

Gosport Independent Panel Minutes of the Panel Meeting 19 July 2016

Venue Wellington House, London, SE1

Present

Panel

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

Secretariat

Louise Dominian (Secretary, LD)
Sarah Armstrong (SAr)
Tracy Ofeosi (TO)
Peter Burgin (PB)
Code A
Andy Fitt (AF)
Judy Joslin (JJ)

Code A

Code A

Apologies

Bill Kirkup (BK)

	Agenda Item	Summary of discussion	Actions
1.	Introduction and Welcome	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.	Minutes of 24 May Panel meeting and matters arising	Panel members should ensure they are content with the minutes as recorded. The Panel minutes will eventually form a public record. The minutes of the Panel Meeting on 24 May were agreed. <u>Matters arising</u> None.	a) BJJ signed the minutes as a true record of the meeting.
3	Reflections on the June Panel meetings - offsite (20 June) and less paper panel (21 June) GIP/Paper 20. 1	The Panel discussed the offsite and 'less paper' Panel meetings held in June. The Panel agreed the meetings provided a platform for robust and extensive discussions. They provided the Panel with a good overview of progress and direction. The Panel agreed that it will have to discuss the scale and volume of the Panel's work with the new Department of Health Minister responsible for	

		<p>Gosport. It was noted that the current fiscal climate will make any request for additional resources challenging. The Panel will need to consider its options to deliver the Terms of Reference accordingly and provide rigorous evidence for any options put forward.</p> <p>The Panel is not an exhaustive criminal investigation but an investigative Panel establishing through a written report whether there is a case to answer in response to allegations in four areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether there was an attitude of dispatching chronically ill patients without consultation or consent; • whether there was a regime of prescribing and administering a toxic cocktail of medicine; • whether there was a sequence of inadequate investigations; • whether there was poor governance - lacking in accountability and rigour. 	
4.	<p>Family Liaison</p> <p>GIP/Paper 20.2</p>	<p><u>Family engagement</u></p> <p>To date (as of 19 July) the Panel is in contact with families relating to 110 deceased patients. This includes eight families that have come forward through the recent tracing activity.</p> <p>A significant amount of family material has been collected and more material will be collected over the coming weeks.</p> <p><u>July's Informal Family Liaison Meeting</u></p> <p>Six families are expected to attend the informal Family Liaison meeting. Three of the six families are newly traced families.</p> <p><u>Update on Tracing</u></p> <p>The Panel was updated on the outcome of the tracing activity. The Panel agreed in April that letters should be sent to family members involved in Operation Rochester who are not in contact</p>	

		<p>with the Panel. 20 of the 28 families have responded to the letter from the Chair. The Panel agreed a strategy to trace the families involved in Operation Rochester who are no longer living at the same address.</p> <p>The outsourcing of a tracing company for the remaining families will be done with the required sensitivity.</p>	
5.	<p>Access Workstream Progress Report</p> <p>GIP/Paper 20.3</p>	<p>The Panel was updated on progress.</p> <p>The response from stakeholder organisations remains positive. Progress has been made collecting material.</p> <p>All the hard copy material in Wellington House has been catalogued. Electronic material is now being catalogued.</p> <p>The Panel noted the potential for there to be over one million pages on Relativity for this review</p> <p>Work with the GMC is progressing. A new plan is being developed to scan all their material. This does not include the GMC material that may attract legal professional privilege. The approach being used by the Panel to determine material which is in scope will be recommended to the GMC.</p> <p>Portsmouth Trust has provided a significant amount of electronic material. The Access Team is considering the best approach to ensure it accesses material relevant to the Panel's work.</p> <p>The Medical Defence Union has not provided any material yet.</p> <p>The Inquest material that was requested from the Coroner will need to be followed up to ascertain if it has been collected.</p> <p>Contact has been made with the new Hampshire Police Chief Constable.</p> <p>The work to manually search Southern Health boxes in Southampton is complete. About 1600 boxes were checked and 24 medical records were found.</p> <p>CG will send a letter to seek permission from a family for material held by Medical Defence Union (MDU) to be shared with the Panel.</p>	<p>b) KB to discuss the approach for handling material which attracts legal professional privilege with the GMC.</p> <p>c) PB and AF to check whether the Inquest transcript material has been received from the Coroner.</p>

		The Panel agreed that the name of the person who provided the information for the death certificate will not be published by the Panel in its final report, and where publication is necessary, consent will be sought beforehand.	
6.	Review Workstream Progress Report GIP/Paper 20.4	<p>The Panel was updated on the progress of the four workstrands – Networks, Regulatory, Clinical Ascertainment Phase (CAP) and Investigation.</p> <p><u>Investigation workstrand</u></p> <p>Comparative Analysis Document (CAD)</p> <p>28 CADs which relate to patients who have very little family material have been completed. The Panel noted the first reference to the policy on syringe drivers.</p> <p>The Panel was briefed on the Senior Investigative Officer (SIO) Policy files. The files are developed to promote accountability, consistency and to support professionalism. Policy files should define the overall strategy and the tactics of the investigation</p> <p>10 Senior Investigative Officer (SIO) Policy files are on Relativity. Six of the SIO files have been reviewed to date. In reviewing the SIO Policy files a number of factors are being considered. This includes what was reasonable at the time and what was known to ascertain if the investigation was proportionate</p> <p>Hampshire Police had a number of different SIOs during Operation Rochester. Any decision to discontinue the Rochester investigation would have been discussed and agreed with the Hampshire Police Senior Management Team.</p> <p>CG has asked Hampshire Police for additional material to verify who made a decision to halt the investigation and on what basis.</p> <p><u>Networks workstrand</u></p> <p>The Panel agreed the Networks' Protocol is consistent with the Panel's documentary evidence based work. The Review team will consider the</p>	<p>d) Code A b review the SIO files for information about where the SIO was located and background of the SIOs.</p> <p>e) AF to follow up the request to Hampshire Police for SIO policy material relating to minutes of the Senior Management meetings.</p>

	<p>media strategy and the link to any networks when reviewing the Police policy files.</p> <p>It was noted that anyone in the Gosport area who had concerns may have spoken to a local Vicar and any correspondence between the Parish Priest and members of the community would have been recorded in a "blue file".</p> <p>DH and AF are due to meet the journalist, Nina Lakhani, in July.</p> <p><u>Regulatory workstrand</u></p> <p>Links and patterns are emerging between issues in the Police policy files and the Inquest material.</p> <p>In the 80s and 90s the CPS did not routinely and proactively contact families. Some relatives seem to have had direct contact with the CPS. Material is being reviewed to understand the CPS protocol and principles in place at the time.</p> <p><u>Gosport Working Family Tree</u></p> <p>This paper covers the key players, how roles changed over time, the hierarchy and lines of accountability in GWMH during the relevant years.</p> <p>1991 is a key year with the change to the provider and commissioner role. A correlation between the names in the WFT and the stakeholder organisations worksheet will be undertaken to ensure the Panel is accessing all the relevant material that may be held by individuals listed in the WFT.</p> <p><u>Clinical Ascertainment Phase workstrand (CAP)</u></p> <p>The Panel noted the three strategic objectives below for the CAP workstrand and the next steps outlined in the Review paper.</p> <p><u>CAP's strategic objectives</u></p> <p>i. What happened? Establish what happened at GWMH</p> <p>ii. What are the numbers? Establish the total number of patients who were affected by what</p>	<p>f) CG and AF to write to the Bishop of Portsmouth asking if he has any relevant material.</p> <p>g) SW and AF to establish if there is any correlation between the names in the WFT and the stakeholder organisations worksheet to ensure the Panel is accessing all relevant material</p> <p>h) The Panel will be updated on the emerging key themes from CAP work by the Review Team in September.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>happened</p> <p>iii. Responsibility to the Families. Create detailed accounts of patients for the families who will wish feedback about what happened to their lost loved ones at the end of the Panel process.</p> <p>Further information will be provided on the emerging key themes referred to in paragraph 11 (a) of the Review paper</p>	
7.	<p>Highlight Report and High level plan</p> <p>GIP/Paper 20.5</p>	<p>This was covered within the Workstream updates in items 3-6 above.</p> <p>The new DH Minister responsible for Gosport is Philip Dunne, MP. The Bishop will seek to have an early meeting with him</p> <p>Early work has begun on the design of the Disclosure website. Panel Members will be contacted to complete a short questionnaire as part of the process.</p> <p>A focus on cyber-security in DH prompted a reminder to all Panel members about keeping information safe (electronic and paper).</p>	<p>i) TO to circulate the information on the new Minister to Panel Members.</p> <p>j) LD and TO to arrange an early meeting between the Bishop and the new Minister.</p>
8.	<p>Forward Look</p> <p>GIP/Paper 20.6</p>	<p>The Forward Look has been updated to reflect the agreed changes to the schedule of 2016 Panel.</p>	<p>k) LD to consider joining up the 'less paper' and offsite panel meetings.</p>
9.	AOB	The meeting ended at 1.20 pm	

Code A