

THURS. 29. DEC. 16.

10.00. DN. Neonates. (see sep. note) Level 1? Level 2?
 Mb. with TC & IH. on 30.12.16.

11.00. Rose G. (Greenbury rules).
 Disclosure. Q. of Ian Reitt?
 Debs / Simon!

11.30. km. (End of service)

12.00. Sue H. (Debs) (MAU)

FRI. 30 DEC. 16.

9.15. TC. NEONATES. DEBS.

9.45. TE. ROR HOWARTH. Tele-briefing L. of Intent.

Irrelevant & Sensitive

10.15. NEONATES. DN TC. IH. LB. SPC.

IH. Summary update.

Un-redacted version → should it go anywhere?

Re-dacted version. (Debs & Chair)

further in-depth review. IH. Collating all case reviews. (Jane Horden)

'Aim is to get all info in one version' by end of next wk - 6 Jan. 17.

TC 2 rep matters - Review (as above)

- to what next?

re. Neonates plan?

what level (1) (2) or (3) going forward.

DISTRIBUTION?

- PARENTS.
- COLONEL.
- IN-HOUSE (AIDS TEAM)
- NETWORK.
- IN-HOUSE (Nutting)
- Press Chronicle.

IA. has met with Gill Galt re: mths. needed
Chronicle has been in touch for more info.

IA & LB. hu. met with Network & will be supportive.

- Network wd like a copy of the Review.

LB. Pressures in system. see SPEC. COMM.

L. from Vincent Connolly NHS.

TC. Whole thing tricky. & net Board.

but need to 'complete' Paed. consultants.

Difficult mth with Lucy & family.

- commitment to them at mth. eg. safety of babies.

- exposed in mth. somewhat reputation of Trust.

↳ it. qn'ts need by Consultants.

↳ ∴ no alternative to moving Lucy

↳ sment from Lucy & family needs to be shared with Board & Paed. consultants.

↳ challenge of return of Lucy to unit & Trust will manage this return.

↳ ∴ mth with Paed consultants needs to address

grievance of Lucy - apology requested from Paed consultants.
what is apology for? 'victimisation'

IA. → apology for behaviour - language used by Paed consultants

↳ original decision to move Lucy - vindicated.

↳ Lucy work mediation. to improve relationships.

DN. finish Review. (some unexplained but not unusual')

Does not leave open Q.

Clarity on any concerns & reference against standards.

o Strategic issue & finances.

Will review demand bring requirements? IA. YES.

Investment needed if back to level 2.

IA. Money for Paeds. service. R&H.

DN. Board wd want to understand. Investment needed

& Network requirements. & do we want it?

LB. Need over-arching action plan following recommendation in Review.

NEONATES (cont) 30.12.16.

TC. Going forward refer back to what was sd. at Board mtg. with Paed. Consultants, B4. decision on Level 1 & 2.

LB. Business case? Do we need a level 2.

Looking at last 6mths. No deaths. Little movement of babies. & no late transfers.

INCLUDE IN UPDATE TO BOARDS.

IH. Network not expecting COCH. to go back to level 2. quickly

LB. Network plan -> expected done/July '17

EXPECTATIONS FOR BOARD MTG?

TC. Remove emotional - focus on clinical & financial responsibility

DN. Shd wait until network plan

10 Jan 17. Nxt 6 steps. to just the Board

TC. Nxt steps to go forward. Prev. mtg 30 Dec 16. - follow up. with Paed. Consultants. DN to represent NEDS + relevant execs.

Mtg to include behaviours & outcome from mtg. with Lucy

IH. Lori Steve B. & Anne Murphy hv. seen draft. Review. Steve B. - reasonable person.

TC. Sequence: Lucy mtg.

* B4 ^{14TH JAN} Board mtg. (w. 17) -> formal acceptance of review action plan. Then mtg with Paed consultants. + then

DN. Importance of 32 wks. & explanation.

-> Reserve its position on Level 1 or Level 2?

IH. Coroner response by SPZ. IH & SPZ. to mtg Coroner by end of January.

-> Endorse transition of Lucy back into unit.

TC. Re-drafted version. to be used.

-> Re-drafted & Un-re-drafted copies.

to check with the H.