

Gosport Independent Panel

Minutes of the Panel Meetings

19 and 20 June 2017

Venue Wellington House, London, SE1

Present

Panel

Bishop James Jones (Chair, Gosport Independent Panel, BJJ)
 Kate Blackwell (KB)
 Christine Gifford (CG)
 David Hencke (DH)
 Duncan Jarrett (DJ)
 Jim Smith (JS)
 John Pounsford (JP)

Secretariat

Louise Dominian (Secretary, LD)
 Andy Fitt (AF)
Code A
 Leila Ghahhary (LG)
Code A
 Judy Joslin (JJ)
Code A
 Tracy Ofeosi (TO)
Code A
 Sarah Wishart (SW)
 Peter Burgin (PB)
 Stanley Tan (ST)
Code A
 Louise Cowen (LC)
Code A

Apologies

Bill Kirkup (BK)

	Agenda Item	Summary of discussion	Actions
1.	Introduction and Welcome	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Phillip Dunne has retained his post, following the General Election in May, as the Minister of State for Health. His responsibilities still include Patient safety, Patient experience and the Gosport Independent Panel</p> <p>The Panel noted the risk that a further General Election could pose to the Panel's completion date of Spring 2018.</p>	
2.	Minutes of 23 May meeting and matters arising	<p>Panel members should ensure they are content with the minutes as recorded. The Panel minutes will eventually form a public record.</p> <p>The minutes of the Panel meeting on 23 May were agreed.</p>	a) BJJ signed the minutes as a true record of the meeting.

		<p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p>The Chair updated the Panel on issues raised in previous Panel meetings and discussed at a meeting in May. The Panel noted that William Vineall will be exploring the broader issues raised by the discussion of procurement and report back to the Panel.</p>	<p>b) LD to update the Panel on DH's response to the bureaucracy issues.</p>
3.	<p>Disclosure decisions and July Family Liaison Meeting</p> <p>GIP/Paper 30.1</p>	<p><u>Venue for disclosure day</u></p> <p>Two venues - Portsmouth Guildhall and Portsmouth Cathedral were shortlisted from a list of 12 venues because they fully met the venue specification shared at April's Panel meeting.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the preferred venue will need to offer the right environment and impression to ensure an appropriate sense of dignity, an atmosphere of neutrality and calmness. The Panel agreed that the Cathedral is the preferred venue – it has a dedicated space which is important for the families as well as the right environment with peace and tranquility which is equally essential.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that families will be informed at July's Panel meeting that the Cathedral is the preferred disclosure venue for the reasons stated above. Families will be informed as soon as practically possible of the arrangements for Disclosure and assured that their needs have been at the forefront of the Panels decisions.</p> <p><u>Preparing families for disclosure</u></p> <p><u>Identifying potential disclosure dates</u></p> <p>The Panel agreed Wednesday, 16 May and Wednesdays in June should be reserved as potential dates for Disclosure in 2018.</p> <p>The precise disclosure date would be communicated at the Family Liaison Meeting on the 21 February 2018, with a procedural meeting three to four weeks before disclosure. Panel attendees for the future Family Liaison Meeting would be agreed at a future Panel meeting.</p>	<p>c) JJ to arrange for BJJ to inform the families that the Cathedral is the preferred venue at the July Family Liaison Meeting and invite them to make their observations.</p> <p>d) JJ to propose a precise disclosure date to the Panel in advance of the February Family Liaison Meeting.</p> <p>e) JJ to arrange for BJJ to communicate the potential months for disclosure day at the July Family Liaison Meeting.</p>

		<p><u>Feedback from the April Family Liaison Meeting</u></p> <p>The Panel will continue to make attempts to engage with the family that had sent feedback on the April Family Liaison meeting. The Family Team would respond on the Panel's behalf. CG and DJ will write offering to meet the family to discuss any issues they may still have, and would make this offer to all families at the next Family Liaison Meeting in July.</p> <p>The Panel noted that Jon Tunney, who led the media strategy for the Hillsborough Independent Panel, was meeting the Chair on 20 June and this will include a discussion about how to prepare families for discussions with the media, if they wished to have these.</p> <p>The following decisions were made in relation to the remainder of the paper:</p> <p><u>Preparing Families for Disclosure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The messaging contained in paragraphs 17 and 18 was agreed; - The families would be given an indication of the likely timescale of disclosure (May/June), rather than a specific date, as early as possible. It was agreed this would be communicated at the July Family Liaison Meeting. <p><u>Future Family Liaison Meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agenda was agreed; - A decision on who should attend the October Family Liaison Meeting would be made at a later Panel meeting <p>The Family Liaison Meeting in October will be used to consult families about invitees to the disclosure day.</p>	<p>f) The Family Team will write to the relevant family; with the Panel's response. DJ and CG will also write to them and make the same offer to meet to all the families at the July Family Liaison Meeting.</p>
4.	<p>Access Workstream Progress report and Website GIP/Paper 30.2.</p>	<p>The Panel was updated on outstanding issues with a small number of stakeholder organisations.</p> <p><u>General Medical Council (GMC)</u></p> <p>The GMC had agreed that the schedule of</p>	

documents could be shared with the Panel. It was processing the remaining material it considered to be subject to Legal Professional Privilege (LPP) and would pass the majority of this to the Panel. A small amount of material would be subject to discussion with KB on a document by document basis. There had been significant progress on redaction.

Hampshire Police Constabulary (HCO)

Four outstanding requests for information were being followed up. This included an organogram, which it was hoped would be provided by HCO before the meeting between the Chair and the Chief Constable on 6th July.

Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)

It was agreed that the Chair would not write to the Director of Public Prosecutions at this stage, until the Panel had considered the response from the CPS.

David Perry QC

David Perry QC had confirmed the drafts submitted were the same as the final advice. He further explained that he had returned instructions received from the CPS to the CPS. This was normal practice and the team had asked the CPS directly for the instructions.

Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)

The ICO continued to be very slow in providing the remaining material. The Chair would write to the Information Commissioner to ask her to ensure action was taken (the ICO have submitted the outstanding material since the meeting).

Beechcroft Solicitors

Peter Burgin was meeting Beechcrofts to collect their material on 27th June.

Portsmouth Trust (PHT)

It was noted that almost all the material received so far from PHT had been electronic. If the Trust

		<p>could locate any paper material, this was likely to be the largest outstanding amount of material. CG would contact Peter Mellor, the relevant Trust Director, next week.</p> <p><u>Medical Defence Union (MDU)</u></p> <p>Following an intervention by the Royal College of Nursing, the MDU have contacted the team to let them know that there may be further statements forthcoming which were originally provided by some of the nurses.</p> <p>CG noted that she had not been asked by the organisations to review any of the redactions. Although there were one or two organisations (eg Mills and Reeve) who were citing LPP for all their material, most had agreed only to redact sensitive and personal data.</p> <p><u>Website</u></p> <p>Following a reduction in the budget to £100k, and an unsatisfactory series of discussions with GDS which had left matters unresolved, the sponsoring DH Director had been made aware of this position. It was agreed that if matters continued to be unresolved, the Chair would write to the Head of GDS to complain formally and to ask for urgent action to allow the website to proceed.</p>	<p>h) CG to contact PHT in June.</p> <p>i) Depending on the outcome of the meeting with DH, BJJ to write to the head of GDS</p>
5.	<p>Review Workstream Progress Report</p> <p>Cross Cutting Issues</p> <p>GIP/Paper 31.1</p>	<p>There was a verbal update of salient points emerging from all the Review workstrands and an update on the preliminary cross-cutting work.</p>	
6	<p>High Level Plan and Disclosure including Report Planning</p> <p>GIP/Paper 31.2</p>	<p>The Panel noted the transition to the key blocks of work for the disclosure, Report writing, and website workstreams in the High level Plan and that the work on Access runs in parallel. The transition aligns with the final stages of the Panel's Terms of Reference accessing all documents across all organisations, analysing the documentation and writing a report that adds to public understanding.</p> <p>The focus is on completing the review of material</p>	<p>J) Panel Members (and Workstream leads) to draft comprehensive Report chapter summaries by the end of August.</p>

		<p>in the summer and moving to Report writing with comprehensive Report chapter summaries produced by the end of August for discussion at the individual Panel members' meetings with the Bishop being scheduled in early September 2017.</p> <p>The Panel noted chapter summaries will be considered at September's Panel meeting and that the outline drafts of individual Report Chapters will be completed by the end of October.</p>	<p>k) Panel Members to develop outline drafts of individual Report Chapters by the end of October.</p>
7.	<p>Forward Look</p> <p>GIP/Paper 31.3</p>	<p>The Panel noted the proposed 2018 Panel dates in support of delivery of the final plans of the Panel's work .</p>	
8.	<p>AOB</p>		