

Pharmacy Review Steering Committee (PRSC) Minutes

4th June 2020

Attendees and role

David Wright, Independent Chair (UEA, Norwich) [DW]

Shilpa Shah, LPC Representative (LPC Executive Officer representative) [SS]

Ruth Buchan, LPC Representative (LPC Executive Officer representative) [RB]

David Bearman, LPC Representative (LPC member representative) [DB]

Vicki Roberts, LPC Representative (LPC member representative) [VR]

Mark Ireland, Contractor Representative (CCA) [MI]

Adrian Price, Contractor Representative (CCA) [AP]

Reena Barai, Contractor Representative (Independent) [RBa]

Peter Cattee, Contractor Representative (non-CCA multiple) [PC]

Simon Dukes, PSNC Representative (CEO PSNC) [SD]

Richard Whittington, LOC representative (CEO LOCSU) [RW]

Zoe Long, Observer (Director of Communications and Public Affairs at PSNC) [ZL]

Bethany Atkins, Administrator (UEA, Norwich) [BA]

1) Welcome and apologies

The committee were welcomed by the chair. Apologies had been received from Asif Alidina and Richard Whittington (unable to attend afternoon only).

2) Minutes from 5th March (Accuracy)

The PRSC discussed the draft minutes from the previous PRSC meeting on the 05/03/2020. Minor amendments were requested for accuracy purposes only.

3) Views from the committee (Round table discussion)

The main messages from the PRSC discussion regarding the report were as follows:

- There was concern around current LPC chairs having capacity to be at the centre of the proposed structure for Community Pharmacy England (CPE). The CPEC would not necessarily get the representation as those in the current roles may not be able to take on the extra responsibilities.
 - DW stated that this should not be a reason not to move LPCs to the centre but means that LPCs will need time to ensure that they have a chair who is able or willing to take on the extra responsibility
- There was also concern around governance and the proposed role of the CPEC. The committee noted that the proposed structure would only work with good governance and training. The report needs to include more on LPC governance.
 - DW stated that the CPE board would provide governance oversight
 - He recognised that the statement regarding CPEC members signing up to this was at the end of a paragraph rather than separate.
- It was noted that negotiation training also needs to come down to LPC level.
 - DW stated that this was already in the report but clearly needed highlighting better
- The report needs to include more on training overall and could have included a recommendation on how we address pharmacy training.
 - DW stated that this is considered under the HR team on the diagram, the recommendations recommend more standardised training and he had noted the lack of focus on pharmacist training and workforce in current negotiations in the discussion. Hence it is recommended as a policy group.
- It was noted that Scotland has significantly more funding and therefore comparison is not appropriate.
 - DW agreed to include a statement to this effect in the report
- It was also noted that GPs do not have the complexity we have in community pharmacy with multiples, independent multiples, etc. and have different business models.
 - DW agreed to include a statement to this effect in the report
- It was agreed that there needs to be more clarity around the proposed role of the strategy committee vs. the council (CPEC).

- DW stated that this level of detail would require consideration once the CPEC was set up and was beyond his report where he has tried not to be too prescriptive with the recommendations. This is to allow the network to make the decisions by themselves.
- There was concern that the recommendations/structure will not reduce duplication or achieve a reduction in variation between LPCs.
 - DW stated this was the point of a governance framework and KPIs and the need to sign up to this. Also COVID-19 found that LPCs were working better together and by creating a structure to enable better sharing of practice was seen to be reducing duplication.
- There was agreement that the discussion (specifically detail regarding proportionality and fair representation) needs to come earlier in the report.
 - DW agreed to replicate the discussion earlier but shorten it to ensure that the main reasons for the decisions are easily seen.
- It was noted that the model in Wales is working at a very different scale, and moving to a council in England where there isn't proportionality will have some significant concerns.
- It was noted that while the structure takes several reads to understand, it is very transparent. Reorganising the structure of the report/including more of the Discussion upfront would help explain the proposed CPE structure.
 - DW agreed to reformat the report as suggested
- It was noted that there needs to be consistency between how the PSNC committee functions and how LPCs function.
- Re: reserves – it was noted that the diligence of the report rightfully highlighted the significant amount of money that isn't currently being utilised. It was noted that the report will help ensure more transparency.
 - DW noted that he had not commented on reserves in his discussion and would do so in the final version
- There was discussion around whether it is the right time to share the report in light of Covid-19. There was agreement that Covid-19 has accelerated primary care significantly in a matter of weeks and this needs to be captured in the report.
 - Overall agreement the report is pertinent and timely and taps into an overarching demand for change.
- There was discussion around the Pharmacy Integration Fund (PHIF). The committee asked why funds would be sought from here and not other funding streams, such as LPC reserves and NHS transformation. The point was raised that the PHIF will have been utilised over the of the pandemic and that the report/recs cannot rely on it.
 - DW agreed to encourage access for external funding wherever appropriate and from appropriate sources to minimise the cost to contractors
- There was concern around whether the report was pitched correctly for the average contractor.
 - DW agreed to add a structure of what the PSNC currently looks like to enable the reader to visualise the proposed transformation.
- There was discussion around the time and pace of the recommendations – the proposed structure and recommendations may not be fit for purpose if implemented in three years' time. There was agreement that we need to do things quicker than anticipated and DW would prioritise the recs?

- DW stated that he had originally written recommendations with a three-year timescale underpinning them but finally decided to identify the priorities i.e. what had to happen first and then allow the network to agree timelines for everything else.
- It was noted that honorarium payments should be based on workload.
 - DW agreed and stated that he would make this expectation clearer in the report
- There was concern around the proposed structure, specifically the Chief Execs group and Chairs group. DW to consider how to manage these so as not to create any dissonance.
 - DW acknowledged this but felt that the council should be constituted with those elected to their posts and the COs would provide greatest value to the network by working more closely with and supporting the executive as was seen with the RAT
- It was noted that the word 'chemist' is used in primary and secondary legislation, however there was agreement that the word should be removed from public facing documents.
 - DW stated that he would change the wording to acknowledge the fact that the word cannot be easily just removed at present.

Localism/LPCS:

- It was noted that the recommendations are top down and could be seen as disempowering for LPCs – they do not adequately recognise the powerful role LPCs can have at local level.
 - DW did not understand this. By placing them central to decision making at all levels their contribution was being fully recognised.
- It was noted that LPCs need to be agile, and they need guidance and fluidity so can react to local issues. It was noted that there needed to be flexibilities so that LPCs can have their own essence.
 - DW agreed with this and would include a comment to make it clear that this is not about reducing innovation which occurs in LPCs but about making sure that Levy funds are used for representative purposes
- There was concern about backlash to the report, specifically as some members of the committee felt the report used negative language in places. Overall agreement that there needs to be more in report about inspiring the local and more positivity. Covid-19 has shown how much is done locally and this could be better reflected.
 - DW agreed to read the report again, as this was submitted on the 1st of April and would revise the language in the report to address these concerns.
- It was noted that some employees should perhaps have voting rights on LPCs as they understand the local pressures and patients.
 - DW stated that whilst we have proportionality in LPCs (which currently wasn't appropriate to remove) then giving additional non-elected members voting rights changes this balance. Once there was evidence that everyone was voting in the best interests of community pharmacy then these recommendations regarding proportionality and non-elected members could be reviewed.

- It was noted that work around the transition to the proposed CPE structure needs to be addressed in the report, specifically regarding national vs. local. There was concern about whether the recs could be interpreted as a diminishing of localism. Highlight local variation – we will still have variation and it is about how we will manage this sensibly. The management of this is a critical element that is missing in the report.
 - DW stated that he would review the report considering this concern. However, there is no desire to affect localism and this is already clearly stated in the discussion.

4) Recommendations – how best to present them / Report structure

The main suggestions from the PRSC regarding the report structure and how best to present the recommendations were as follows:

- The terms ‘Consider’ and ‘Review’ within recommendations allows inaction and to consider the use of these words i.e. where there should be some clearer direction provided
- Consider including guidance on what size committees are appropriate, i.e. include numbers (keep fairly wide)
- Consider that the committee size could have an odd number of people for voting purposes
- Explicitly mention maintaining proportionality within LPCs
- Consider listing the recommendations in priority order, or add a timeframe/prioritisation ranking to the recommendations as they are
- Election cycles: LPCs might be out of sync to the 2022 election cycle.
- While the report needs more positivity in places, it is imperative that it remains straight and honest
- The report is paid for by contractor levy, and so contractor views need to be captured and documented in the report
- All appendices to be made publicly available on Pharmacy Review website

There was discussion about whether the finer details should be removed from the main report for length/clarity and moved to the appendices and website. There was agreement that all detail would be included in the main report for transparency.

Revised structure of report:

Part 1 (highlight the three main messages: governance, CPEC, funding for PSNC):

- Recommendations
- Executive summary
- Discussion (change to ‘Explanation for Recs’)
- Table

- CPE structure (DW to add current PSNC structure and more detail upfront to explain the structure)

Part 2:

- Methods/results
- Review agenda/objectives
- Conclusion

ACTION DW: Produce two-page PR document

5) Comms

There was discussion that more needs to be done with LPCs to make them aware of the virtual event on July 8th. A registration link for the event will go live by 5th June.

Future comms/events will be decided based on the outcome/feedback from the breakout sessions on July 8th.

It was agreed that the independent review team (Linda Birt, Michael Twigg and Hannah Family) will be present at the meeting with LPCs and PSNC members and contractor evening. DW will be attending the press briefings on his own.

Dates:

17th June – Press briefing

19th June – Report goes public

29th June – Contractor webinar

July 8th – LPC and PSNC virtual event