




**National Association Steering Group Meeting No 3**  
**12 July 2007,**  
**CPPIH London Office, 163 Eversholt Street, London, NW1 1BU**

**Attendees:** Malcolm Alexander (Chair), Ruth Marsden (Vice Chair), Josephine Percy, Ian Thomasson, Hali Qureshi, Leslie Forsyth (CPPIH), Ray Crocken, John Amos, Elli Pang, Len Roberts, Michael English, Iris Parker Smith and Sharlene Bedward (CPPIH, note taker).

**Apologies:** Tony Darwood, Bob Maggs, Trevor Gauntlett, Sharon Doyle and William Hatton

<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion Details</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<b>Minutes of the meeting held June 20, 2007</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The new format of the minutes was approved.</li> <li>2) The minutes of the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting were agreed a correct record</li> <li>3) It was agreed that the date of distribution of minutes be added to the end of the document.</li> <li>4) The correspondence Response Book was shown to each member of the Steering Group.</li> </ol>	
<b>Matters Arising</b>	<b>Name of Association</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) John Amos objected to the renaming of the Association to the National Association of Patients' Forums on the grounds that the Association does not have a mandate from Forum members to rename the Association. It was agreed that in view of the need to make clear to members and other organisations and colleagues what the purpose of the organisation was, that the name would continue to be used. It was also agreed to use 'patient and</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use PPIF in the strap line of all NAPF publication</li> <li>• Explain reason for the change in NAPF newsletter</li> <li>• Consult on the name of the Association at NAPF campaign meetings.</li> </ul>

		<p>public involvement forums' as a strap line in publications and to explain the reason for the change in the NAPF newsletter and consult when the Association holds its campaign meetings.</p>	
<p><b>EDM</b></p>	<p></p>	<p><b>Early Day Motions (EDM)</b>                  It was noted that several EDM had been initiated by MPs. It was agreed to review these and to decide whether it would be best to support one of the EDMs or propose a new one for the next parliamentary session.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Malcolm and Ruth to look at the Early Day Motions (EDM) and recommend which one to support.</li> <li>• Once the EDM has been agreed run a national campaign to get 200 MPs to sign up if this is likely to fit the parliamentary timetable for the Local Government and PIH Bill</li> <li>• See appendix one (below)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Manifesto</b></p>	<p></p>	<p><b>Manifesto</b>                  Ruth presented the draft Manifesto to Steering Group members. A number of changes were suggested and it was agreed that RM and MA will discuss and present re-present to SG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RM and MA to represent Manifesto to SG for August meeting</li> </ul>
<p><b>Partner Organisations</b></p>	<p></p>	<p><b>Contacts with partner Organisation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Royal Colleges:</b> RM reported that she had been in contact with the Royal Colleges regarding joint work on the Bill and publicity</li> <li>2) <b>National Voices:</b> Noted that Len had written to National Voices and agreed to sit on their Planning Group if an invitation could be secured. Agreed that he would represent the Steering Group.</li> <li>3) <b>National Centre for Involvement:</b> Eli reported that she had made contact with</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

	<p>Jonathan Tritter of the NCI and that they had agreed to meet. Agreed that Eli would get dates and either Ruth or Malcolm would attend as well.</p> <p>4) Status of NCI: LF clarified the role of NCI as a client of the DH and therefore bound to carry out contracted roles.</p> <p>5) Agreed to make contact with the Local Government Information Unit (LGIU), Centre for Public Involvement and the Democratic Health Network <i>✓</i></p>	
<p>Local Government Association <i>✓</i></p>	<p>LGA: Noted that Matt Hibberd from the LGA was unable to attend the Steering Group meeting. Agreed to continue to find a meeting date.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact Matthew Hibberd and find a suitable date to meet.</li> <li>• See Appendix Two</li> </ul>
<p>NAPF letters to Local Authorities</p>	<p><b>Local Authorities with social services responsibilities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that CPPIH was in the process of sending letters about the 'gap' on behalf of the NAPF, to each relevant local authority in the name of Regional Steering Group members. Agreed to present responses to the August Steering Group meeting.</li> <li>• Agreed to follow up any LAs which have not replied within 20 working days. Local Steering Group members will prod LAs where possible.</li> <li>• Agreed to follow up contact with LAs with NAPG information packs.</li> <li>• LF agreed to distribute spread sheet of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present responses to the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> <li>• Steering Group members to report back on LA contacts</li> <li>• LF distribute spread sheet of LAs</li> </ul>

	contact details for LAs.	to all Steering Committee members.
<p><b>Meeting with Meredith Vivian</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MA and ME gave a detailed account of the meeting with Meredith Vivian.</li> <li>MA to feedback to MV that the Steering Group wished to be consulted on secondary legislation and draft policy documents. Agreed as a fall-back position that a smaller group of 8 members would be involved in reviewing documents. The following people were elected to the 'consultation group': xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</li> <li>John Amos protested at the attitude of MV concerning the 'gap' between Patients' Forums and LINKs. JA agreed to distribute a draft letter for MV to all members of the steering committee.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MA agreed to contact MV on the issues of consultation on draft documents</li> <li>JA to write to MV re the gap (letter attached)</li> <li>Final report of meeting with MV attached.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MA to contact MV and request a copy of the draft contract</li> </ul>
<p><b>Model Contract</b></p>	<p><b>Model Contract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the model contract had not been shared with the NAPF, but had been received by FSOs. Agreed that MA would contact MV to request a copy of the model contract.</li> <li>The contract was expected to be ready by the end of June</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefing of relevant Peers to continue up to the Committee Stage of the Bill</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Government and PIH Bill in the Lords</b></p>	<p><b>Peers:</b> Noted that Peers had been briefed on the Bill by MA and had been supplied with a briefing paper on amendments for the</p>	

		<p>Committee stage of the Bill. MA felt that a very positive response had been received from Earl Howe. A meeting had been arranged with Baroness Neuberger for July 17<sup>th</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the Bill would return to the Lords on July 19<sup>th</sup> 2007</li> <li>• LF reported that the position of the DH appeared to have shifted and that they now considered the gap needed to be managed and that a strategy would be necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MA to produce report on the Bill for the August meeting of the Steering Group</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Government and PIH Bill in the Commons</b></p>	<p><b>Commons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that a letter will be sent to each English MP together with a briefing paper and the report on the NAPF meeting with MV to prepare them for the LG Bill when it returns to the Commons.</li> <li>• LF agreed that the letter would be sent out by CPPIH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MA and RM to finalise letter and Briefing Note to MPs - attached.</li> <li>• LF to arrange for distribution of letter and briefing note.</li> <li>• LF to confirm method used to distribute letter to MPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ME to prepare draft letters and MA to distribute to members of the SG.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Correspondence with the Treasury and Cabinet Office</b></p>	<p><b>The gap:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to write to the Alistair Darling to advise him about the problem of the 'gap' which will result if Forum are closed before LINKs are running and to propose a solution.</li> </ul> <p><b>Visiting arrangements for LINKs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to write to Ed Miliband the Communities Minister concerning the problem of visiting patients in NHS</li> </ul>		

	Trusts and the proposal that such visits should be arranged through the HCC or CISC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michael English agreed to draft these letters.</li> </ul>	
<b>NAPF Newsletter</b>	<p><b>Newsletter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed that the NAPF Newsletter would be distributed to all Forum member by CPPIH to their home address.</li> <li>Agreed it was essential to get information about the NAPF to Forum members asap and to involve every member in the parliamentary process through their local MPs.</li> <li>Agreed NAPF also needed to emphasize the duties and responsibilities of Forum and FSOs and to keep going.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MA and RM to produce newsletter and CPPIH to distribute</li> </ul>	
<b>National Meeting of NAPF</b>	<p><b>National Meetings of the NAPF:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RM proposed a national campaigning meeting of the NAPF. It was agreed that two meetings (North and South) would be more practical. It was agreed that RM and MA would produce a proposal for the next meeting.</li> <li>LF thought that a national meeting would cost about £30,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leslie to check if money is available to fund two regional events.</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Meetings</b>	Agreed to arrange meetings with Anne Keene, the Minister of Health and Stephen O'Brien, the Opposition front bench spokesperson on health		
<b>Date of Next meeting</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> of August 2007		

## Appendix One

EDM 1407 39 signatures

Printable EDM. Signatures

### PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE NHS

02.05.2007  
Vis, Rudi

That this House welcomes the Third Report of the House of Commons Health Committee's recommendation that local involvement networks should have the same involvement forums as at present; believes that local involvement networks to visit premises and that the regulator should not have the ability to require Government to remove proposed restrictions on service providers' duties and involvement in Health Bill.

EDM 1169 38 signatures

Printable EDM. Signatures

### PATIENT FORUMS

20.03.2007

Meale, Alan

That this House is aware that contained within the Government's proposals is its wish as identified in its clauses 153 to 164 to abolish Patient Forums established just over three years ago in local primary care trusts in replacement thought-out and if enacted likely to weaken considerably statutory independence to desist from such moves and to give forums time to deliver their worth

EDM 1811 64 signatures

Printable EDM. Signatures

### FUTURE OF PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FORUMS

14.03.2006

Leech, John

That this House welcomes the work of Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) forums to secure improvements in health services in many constituencies; notes that the Government is still reviewing the future of patient and public involvement in health and is concerned at suggestions that local authority overview and scrutiny committees could take on the work of PPI forums; believes the overview and scrutiny process is often highly politicised and can be used as a rubber stamp of executive decision-making, and that committees are already overstretched; further believes that the strength of PPI forums is that they are people-focused and work outside the party political arena; and therefore urges the Government not to retreat from supporting independent patient and public involvement bodies.

EDM 637

32 signatures

Printable EDM.

Signatures

PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FORUMS  
20.07.2005

Gibson, Ian

That this House welcomes the Government's continued commitment to a patient-centred NHS and to effective patient and public engagement in decision-making; notes with concern that patient and public involvement (PPI) forums, which have only existed since December 2003, are to undergo a further reorganisation in the coming year leading to a reduction in forum numbers and a loss of focus on ambulance, mental health and acute trusts; further notes with concern that reorganisation so early in the life of PPI forums could destabilise the system before it has the opportunity to develop properly and show its full benefits, leading to a loss of confidence amongst forum members; and further notes with concern that the abolition of the Commission for Patient and Public Involvement in Health, without any single national body to replace it, may impede the ability of patients and the public to influence decision-making on health services at a national level.

**Appendix Two:**

**Sent:** 08 August 2007 11:52

**Subject:** Development of LINKS

Hi Malcolm,

I will be on leave on 14 August but I do think it would be good to meet up. For information, our position on LINKs is that any delay to them 'going live' may well lead to confusion, duplication and additional costs to maintain patient forums, which consequently may leave LINKs under-funded. We therefore support the proposed date for them going operational and believe the best way to ensure we meet this deadline is by encouraging councils to start preparatory work (who those who haven't yet started) and keeping the momentum up (for those who have). I know this is not the position of the NAPF, but this is why I think it would be good for us to meet to discuss the agenda. I also think it would be good if our new Programme Director joined us. 21, 22 and morning of 24 August look quite clear at the moment – let me know if any of those are convenient.

Look forward to hearing from you and apologies this meeting has taken a while to arrange. Best, Matthew Hibberd



**Appendix Three:**

Notes on meeting of July 12<sup>th</sup> prepared by Ruth