

Independent scrutiny of NHS Boards proposals for major changes in local NHS services

Please write your response here (please continue on a separate sheet of paper, if necessary.)

Question 1: Do you agree that an expert panel is the most effective way to provide independent scrutiny? If not, what would be your preferred choice?

This would be the most effective choice

Question 2: Do you agree that the role of the panel should be to assess the safety, sustainability, evidence-base and value for money of NHS Boards proposals for major changes to local NHS services?

YES

Question 3: Do you agree that the chair should be a lay person appointed by Scottish Ministers?

A lay person with experience in
chairing committees, and appropriate
knowledge & expertise

Question 4: Do you agree that the panel should have a lay majority among its members?

I'm not sure about this.
It may result in emotional & subjective
opinion.

Question 5: Do you agree that the panel should assess the evidence and options during the process of public engagement prior to consultation, and provide a commentary on these that would be available to the Board and to Ministers in reaching decisions?

Yes - this would be necessary

Question 6. Do you have any other comments on how independent scrutiny should be carried out, or on the guidance on "Informing, engaging and consulting the public in developing health and community care services" at Annex 3?

The public in general are apathetic, and their involvement uncertain

Perhaps awareness could be raised by a spirited involvement by local newspapers
RADIO, TV would result in more interest

Question 7

Do you have any other comments on either the consultation process or your preferred choice?

I tend to think that decisions will have already been made, and I doubt if the views of the public will carry a great deal of weight.

No Area will want a reduction or relocation of services, and an emotional rather than objective response is likely.

However, financial implications must largely dictate decisions, and the centralisation of specialist services makes good sense.

Objections from the public will include the expense of travelling, and non-means tested help with this would be well received.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this consultation. We will acknowledge receipt of your response.