It further noted that the Minister had proposed a meeting between the Officers, the Officers for the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel</p>	

<p>[20/03/06, Item 7]</p> <p>[20/03/06, Item 2b]</p>	<p>and the Chief Officer of the Department for Home Affairs. The Panel requested that correspondence be sent expressing its concern that this meeting had not taken place.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel intended to hold quarterly meetings with the Ministers within its remit.</p> <p>The Panel considered the implications for its Work Programme of the withdrawal of <i>Housing Trading Organisation: establishment</i> (P.211/2005). It agreed that discussion of its Work Programme would be deferred to the next meeting on 18th April 2006.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that Scrutiny Reports were sent as a matter of course to witnesses who had attended a Public Hearing.</p> <p>The Panel noted the Chairmen's Committee would meet the Council of Ministers on 6th April 2006 to discuss the provision of legal advice to Scrutiny Panels.</p>	<p>CA/WM</p>
<p>[20/03/06, Item 2a]</p> <p>[06/03/06, Item 2] [11/01/06, Item 2]</p> <p>[20/03/06, Item 3]</p>	<p><b>3. Youth Service</b></p> <p>The Panel was advised that the Chairman had spoken to Senator M.E. Vibert, Minister for Education, Sport and Culture, regarding a recent Panel request for information on the Youth Service budget. The Panel agreed the information received did not constitute an appropriate response to its request. It further agreed that Deputy S. Pitman would consider the information received and speak to the Chairman before he subsequently spoke to the Minister on this matter.</p> <p>The Panel noted the request of the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture to be informed of any request for information made to his Department's liaison officer. It further noted that Mr J. Westwater had previously been named as the Department's liaison officer during the Panel's meeting with the Minister on 11th January 2006. The Panel agreed the Chairman would speak to the Minister to clarify this matter.</p> <p>The Panel noted that Mrs S. Costigan, Principal Youth Officer, had been invited to meet the Panel on 18th April 2006. The Panel was advised that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture, or one of his Assistant Ministers, would probably accompany Mrs Costigan.</p>	<p>SP BH</p> <p>BH</p>
	<p><b>4. Age Concern and Senior Citizens Association</b></p> <p>The Panel met Mrs D. Minihane MBE and Mr R. Le Brocq to discuss the views of Age Concern and the Senior Citizens Association on the new General Practitioner (GP) out-of-hours service.</p> <p><b>a) General Discussion</b></p> <p>The Panel was informed that the Senior Citizens Association involved people of 55 and over.</p> <p>Mrs Minihane advised the Panel of her belief that the scheme</p>	

was to have been implemented in conjunction with the new Income Support system.

The Panel asked whether Age Concern and the Association would monitor the new out-of-hours service and consider informing the Panel of its findings.

#### **b) Matters Raised**

During the course of its meeting with Mrs Minihane and Mr Le Brocq, the Panel considered the following matters in relation to the co-operative out-of-hours service:

- The impact of the service on those who currently received HIE.
- The possibility that the new service would make Jersey a more attractive place to work for GPs.
- The impact of the new system on short-term residents of the Island.
- The access visiting GPs would have to patient information.
- The use of Public funds establishing and maintaining the out-of-hours service.
- The potential impact of the service on Accident and Emergency (A&E).
- The arrangements for receiving and transferring calls in the new system.

#### **c) Consultation**

The Panel was advised that no formal request had been made by the Department of Health and Social Services for the views of Age Concern or the Senior Citizens Association. It was further advised that no request had been made by the Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority (JCRA) for its own investigation.

The Panel was advised that Mrs Minihane had consulted informally with members of Age Concern and the Association at meetings held on Tuesday mornings. The Panel was informed that these meetings were generally attended by approximately ninety people, approximately half of whom benefited from Health Insurance Exception (HIE).

The Panel was informed that Mrs Minihane had not received many adverse comments relating to the new out-of-hours service. The Panel was further informed that no adverse comments had been received relating specifically to the use of the Gwyneth Huelin Wing at the General Hospital for the Co-Operative's surgery.

The Panel was advised that the Senior Citizens Association would hold a meeting in April 2006 regarding the new out-of-hours service. Mrs Minihane advised the Panel that an invitation to the meeting would be extended to a representative of the GP Co-Operative.

### **5. Family Nursing and Home Care (FNHC)**

The Panel met Mrs K. Huchet to discuss Family Nursing and Homecare's views on the co-operative GP out-of-hours service.

#### **a) Work of FNHC**

The Panel was informed that Family Nursing and Homecare services were offered from 7:30am to 12:00am and that nurses were on call between 5:00pm and 12:00am.

The Panel was informed that nurses took phone-calls at Le Bas Centre and would need to decide whether a patient should be transferred to a GP.

The Panel was informed that 60% of referrals to FNHC came from GPs.

The Panel was informed that discussions were occurring between FNHC and Dr R. Geller, Medical Officer of Health, regarding the use of Le Bas Centre. It was further informed that some FNHC services were to be outsourced to the former La Pouquelaye School.

The Panel was informed that all nurses who undertook home visits were equipped with personal alarms. It was further informed that certain visits would be undertaken by two nurses if there were concerns regarding safety. The Panel was advised that risk assessments for potential home visits were undertaken during daytime working hours.

The Panel was informed that Family Nursing and Homecare had access to an interpreter to assist patients who did not speak English. It was further informed that one of the receptionists spoke Portuguese.

The Panel was advised that a pilot scheme for 'Rapid Response' had been implemented in 1999. It was further informed that this scheme involved specialist staff attending patients at their homes to avoid the use of hospital facilities. The Panel was advised this scheme had ceased due to insufficient funding but that it had run twenty-four hours a day.

#### **b) Matters Raised**

During the course of its meeting with Mrs Huchet, the Panel considered the following matters:

- The suggestion that the new service had been developed to meet the needs of GPs and the Department of Health and Social Services rather than of patients.
- The alternatives that may have been considered during development of the proposals.
- The consideration given to involving FNHC in out-of-hours service.

The Panel noted that FNHC would monitor the new out-of-hours service to see what impact would be had on it in terms of follow-

up care.

Mrs Huchet offered to forward to the Panel a copy of the notes she had prepared for the meeting.

### **c) Consultation**

The Panel was advised that FNHC had not been formally approached by the Department of Health and Social Services for its view on the out-of-hours service and that FNHC had made no official approach to the Department to express this view. It was informed that Mrs Huchet had had an opportunity to discuss the matter with Mr M. Littler, Directorate Manager of Medicine.

The Panel was advised that Mrs Huchet had spoken with employees of Clinical Services on the following matters:

- The cost-effectiveness of the new service.
- The potential impact of the service on A&E.
- The potential impact of the service on the provision of pharmaceutical products.

## **6. Parents Action Group**

The Panel met Mrs Z. Bisson to discuss the Parents Action Group's views on the new GP Co-Operative out-of-hours service.

### **a) General Information**

The Panel was advised that the Parents Action Group was an offshoot of the Early Years Association. It was further advised that the Group comprised eight people who worked for the interests of a larger number of parents.

### **b) Consultation**

The Panel was informed that the Group had not been approached by the Department of Health and Social Services for its views on the new out-of-hours service.

The Panel was advised that the Group could consult with those parents it represented in effort to ascertain their views on the service.

### **c) Matters raised**

The Panel considered the following matters during its meeting with Mrs Bisson:

- The possibility that the service would impact on access to hospital services by sick children.
- The potential responsibility of the telephonist to receive phone-calls and subsequently decide upon the appropriate course of action for the patient.
- The levels of the fees charged by the co-operative.
- The potential loss of discretionary charges for GP home visits.
- The possibility that on-call GPs would not know the patients they would visit.

- The possibility that private and sensitive information would be at the disposal of a greater number of people than previously.

## **7. Meeting with Dr. B. Perchard**

### **a) Development of Proposals for an Out-of-Hours Service**

The Panel was advised that proposals to establish a co-operative out-of-hours service had been repeatedly mooted during the previous ten years and that an unsuccessful attempt to introduce such a service had been made five years previously.

The Panel was informed that development of the present proposals had involved consultation with GPs as well as presentations on the service offered in the Isle of Wight.

The Panel was informed that members of the Jersey Medical Society had agreed by 45 votes to 9 for an approach to be made to the Department of Health and Social Services regarding the creation of a co-operative out-of-hours service.

The Panel was advised the involvement of 70% of the Island's GPs was required for the co-operative service to be viable. It was informed that this figure had been achieved.

The Panel was informed that one practice that had chosen not to join the co-operative had been split in its decision along generational lines. It was further informed that a second practice that had chosen not to join had done so due to its belief that the Department of Health and Social Services should not be involved.

The Panel was informed that all necessary staff had been recruited for the implementation of the service on 3rd April 2006 and that appropriate training would be given.

The Panel was informed that 84 FTE (full-time equivalent) GPs worked in the Island and that there was therefore approximately one GP for every 1,100 people. Dr Perchard estimated that 70% of the population would be covered by the co-operative service.

The Panel was advised that the Joint Working Party had first met the JCRA in November 2005. It was noted the JCRA had been unable to give a firm date for when it would finish its investigation of the co-operative service.

### **b) Consultation**

The Panel was informed that the Department of Health and Social Services had taken lead responsibility for Public consultation. It was advised that the Joint Working Party had considered all responses made as part of the Public consultation. Dr Perchard expressed a belief that the lack of Public response to the consultation was surprising but indicated the Public was not opposed to the scheme.

The Panel was advised that no Patient Body existed in Jersey to present patients' views.

The Panel was advised that Dr Perchard had consulted with GP practices and that informal consultation had occurred between GPs and their patients. It was further advised that Dr Perchard had given a radio interview on the out-of-hours service.

The Panel was advised that participating GP practices had chosen not to advertise their involvement in the co-operative service due to concerns regarding Public perception and a desire not to be seen denigrating those who had chosen to remain outside the co-operative.

### **c) Operation of the Co-Operative Service**

#### **i) Access to the Service**

The Panel was informed that patients of practices which chose to remain outside the co-operative would not have access to the co-operative's services.

The Panel was informed that, upon implementation of the service, patients would need to dial two numbers to access the service. It was advised that an integrated call system which would allow access with one telephone call was likely to be implemented within two months.

The Panel was informed that calls made between 6:00pm and 11:00pm would be answered by the receptionist at the co-operative surgery. It was further informed that calls after this time would be answered at the Emergency Call Centre on a separate line to that used for the 999 service.

#### **ii) Driver Service**

The Panel was advised that GPs would use a driver service for approximately 20% of on-call sessions although some 16% of the funding for this service would come from the Department of Health and Social Services. It was noted that not every GP desired to use the driver service. The Panel was advised that a driver service would help with finding the location of home visits.

The Panel was advised that on-call GPs would be able to operate from Peter Crill House but that some GPs preferred to operate from their home during their time 'on call'.

#### **iii) Billing Arrangements**

The Panel was advised that GP practices presently gleaned approximately 2% of their annual turnover from out-of-hours work.

The Panel was informed that fees for the co-operative service had been based on the average of fees charged prior to

commencement of the co-operative service.

The Panel was advised that individual practices would remain responsible for billing arrangements and that the GP who had undertaken a home visit would be entitled to the full fee for this visit. The Panel was informed that conciliation of accounts would occur each month between individual practices and the co-operative surgery.

**iv) Access to Patient Data**

The Panel was informed that a visiting GP would not have access to the patient's records during the visit. It was advised that patient databases for individual practices were presently in a poor state and that work on a central database for the co-operative service was ongoing. The Panel was informed that provision for remote access to the database would eventually be possible and that such remote access was currently available in the United Kingdom through the Adastral system.

**v) Quality Assurance**

The Panel was informed that quality standards for the co-operative service would be based upon standards used in the United Kingdom. It was advised that GPs would not be required to meet the standards before entering the service and that to introduce such a requirement would be a highly contentious issue.

The Panel was advised that, upon implementation of the co-operative service, every patient would be asked to complete a questionnaire on the service but that subsequently every 30th patient would be given the questionnaire. It was further advised that this proportion could be subject to change.

**vi) Language Services**

The Panel was informed that the GP co-operative would have access to the language service at the General Hospital and that the cost for this use would not be borne by the Department of Health and Social Services.

**8. Meeting with the Association of Professional Ambulance and Paramedic Staff (APAPS)**

The Panel met Mr M. Judge and Mr G. O-Rourke of the Association of Professional Ambulance and Paramedic Staff (APAPS) to discuss the potential use of Ambulance crews to provide a driver service for the GP co-operative.

The Panel was advised that ambulance crews operated centrally from Ambulance Headquarters and would attend to emergency calls from there.

The Panel was advised that indications had been given to APAPS that any driver service involving ambulance crews would have been stopped if it had been found to have an adverse effect on responses to 999 emergency calls.



The Panel was informed that a meeting of approximately 20 ambulance staff had occurred on 6th March 2006 to consider the possibility of using ambulance crews to provide a driver service for on-call GPs. It was further informed that the following three options had been considered and that the third option had been chosen:

- To use the two established ambulance crews to provide a driver service
- To undertake a trial period of one month, during which a third ambulance crew would be established, in order to monitor the potential impact of providing a driver service
- To have no involvement of the ambulance crews in providing a driver service

The Panel was advised that no written notice had been received by APAPS of the decision not to involve ambulance crews in the provision of a driver service for GPs.

The Panel was advised that workers in the Emergency Call Centre did not form part of APAPS. It was advised that concerns had been raised by workers in the Call Centre regarding the impact of the co-operative service on the Centre.

[20/03/06,  
Item 5]

#### 9. GP Out-of-Hours

The Panel noted that the Out-of-Hours service would begin on 3rd April 2006 before the Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority (JCRA) had completed its investigation into whether the service would be granted an exemption from Article 8 of *Competition (Jersey) Law 2005*.

The Panel noted Act B4, dated 7th October 2005, of the former Health and Social Services Committee relating to work that had been undertaken on developing a co-operative out-of-hours service.

The Panel was advised that the Department of Health and Social Services had undertaken Public consultation at the behest of the former Policy and Resources Committee.

The Panel noted that the Department of Health and Social Services had contacted the following groups directly as part of the consultation on the new out-of-hours service:

- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Age Concern Jersey
- Hospice Care

It further noted an apparent contradiction to advice received from Mrs D. Minihane that Age Concern had not been approached for its view on the co-operative service. The Panel agreed to write to Age Concern for clarification on this matter.

The Panel noted it would need to consider the potential implications for the co-operative service of *Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law 1989*.

CA/WM

<p>[20/03/06, Item 6]</p>	<p><b>10. Income Support</b></p> <p>The Panel noted the Income Support Sub-Panel would next meet on Friday 7th April 2006.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the Sub-Panel would consider the use of an adviser for the Income Support Review. The Panel noted the Sub-Panel would need to seek the Panel's endorsement to use its resources. It further noted the following provision under Standing Order 139 (3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A scrutiny panel may not allocate any of its resources to a sub-panel without the agreement of the chairmen's committee.</li> </ul>	
<p>[19/12/06, Item 2]</p>	<p><b>11. Media Contact</b></p> <p>The Panel noted that recent comments made by the Chairman relating to the Minister for Home Affairs had been correctly reported in the Jersey Evening Post as his personal opinion and not the collective opinion of the Panel.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that Panel members make it clear when speaking to the media if an opinion expressed were their personal opinion.</p>	
	<p><b>12. Draft Strategic Plan</b></p> <p>The Panel noted a request from the Chairmen's Committee for each Scrutiny Panel to consider the <i>Draft Strategic Plan 2006-2011</i>. It noted a further request that its comments on the Draft Plan be ready for the Chairmen's Committee to consider at its meeting on 20th April 2006. The Panel noted that a presentation on the Draft Plan would be given to States Members on 11th April 2006. The Panel agreed to meet on 12th April 2006 to consider its comments on the Draft Plan. The Officers were requested to make the necessary arrangements.</p>	<p>CA/WM</p>
	<p><b>13. Budget</b></p> <p>The Panel noted the quarterly budget update.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that no consideration had been made in initial budget allocations for 2006 for the appointment of an adviser for the Income Support Review.</p>	
	<p><b>14. Scrutiny Road Shows</b></p> <p>The Panel endorsed the decision made by the Chairmen's Committee that a Public Meeting for Scrutiny would be held every six weeks. It noted that the Chairman of each Scrutiny Panel would attend the meetings but that other members of the Social Affairs Scrutiny Panel would be able to speak on matters for which they had been given lead responsibility. The Panel further noted that it would be able to hold Public meetings in its own name.</p>	
<p>[20/03/06, Item 9a]</p>	<p><b>15. Topic Proposals</b></p> <p><b>a) Legitimacy Law</b></p> <p>The Panel was advised that the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel had received a Proposal Form suggesting amendments be made to <i>Legitimacy (Jersey) Law 1973</i> but had had agreed to defer a review of this subject as it felt the matter was being addressed elsewhere. The Panel requested clarification on who</p>	

	<p>was undertaking work that might address concerns raised in the Proposal Form.</p> <p><b>b) Completion of Proposal Forms</b>  The Panel agreed that Deputies D.W. Mezbourian and A.E. Pryke would consider the Proposal Forms if they were able to do so. It further agreed that consideration of Proposal Forms would be placed early on the agenda for 18th April 2006.</p>	<p><b>CA/WM</b></p> <p><b>DM/AP</b></p> <p><b>CA/WM</b></p>
	<p><b>16. Forthcoming Propositions</b>  The Panel agreed that it would not seek to review the following proposition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.33/2006 – <i>Higher Education ‘top up’ fees – payment by the States</i></li> </ul> <p>The Panel agreed it would not seek to have the following proposition referred to it under Standing Order 72:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.25/2006 – <i>Draft Housing (General Provisions) (Amendment No.24) Regulations 200-</i></li> </ul> <p>The Panel noted that Senator T.J. Le Main, Minister for Housing, had indicated the following proposition would be withdrawn. The Panel agreed that it would ask for this proposition to be referred to it under Standing Order 72 if the proposition were not withdrawn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.19/2006 – <i>Draft Housing (General Provisions) (Amendment No.23) Regulations 200-</i></li> </ul>	
	<p><b>17. Questions to Ministers</b>  The Panel was informed the Chairman would ask the Chief Minister to expand upon comments he made at a meeting with the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>The Panel requested clarification of the rota for Ministers to receive questions without notice.</p>	<p><b>CA/WM</b></p>
	<p><b>18. Future Meetings</b>  The Panel noted that the next meeting would take place at 9:30am on Tuesday 18th April 2006 at Trinity Parish Hall.</p>	

Signed

Date

.....  
Chairman, Social Affairs Panel

.....