

		Ian share the draft report with the lead paed, lead neontaologist and lead nurse.
Oct 2016	Programme Board written update	“Two recent reviews have become much more complex than initially anticipated, mainly due to the management (our clients) not being open and honest with their paediatric team and/or not responding to our requests for data. This is always a risk given that the reason we are invited may be due to dysfunctionality but we are reflecting on how to ensure our approach is appropriate and we identify and mitigate problems at an early stage”.
27 th October	Sue E	Appendix 4 with case details and invoice sent to the Trust
11 Nov	From Paeds	Dr Brearey copied me to an internal note – the paediatricians had seen the redacted report and made some comments which were forwarded to RCPCH on 15 th November, confirming the draft report had been seen by the Execs, Steve Brearey, Ravi Jayaram and Ann Murphy (in place of Eirian Powell) and there comments have been taken in to account.
28 Nov	David S – QA of final report	Queried why the Trust did not go to the police originally. “Quite an interesting and complex review. Good to have David M leading that one. Almost felt a bit like the Grantham situation 30 years ago and my only question was why they didn't involve the police if they had those suspicions. Otherwise looks like a good report with very clear recommendations”
28 Nov 16	To Ian	Final report sent with covering letter from Dr Shortland
6 Jan 17	From Ian correspondence and reply about publishing a redacted version of the report	We are reaching the end of the forensic review, just waiting for secondary pathology reviews of 4 cases, and are now discussing the sharing of reports. We have concerns that effectively there are two reports, one described as confidential and the other for dissemination. We don't want to be seen as concealing anything given how that would be perceived post Morecombe Bay, and whilst I appreciate that the former related to HR aspects regarding one of our nurses, is there anything in the report that the College wouldn't want published or were the two reports purely to protect the nurse and the Trust? From SE – after taking advice from review team Dear Ian Thanks for your note and Happy New Year - with all the challenges that brings! The latter. From our perspective either can be published if you choose to do so; we recognised the importance of wide dissemination of the report but also the responsibility to protect individuals for the HR issues (that aspect is the only difference) which we had a duty to report formally to you as they were a concern to