

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| DECISION-MAKER: | HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE | | |
| SUBJECT: | HEALTH SCRUTINY 2012/13 – REVIEW | | |
| DATE OF DECISION: | 21 March 2013 | | |
| REPORT OF: | HEAD OF COMMUNITIES, CHANGE AND PARTNERSHIPS | | |
| <u>CONTACT DETAILS</u> | | | |
| AUTHOR: | Name: | Caronwen Rees | Tel: 023 80832524 |
| | E-mail: | Caronwen.Rees@southampton.gov.uk | |
| Director | Name: | John Tunney | Tel: 023 80917713 |
| | E-mail: | John.Tunney@southampton.gov.uk | |

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None.

BRIEF SUMMARY

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee is required to submit a report summarising scrutiny activities over the past twelve months to Full Council each year. This paper seeks agreement of the Panel for the HOSP contribution to the annual report and updates member on proposals of health scrutiny in 2013/14.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) The Panel agrees the content for the HOSP contribution to the Scrutiny Annual Report due to be presented to OSMC on 11 April and Full Council on 15 May.
- (ii) The Panel note the proposed changes to Health Scrutiny for 2013/14.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Annual Report is submitted for information in line with the requirements of the constitution.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

2. None.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

3. The Council's overview and scrutiny procedure rules require an annual report to be made to the Council on the overview and scrutiny function. It aims to provide a succinct summary of the main scrutiny activities and inquiries undertaken during the course of the year including Health Scrutiny. Members are asked to agree the following highlights of Health Scrutiny undertaken during 2012/13 are included in the Report.

4. Responding to Government Consultations

The Panel scrutinised several of the changes proposed nationally including:

- **Health Scrutiny:** The Panel responded to the Department of Health's consultation on proposals for local authority health scrutiny. Amongst their points the Panel raised concerns about the need for health scrutiny to remain non political and the role of the National Commissioning Board in relation to health scrutiny.
- **Draft Care and Support Bill:** The Panel scrutinised and responded to the draft Care and Support Bill highlighting that uncertainty over the future funding arrangements weakens and undermines the true effectiveness of those good ideas which are contained in the draft Bill.

The Panel also scrutinised the local implementation of the Health and Social Care Act 2012 including progress with Healthwatch, the Health and Well-Being Board and new Commissioning Structures.

5. **Vascular Services Review**

The Panel continued to work closely with Southampton LINK to scrutinise changes to vascular services in the South Central region. There has regular engagement with both providers and commissioners and Panel members have attended external events including a meeting organised by the SHIP Cluster, which included national experts, and a Health Scrutiny meeting in Portsmouth. The Panel are continuing to scrutinise this issue and are very pleased that progress is being made towards the implementation of a sustainable solution.

6. **Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy**

The Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the draft strategy at a workshop session and fed back a number of detailed comments in response to the draft strategy document. These included making the strategy more focused with a smaller number of actions being required where impact and improvements could be measured and compared with other local authorities; improving the quality of the information cited from the and adopting innovative. The Panel were pleased to note that most of their recommendations had been adopted in the final version of the strategy.

7. **Health Service Pressures**

Budget pressures and increasing patient numbers have resulted in strain on local health services. The Panel continue to work closely with providers and commissioners to ensure local services are provided safely. The panel jointly scrutinised all local providers and commissioners in relation to the Emergency Care Intensive Support Team report on the South West Hants Unscheduled Care System and will continue to work with them to ensure all recommendations are implemented.

Recognising the links between the issues, the Panel also scrutinised the University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust over their recent Care Quality Commission inspection report at the same meeting. The Panel have asked for updates on progress against the implementation of the resulting action plan.

8. **Public And Sustainable Transport Provision To Southampton General**

Hospital Review

At the request of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport the panel agreed to undertake a short review into public and sustainable transport provision to Southampton general hospital. As part of the review evidence was gathered from several partners and stakeholders including University Hospitals Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, bus service providers, staff and patient representatives and Council transport officers.

The Panel provided early feedback to the Council's 2013/14 budget consultation. They have since made several recommendations, many of which can be quickly implemented to improve services for public transport users and look forward to hearing the response to these from partners in due course.

9. Health Scrutiny in 2013/14

The local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny Regulations) 2013 amend the current health scrutiny legislation to confer the power to undertake health scrutiny on the Council rather than directly to a Health Scrutiny Committee. As a result in order for health scrutiny to continue to be carried out by the existing Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel (HOSP) the Council are required to delegate responsibility to OSMC and subsequently the Panel. A recommendation on this is due to be made to full council on 20th March 2013.

The legislation as drafted and existing guidance is not clear as to whether the power to refer to the Secretary of State can also be delegated to the HOSP or remains a function of the Council. Further guidance is expected before the end of March and the position will be clarified at Annual Council.

The Chair of the Panel is currently in discussion with the Chair of OSMC in relation to any further changes required next year for example in relation to clarity of responsibilities relating to social care, the autonomy of HOSP to undertake reviews and the need to formalise the relationship between the HOSP, the Health and Wellbeing Board, and Healthwatch.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

9. None.

Property/Other

10. None.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

11. The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government and Public

Involvement in Health Act 2007.

Other Legal Implications:

12. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

13. None

KEY DECISION? Yes/No

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED: | |
|------------------------------------|--|

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

| | |
|----|------|
| 1. | None |
|----|------|

Documents In Members' Rooms

| | |
|----|------|
| 1. | None |
|----|------|

Equality Impact Assessment

| | |
|--|--------|
| Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) to be carried out. | Yes/No |
|--|--------|

Other Background Documents

Equality Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:

Title of Background Paper | Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

1. None