PHSO BOARD OPEN SESSION MEETING

21 June 2018

Minutes (Approved)

MINUTES OF PHSO BOARD OPEN SESSION MEETING

21 June 2018

CHAIR:

Rob Behrens CBE, Ombudsman

NON-EXECUTIVES
Sir Alex Allan KCB
Elisabeth Davies
Dean Fathers
Ram Gidoomal CBE
Alan Graham MBE
Mick King
Ruth Sawtell
Dr Julia Tabreham

EXECUTIVES
Amanda Campbell, Chief Executive
Gill Kilpatrick, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Services (item 5)
Alex Robertson, Executive Director of External Affairs and Insight

IN ATTENDANCE
Karl Banister, Director of Legal and Governance
Andrew Dawson, Governance Officer (minutes)
James Hand, Head of Business Planning and Performance (Items 14 -16)
Abigail Howarth, Director of Operations and Quality
Steve James, Director of Human Resources (Items 5)
Richard Muirhead, Director of Finance (Items 14 & 20)
Stuart Ogden, Head of ICT and Accommodation (Item 17)
Martyn Schofield, Head of Governance
Warren Seddon, Director of Insight and Public Affairs
Paula Woodward, Chief of Staff

OBSERVERS:
Brad Denton, Performance Officer
David Guy, Performance Analyst

8.   Chair's Introduction and Welcome

8.1   The Chair welcomed members, observers and others present to the meeting.

9.   Declarations of Interest

9.1   There were no declarations of interest related to any matters on the agenda.

10.   Minutes and matters arising

10.1   The Board approved the minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2018 subject to minor amendments.

10.2   The Board agreed that the Matters Arising from 22 March 2018 (Items 12.5 and 17.9) were now closed.

11.   Chief Executive's report to the Board

11.1   The Chief Executive's report had been circulated to the Board. The report was **noted.**

11.2   Amanda Campbell said that, on casework, we had delivered exactly what we said we would and had finished the year on trajectory. However since then we had started to track behind, and were currently 378 cases behind where we had expected to be.   This was due to:
- Delays caused by the *Miller & Howarth* judgment;
- Delays in recruitment and the impact of having large numbers of new staff;
- The impact of maternity leave had been omitted from our modelling. We have now recruited against this.

Amanda Campbell said that mitigations were now in place we expected to be back on track by October.

11.3   Elisabeth Davis asked whether we were confident that the casework allocation model was accurate and free of optimism bias. Amanda Campbell said that models were iterative and that we were reasonably confident about the current model. Alex Robertson added that the Director of Operations and Quality had recently carried out a full review of the model.

11.4   Ruth Sawtell said she was assured that we believe the model is robust. She asked how confident we were that we would be back on track by the autumn. Amanda Campbell said that it was challenging, but that momentum was there and we will build on that.

11.5   Amanda Campbell said that the March Pulse Survey highlighted some concerns about bullying, discrimination and harassment.   We have therefore commissioned follow-up work from an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (ED&I) specialist to produce an insight report based on all available data. Amanda Campbell noted that staff have been overwhelmingly positive about how the organisation is changing.

11.6   Alan Graham asked if there was anything to suggest that staff were going outside of the organisation for whistleblowing purposes.   Amanda Campbell said that the only example was the trade union side writing to the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee. We had responded to

PACAC as some of the points made by the trade union side were incorrect or misleading.

11.7   Alex Allan said that he remained concerned about the pulse survey. Amanda Campbell undertook to share the ED&I insight report to the Board once it had been reviewed by the senior leadership team. The report made a number of recommendations to be taken forward.   She said that one of the report's conclusions was that our ED&I position is better than we believe it is, and that we are ahead of most of the public sector.

Action: ED&I Insight report to be circulated to the Board

11.8   Dean Fathers asked if we had sought advice from the Royal National Institute for the Blind over the accessibility of ICT to visually impaired staff. Amanda Campbell confirmed that we had not done so.

11.9   Dean Fathers asked whether our casework modelling took into account the likely impacts, short and long term, of the World Cup on staffing levels. Amanda Campbell confirmed that this had been included in our modelling.

11.10 Alex Allan asked if the revised Senior Structure could be circulated to the Board once it was finalised. Amanda Campbell agreed to do so.

Action: Finalised Senior Staff Structure to be circulated to the Board.

11.11 The Board **noted** the Chief Executive's report.

Elisabeth Davies took the Chair

12.   Ombudsman's report to the Board

12.1   A report by Rob Behrens had been distributed.

12.2   Elisabeth Davies congratulated Rob Behrens on his election to the Board of the Ombudsman Association.

12.3   The Board **noted** the Ombudsman's report.

12.4   Elisabeth Davies invited Rob Behrens to update the Board on progress on a Public Sector Ombudsman (PSO) bill. Rob Behrens said that, together with Mick King (in his role as Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman) he had recently met with the new Cabinet Office Minister of State, who had been responsive to their views. However it did not seem likely that legislative progress was likely in the next few months.

12.5   Rob Behrens said that, through the Ombudsman Association, he had raised concerns that academics had not used their unique position to comment on a possible PSO Bill. In response, a group of academics had agreed to set up a project to explore this further, and were holding a conference in January to discuss what a PSO Bill could contain.

12.6 Mick King said that in his view the PSO Bill remained parked but was not dead. He said that that this year, LGSCO were required to make a submission to the Secretary of State about the fitness of their legislation. The submission will focus on the need for a PSO Bill.

Rob Behrens resumed the Chair

13. Operational Performance Report – End of Year Report 2017-18

13.1 A report by James Hand, Head of Business Performance and Planning, and Warren Seddon, Director of Public Affairs and Insight, had been distributed. Abigail Howarth, Director of Operations and Quality, presented the report to the Board.

13.2 Abigail Howarth said that, further to the comments of the Chief Executive (paras 11.2 – 11.4), she had worked through the assumptions in our models in great detail with her assistant directors, managers and staff. It would be challenging to return to the trajectory, but she had used the review as an opportunity to ensure that staff and managers own the plan. She believed that we could now have much greater confidence in the forecasting.

13.3 Ram Gidoomal asked what key assumptions had been used in our model. Abigail Howarth said that these were about productivity, the impact of new staff, and the impact of new processes. She said that we had identified what we mean by low, medium and high performance and had identified what needed to be done to improve performance. Performance was now being tracked on a weekly basis in respect of all key assumptions.

13.4 Julia Tabreham asked whether the impact of external developments such as the WASPI[1] campaign and the Gosport Hospital report had been factored in. Abigail Howarth confirmed that this had been the case in respect of the WASPI campaign, and that managers were aware that where such extra demands arise, they need to escalate any concerns they may have about resourcing.

13.5 Mick King asked whether the review of assumptions had caused us to look again at the Target Operating Model (TOM). Abigail Howarth said that it was too early to say whether changes in TOM would be necessary.

13.6 Elisabeth Davies asked whether the casework output model could be used to forecast improvements in Service Charter data. Abigail Howarth confirmed that there was no direct correlation between output forecasting and quality measures, but that she expected improvements in output to eventually flow through into Service Charter data.

---

[1] Women Against State Pension Inequality

13.7 The Board
- **noted** PHSO operational performance, and the impact on strategic aims, for 2017-18;
- **noted** the progress of PHSO's insight projects in 2017-18.

14. Corporate Health Performance Report & Financial Monitoring Report – End of Year Report 2017-18

14.1 A report by James Hand had been distributed. Gill Kilpatrick, Executive Director Finance and Corporate Services introduced the report to the Board.

14.2 Gill Kilpatrick said that she was pleased to report a significant reduction in long term sick leave. This had steadily reduced since the peak in July, and there was now only one person on long term sick absence. This was stress-related. Alex Allan noted that short term sick leave had increased. Gill Kilpatrick confirmed that this was the case and undertook to provide more detailed information to the Board.

Action: Gill Kilpatrick to circulate a detailed sick absence report to the Board.

14.3 Mick King pointed out that table 3b (page 11) was the same as table 4a (page 12). James Hand said that table 4b was incorrect and that he would issue the correct table.

Action: James Hand to circulate corrected Corporate Health Performance Dashboard

14.4 Ram Gidoomal said that he would like to see more detailed information on ED&I, specifically relating to Black and Minority Ethnic staffing by grade. Gill Kilpatrick confirmed that more detailed information was available and undertook to share this with the Board.

Action: Gill Kilpatrick to circulate information on Black and Minority Ethnic Staff by grade to the Board.

14.5 James Hand said that there were no significant changes since the last business plan update in March 2018 (P10). We had made a decision not to pursue some business plan objectives, which were being taken forward into 2018-19.

14.6 Ruth Sawtell asked if we could be confident that the status of the ED&I action plan objective 5.1, relating to bullying, was green. Amanda Campbell said that we had delivered the action set out in the objective, but had not achieved the desired outcome. The narrative would be amended to reflect this.

Action: James Hand to amend the narrative at objective 5.1 of the ED&I Action Plan

14.7 Ram Gidoomal asked whether we held geographical data relating to objectives 1.2 and 1.3 of the ED&I action plan. James Hand replied that this information was not held.

14.8 Dean Fathers asked whether our ED&I monitoring included how staff progressed through the organisation. Gill Kilpatrick confirmed that this was tracked from initial application onwards.

14.9 Dean Fathers asked whether the ED&I characteristics of staff involved in disciplinary action were tracked. Steve James confirmed that they were.

14.10 Dean Fathers asked whether it was possible that some staff with disability characteristics did not self-identify as disabled. Gill Kilpatrick that this was possible. Staff were encouraged to disclose characteristics but could not be compelled to do so.

14.11 Alex Allan noted that use of the digital online complaints system was declining. Alex Robertson said that this was disappointing. However the design of the system was limited by the constraints of our case management system (CMS), and improvements would be built into future CMS developments.

14.12 The Board **noted** the Corporate Health Performance Report.

14.13 A Financial Monitoring Report by Richard Muirhead had been distributed as an annex to item 14. Richard Muirhead presented the report to the Board and stressed that all spending was within our control totals.

14.14 Alex Allan noted that we had underspent on our capital budget. Ruth Sawtell noted that, in particular, capital allocated to homeworking equipment had not been spent. Gill Kilpatrick responded that the ICT priorities this year had been improvements to our case management system and document management system, neither of which required capital expenditure. Richard Muirhead said that limitations on our capacity to manage programmes meant that some items had not been taken forward. Amanda Campbell added that the relocation to new premises in Manchester had placed significant pressure on the ICT team.

14.15 Dean Fathers asked whether we had sufficient cash to deliver on capital projects in the current year. Richard Muirhead said that it was likely that we would need to make a supplementary bid.

14.16 The Board **noted** the report, including:
• the end of year position against the 2017-18 Resource and Capital Budgets; and
• The position against our Parliamentary Control Totals.

15. Strategic Risk Report and Register

15.1 A report by James Hand, including the Strategic Risk Register for P12, had been distributed to the Board.   The Board were asked to **review** the risks identified, the actions in mitigation, and the corporate issues being managed.

15.2 James Hand drew the Board's attention to four key developments in the Risk Register:
- The Managing Demand risk (SR1) had been closed as it is being managed as a live issue;
- A new risk, Managing Potential Future Demand (SR14), has been created;
- The risk level for Casework Quality (SR2) had been reduced from 12 to 8, although the risk status remained Amber;
- Strategic ICT Change had been identified as a new risk (SR16).

15.3 Ruth Sawtell said that she was pleased that we had now acknowledged Strategic ICT as an area of risk.   However she was concerned that this had not emerged earlier.   Gill Kilpatrick said that it had been identified during the Business Plan process and had been added to the Corporate Risk Register, but had not been seen as a strategic risk at that time.

15.4 Ruth Sawtell noted that the impact of the General Data Protection Regulations was also recorded as a new strategic risk (SR17). She said she had understood that we were well prepared for CDPR so was concerned that it now appeared as an area of risk.   Amanda Campbell said that, whilst we were well prepared, it had been recorded as a risk as the future volume of enquiries was unknown.

15.5 Elisabeth Davies said that GDPR had been discussed at Quality Committee and she had asked for some reassurance that GDPR would not prevent us seeking feedback on quality from users of our serve. Karl Banister said that our privacy notice had been updated; we were sure of the legal basis for seeking user feedback and were confident that we could continue.

15.6 Elisabeth Davies asked about the status of the issues log (Annex 2 to the report). James Hand confirmed that there was no change in its status; we intended to retain the issues log. The issues listed were discussed at the Risk Forum and by the Senior Leadership Group before coming to the Board.

16. Risk Management Policy

16.1 A paper by James Hand, introducing a draft Risk Management Policy, had been distributed to the Board.

16.2 James Hand informed the Board Risk Management currently formed part of the Governance Framework. ARAC had accepted an audit recommendation that there should be a separate risk management policy, and had considered

and agreed the draft policy, which was now being referred to the Board for approval.

16.3   Alan Graham said that the policy had been discussed and amended by ARAC. Details of the discussion were available in the ARAC minutes (Item 21).   ARAC fully supported the policy. Ruth Sawtell agreed, and said that the policy was a good example of how responsibility could be assigned effectively.

16.4   Dean Fathers said that the policy was consistent with Institute of Management good practice. He asked whether it had been benchmarked against other Ombudsmen. James Hand said that it had not, but it had been benchmarked against other public sector organisations.

16.5   Alex Allan said that the draft policy was consistent with recent Board discussions on risk appetite and transparency.

16.6   The Board:
- **agreed** that risk management should be removed from the Governance Framework and become a standalone policy;
- **approved** the Risk Management Policy.

17.   Strategic ICT Risk

17.1   A report by Stuart Ogden (Head of ICT and Accommodation) had been distributed to the Board.

17.2   Stuart Ogden said that the report had been produced following discussion by the Board on 22 March 2018, where the Board had asked the Executive Team to consider strategic ICT risks. The report set out four key ICT risks, and the actions being planned or taken to mitigate those risks:
- the absence of an ICT strategy;
- the limited capabilities of Dynamics 365 as our casework management system;
- the ICT service provided by PHSO
- The Capita managed service contract, which expires in November 2018. However this also created an opportunity to re-specify the contract to align with current priorities.

17.3   The Board **considered** the risks and actions in mitigation.

17.3   Ram Gidoomal asked who was leading on the risk, how the work would be led, and whether there were sufficient resources. Stuart Ogden confirmed that he would be leading through a series of project boards, using subject matter experts. Each piece of work would go through a project management process which would also determine the funding requirement.   Alex Robertson said that governance of the strategy would be through the Transformation Programme.

17.4   Dean Fathers asked if the ICT strategy would be driven by developments in artificial intelligence. Stuart Ogden replied that the strategy was in its early stages, but that where it would be appropriate and useful we would look at the possibility of using artificial intelligence.

17.5   Julia Tabreham asked if we needed our systems to interface more directly with those of other organisations, such as the NHS and LGSCO. Stuart Ogden said that the aim was to meet all of the needs of the organisation. We were talking to LGSCO about developing joint systems and also looking at whether we could interface directly with the NHS.

17.6   Alex Allan asked if there was sufficient time to set up a new service contract. Stuart Ogden said one of the risk mitigations was to extend the current contract by a limited period, in order to ensure a smooth transition to the new contract.

17.7   Alan Graham asked if the ICT risk extended to PHSO's financial management systems. Gill Kilpatrick said that the financial management was robust and stable. However the human resources ICT system was less so.

18.   Annual Report and Accounts 2017-18

18.1   A report by Alex Robertson had been distributed to the Board, together with the draft Annual Report and Accounts.

18.2   Alex Robertson advised the Board that the draft Annual Report and Accounts were now with the National Audit Office (NAO). They would be amended in line with any feedback from NAO then would come before the Board again for final approval on 6 July 2018. Alan Graham added that it would also be reviewed by ARAC immediately before the 6 July Board.

18.3   Ruth Sawtell said that she was concerned that the draft Annual Report still made a number of references to *our casework* and *our services* etc. Amanda Campbell said that most had been removed, but that where we deemed it appropriate they had been retained.

18.4   Julia Tabreham queried whether, as stated on page 21, NHS Trusts *must* share our investigation reports with the Care Quality Commission. Rob Behrens said that there is no legal requirement for them to do so. Rather we ask them to. Amanda Campbell said that we were looking at the possibility of sharing reports with CQC directly.

18.5   Dean Fathers suggested that future reports should be prepared using Integrated Reporting principles. Alex Robertson said that the report was intended to meet a number of reporting requirements, but would be redeveloped on 2018-19 as we would be reporting against our new strategy.

18.6   The Board **noted** the draft Annual Report and Accounts.

19.   Stakeholder Research

19.1   A report by Warren Seddon, including a summary of findings from MP research in 2017, and a summary of activities to increase awareness of PHSO, had been distributed to the Board.

19.2   Warren Seddon explained the 2017 survey of MPs suggested that we were perceived positively by an increasing proportion of MPs and that, broadly, we were in a good place. On that basis he was proposing that we did not carry out a stakeholder survey this year, but that we should do so in 2019-20, which would be the middle year of our new strategy.

19.3   Alex Allan asked who we considered to be our stakeholders. Warren Seddon replied that, in the context of this proposal he was mainly referring to MPs and regulators. We carried out separate, ongoing research into the views of our complainants.

19.4   Elisabeth Davies said that it was important that we recognised the role played by MPs' caseworkers, who were often key in generating referrals to PHSO.   Warren Seddon agreed, and said that he had recently attended an event in Parliament for MPs' caseworkers.

19.5   Dean Fathers asked if we had any contact with Lords who had a Health interest. Warren Seddon confirmed that we did, and said that a meeting was being arranged between the Ombudsman and Peers.

19.6   The Board **noted** the research findings and **agreed** the proposal not to conduct research this year.

20.   Value for Money Study and response to PACAC.

20.1   A paper by Richard Muirhead had been distributed to the Board.

20.2   Richard Muirhead explained that the paper aimed to set out our approach to delivering our Business Plan commitment to carry out a Value for Money study. It also included as an annex a draft response to recommendations made by PACAC in their annual scrutiny report, which included a recommendation to commission an external Value for Money study.

20.3   Richard Muirhead said that the paper sought to define what we understood by Value for Money. He said that assessing how we added value through our casework was particularly difficult. It was proposed to take the work forward in two stages, which would allow us to take into account the Value for Money pilots being taken forward by Michael Barber and to draw on work by the Cabinet Office.

20.4   Rob Behrens said that, rather than commission an external consultancy assessment, we proposed to carry out a peer assessment by another Ombudsman and panel.

20.5   Ram Gidoomal said that it was important that monetary value was balanced with equity. Rob Behrens agreed, saying that some communities were under-represented. The issue was to extend use of our service beyond our traditional customer base. This was not necessarily a question of spending more money.

20.6   Dean Fathers said that the question of how we added value was extremely complex. It arguably included the cost of alternative means of resolution, such as judicial review, as well as the value of our insight reports and the provision of themes of learning to the NHS both nationally and regionally. Rob Behrens agreed, saying that our insight reports were crucial. Elisabeth Davies said that values must include what our service users value. Alan Graham agreed that value went much wider than simple monetary value.

20.7   Julia Tabreham said that we needed a clear methodology to determine and demonstrate the value of our service.   Other key issues were how we dealt with barriers to access, and the impact we had on partners such as independent complaint advocates.

20.8   Ruth Sawtell asked about future insight reports. Warren Seddon replied that we were looking at options for future insight papers. The limitations of our casework management system made it difficult to use data to inform future reports. However several options for future papers were being considered. The Ombudsman stressed that the impetus had to flow from themes within our casework. Dean Fathers asked whether Windrush might be an option. Warren Seddon said that there were no related cases as yet.

20.9   The Board:
•   Agreed the proposed approach to the Value for Money study;
•   **Noted** the draft response to the PACAC report.

21.   Report: Audit and Risk Assurance Committee

21.1   The draft minutes of the ARAC meeting of 10 May 2018 had been circulated. Alan Graham (Committee Chair) provided the Board with an update on matters discussed at the meeting.

21.2   Alan Graham reported that NAO's representation on the Committee had changed as their senior person had moved on.

21.3   Alan Graham said that he and Richard Muirhead had exchanged correspondence with Treasury over the error in the supplementary estimates. Treasury had acknowledged their part in the error and there was a clear audit trail.

21.4   Alan Graham said that KPMG had carried out two internal audits. The Corporate Performance audit had been satisfactory (amber/green).   The draft report of the Business Continuity Audit had been submitted to the Executive Team, who were now in discussion with KPMG about the audit

findings. However KPMG had assured ARAC that business continuity was in place. Amanda Campbell added that our systems had proved to be resilient in practice, but that there were issues with the documentation.

21.5 The recommendations of the Information Commissioner's Office Data Protection Audit had now been implemented.

21.6 Since the meeting on 10 May 2018 the technical walkthrough of accounts had taken place. Notes were available if needed

21.7 Alan Graham advised that KPMG's contract as out internal auditors ended this year and procurement for a new contract would commence shortly. Amanda Campbell added that procurement was being undertaken jointly with LGSCO.

21.8 Elisabeth Davies asked about the timing of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion internal audit report and whether it should be held back until after the Insight report was issued. Gill Kilpatrick said that they approached the subject from different perspectives but that they would be combined into one plan.

21.9 Alan Graham advised that the next ARAC meeting would discuss the Finance and Governance Statements, but there would be no ARAC deep dive in July.

22.   Report: Quality Committee

22.1 Draft minutes of the Quality Committee meeting on 23 May 2018 had been distributed. Elisabeth Davies said that each Committee Member would feed back to the Board on part of the Committee's business.

22.2 Elisabeth Davies said that the Committee had for the first time received a quarterly Quality report which included three sets of data from multiple sources: Complainant feedback; our own Casework Process Assurance scores; Customer Care Team insight; and feedback from Organisations we investigate.   This was starting to produce a broader picture, with synergy across the data.

22.3 Elisabeth Davies said she wished to draw the Board's attention to two points in the minutes. At 4.17 the Committee was seeking reassurance about the process and guidance for caseworkers when determining that cases were premature. At 4.12 the Committee had raised concerns about the continued declining score on Commitment 8 (thoroughness) and were asking when this was likely to be reversed.   One of the key focuses of the Committee was asking when we could expect to see improvements in Quality flowing through from changes to processes and the training programme.   Amanda Campbell said that the Behavioural Insights Team had noted that much of the work we did was not always visible to complainants and had recommended that we should set out how we had investigated the complaint in far greater detail.

22.4   Julia Tabreham said that Quality went much broader than the Service Charter standards and included factors such as barriers to access and the underrepresentation of certain groups, as well as the value added by our Insight reporting.

22.5   Julia Tabreham said that measuring quality was challenging even where ready measures existed. It was not always appropriate to average or aggregate data, or to look at variance and tolerance. Looking at Quality also required information about outlier cases.

22.6   Dean Fathers reported that the Quality Committee had discussed the value of direct user engagement and were looking at how best to incorporate the qualitative feedback which would be obtained from users into our Committee structure. This would also need to include feedback from Bodies in Jurisdiction.   He said that 'data blindness' was a particular challenge – too much data made it difficult to pick out that which was useful.

22.7   Mick King said that he was also concerned about data blindness.   Whilst LGSCO did not have a Quality Committee, they did operate a separate Quality Oversight process which involved 32 quality measures. However in his view the best measure of quality was the finished product in the form of investigation reports.   He reflected that he was not aware of any Ombudsman scheme that could definitively say whether quality was improving or declining.

22.8   Ram Gidoomal asked when the Quality Assurance scorecard would be ready to publish externally.   Elisabeth Davies said that the scorecard was being developed mainly for internal use. Alex Robertson added that it would need to be meaningful, and to be tested carefully.

22.9   Ram Gidoomal said that the Committee's work was important. Confidence in quality was integral to PHSO's standing. Building that quality was a long term project.

22.10   Alex Allan said that the he admired the Committee's thorough approach. He commented that he shared the concerns set out in para. 4.7 of the minutes about the loss of specialist knowledge and said that it was essential that we moved to a comprehensive knowledge platform.   Alex Robertson said that we were working hard to develop this.

23. Governance Report – Register of Interests and Fit and Proper Person Policy

23.1   A report by Gill Kilpatrick, including an updated Register of Board Member Interests had been distributed. Martyn Schofield (Head of Governance) presented the report to the Board.

23.2   Martyn Schofield asked that Board Members advise her of any amendments to the register of interests or otherwise confirm that their entry is correct.

23.3 The Board **agreed** that the Fit and Proper Person Policy should be incorporated into the Governance Framework and come under the remit of ARAC.

24. Any Other Business

24.1 Alex Allan provided the Board with a brief update on the Clinical Advice Review which he was taking forward. Julia Tabreham was also involved. The review team had recently met with the Assistant Director for Clinical Advice, a group of senior clinicians, and a senior caseworker. The review was challenging, as it was consulting widely both internally and externally. The review report was due in November. There was some overlap with the work on the new clinical standard, so the team were also working closely with Karl Banister.

24.2 Rob Behrens said that it was Richard Muirhead's final attendance at a PHSO Board meeting as he is leaving the organisation to take up a new role outside. He thanked Richard for the work he had done for the organisation and his contribution to Board meetings.

25. Review of the Meeting

25.1 Rob Behrens asked the observers present for their views of the meeting. Brad Denton said that he had found the meeting extremely interesting, with lots of questions from different perspectives. David Guy said that it had been useful and interesting, and not at all dry. It was personally useful to him to see where his work as a performance analyst ends up.

25.2 Rob Behrens said that Dean Fathers had made some really useful points about bringing in user perspectives. He said that it was also vital that we obtained body in jurisdiction perspective.

25.3 Dean Fathers said that the meeting had had a very good focus on diversity.

26. Next Meeting

26.1 The next meeting is on 27 September 2018 in Manchester.

The meeting ended at 16:00