

Minutes

Meeting title:	Jersey Care Commission Board	
Meeting date and time:	Wednesday 20 November 2024, 09:00-14:30	
Meeting location:	1st Floor, Capital House, 8 Church Street and Via Teams	
Meeting chair:	Glenn Houston (GH)	Chair
Those present:	Lesley Bratch (LB) Kathryn Chamberlain OBE (KC) Jackie Hall (JH) Noreen Kent (NK)	Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner Commissioner
Attendees:	Becky Sherrington (CI) Tara McNair (TM) Mark Silver (MS) Malgorzata Ptak (MP) Alaistair Jerrom-Smith (AJS) Valter Fernandes (VF) Amanda Hutchinson (AH)	Chief Inspector Law Officer Head of Business and Performance Finance Business Partner (Item 5) Digital Project Manager (Item 11) Principal Standards Writer (Item 12) Consultant (Item 12)
Apologies:	Gordon Pownall (GP) Angela Parry (AP) Lisa Phillips (LP)	Commissioner Commissioner Executive Assistant

Documents presented:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agenda</li> <li>2. Draft Minutes of Board meeting (18 September 2024)</li> <li>3. Chair's Report (4 papers)</li> <li>4. Chief Inspector's Report</li> <li>5. Finance Report (2 papers)</li> <li>6. Inspection Project Plan (5 papers)</li> <li>7. Risk Register (2 papers)</li> <li>8. Inspection Report Template (3 papers)</li> <li>9. Update on Delivery Plan</li> <li>10. Update on Digital Analysis</li> <li>11. Business Continuity Plan (2 papers)</li> <li>12. Digital Registration Project Update</li> <li>13. Presentation on preparation of hospital ambulance and mental health (5 papers)</li> <li>14. Forward Look 2024</li> </ol>
----------------------	--

## PART A – PUBLIC SESSION

1.	<p>Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest</p>
	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair noted that apologies had been received from Gordon Pownall (GP) and that Angela Parry had indicated due to travel commitments she may not be able to attend all or part of the meeting.</p> <p>As the meeting was online and may be subject to technical issues the Chair confirmed the quorum rules as requiring the Chair, or their delegate, and at least two other Commissioners to be present.</p> <p>There were no new declarations of interest.</p>

2.	<p>Minutes of the last meeting and Matters Arising</p>
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting (18 September) were discussed and approved with minor corrections noted. Proposed by Jackie Hall (JH) seconded by Kate Chamberlain (KC)</p> <p>Actions from the previous meeting were reviewed and noted as complete.</p> <p><b>Action 1</b> Lisa Phillips to share Q1 and Q2 SPPP minutes with commissioners NK and KC. Noted as complete.</p> <p><b>Action 2</b> The CI and Finance Business Partner to obtain financials for the period from 2019 onwards.</p> <p>Noted as complete. To be discussed under agenda item 5, Finance update.</p> <p><b>Action 3</b> The Forward look was discussed. The following amendments were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove GOJ Policy Lead to provide an update on the Law drafting Instructions for regulation of the hospital, mental health and ambulance services</li> <li>• Defer Review of Board Constitution to May 2025</li> </ul> <p>Noted as complete.</p>

3.	The Chair's Report	
	<p>The Chair presented document 3 and highlighted the following:</p> <p>The announcement of the identity of the new Chair is pending ministerial approval. The Chair will inform the board as soon as the decision is confirmed and prior to any public announcement.</p> <p>Regulation of Care (Jersey) Law proposed amendments. The Minister for the Environment remains committed to extending the regulatory scope as proposed. The public consultation has closed and a link to the final Government response was provided. A date for the States Assembly debate is expected in Q1 2025.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Commissioners to be notified once a date is confirmed and provided with a link to States live webcast site.</p> <p>The Quarterly meeting with the Cabinet Office (SPPP) scheduled for 11 December had been postponed due to changes in leadership roles. Tom Walker had moved to Health and Community Services (HCS) and has been replaced on an interim basis by Paul Wylie. In view of the imminent start of the incoming Chair it was felt more appropriate to hold a meeting early in the new year. Date to be confirmed.</p> <p>The Chair and Chief Inspector (CI) had met with the Minister for HCS and Director of Health Policy Ruth Johnston (RJ) regarding the Minister's plans for a more integrated health and social care system. Proposals were outlined in an informative presentation which RJ has offered to present to the Board. A discussion on timing took place.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> CI to confirm suitable timing for the presentation and attendance of Minister and Director in 2025, considering the current implementation phase.</p> <p>The Chair referred to an exchange of letters between himself and three Heads of Service in which they had raised concerns about professional experience and qualifications of Regulation Officers. Reference was made to their deployment in specialised regulated sectors and potential conflicts where Regulation Officers had previously worked in a service they inspected.</p> <p>The Chair had replied and summarised his response explaining that the Commission was dedicated to a multidisciplinary inspection team approach, supplementing internal experience with external expertise where required. The response explained how this aligns with best practice and how concerns about conflicts of interest are addressed through robust quality assurance processes of inspection methodologies and reports.</p> <p>The Chair added that the context of regulation in a small Island jurisdiction adds to the complexity of managing such issues and means that options available to, for example, much larger UK regulators are not feasible in Jersey. The Board discussed the letter and concurred with the Chair's assessment and response. The Board highlighted that this was an opportunity to clarify and be transparent about processes in place to manage conflicts of interest and the Chief Inspector (CI)</p>	

	<p>confirmed that a Conflict-of-Interest policy is being drafted. This matter may be considered again when the Commission’s Inspection Policy is next due for review.</p> <p>The 2025 schedule for Board meetings has been published. The next meeting is scheduled for 4-5 February 2025. Commissioners to hold these dates unless the new Chair proposes changes.</p> <p>The Chair expressed his gratitude for all the support he had received during his seven and a half year tenure. He particularly thanked Commissioners current and past, the Chief Inspector, the Head of Business and Performance and the Executive Assistant as well as the whole team.</p>	
--	--	--

4.	The Chief Inspector’s Report	
	<p>The CI presented document 4.</p> <p>The CI updated the Board and highlighted that the Commission had recruited into the role of Data and Insights Lead. The CI explained the initial work plan would now be scoped out but was expected to focus on the data required to support inspections of hospital, ambulance, and mental health services.</p> <p>The CI explained that external support is being used to develop the Inspection Handbook for the Hospital and that the Board would have the opportunity to meet the contractor later.</p> <p>She explained the current monitoring process for the Inspection Programme and that the Commission is on track to undertake all mandated inspections during 2024.</p> <p>The Public Accounts Committee has written recently as part of an exercise with all Arm’s Length Organisations to understand their procurement process. The Commission follows Government of Jersey (GoJ) processes and seeks exemptions if required and in line with the approach taken by all GoJ departments.</p> <p>The CI spoke about a regulatory event the Commission had organised in conjunction with the Jersey Financial Services Commission. The event was titled “Regulation do we get the balance right” and was hosted by the local Chair of the Institute of Directors. The Chief Executive of Digital Jersey also joined the panel as an independent, and as someone who experienced the impact of regulation on their organisation.</p> <p>The event was well attended with over 90 attendees and feedback was positive. LesleyBratch attended on behalf of the Board. The Board were particularly interested in attendees’ views and asked about views on regulation. The CI confirmed this was positive and attendees had clearly understood the benefits and purpose of regulation.</p> <p>The CI explained that the European Partnership of Supervisory Organisations (EPSO) in Health and Social care had asked to hold one of their twice-yearly meetings in Jersey next year. A provisional date in June had been agreed and a</p>	

	<p>venue provisionally booked. Once finalised, the Board will consider amending the Board meeting schedule to enable Commissioners to attend the EPSO conference without additional expense.</p> <p>The CI informed the Board that she had been appointed to the Board of the Institute of Regulation. She noted that as an additional appointment this had been declared to the Government of Jersey to ensure transparency and flag up any potential conflict of interest. The CI did not foresee any likely conflict but saw this as a positive opportunity both personally and for the Commission. The Board agreed and congratulated the CI on her appointment.</p> <p>The CI provided a brief update covering her perspective on the digital project which had gone live. She explained Commissioners would have a full presentation from the project manager later in the agenda.</p> <p>Kathryn Chamberlain (KC) highlighted the Institute of Directors Governance report into the Post Office Horizon project. She recommended Board members read the report, as it was aimed at Non-Executive Directors and covered a variety of governance issues.</p>	
--	---	--

5.	Finance Update	
	<p>Malgorzta Ptak (MP), Finance Business Partner (FBP) provided an update on the financial position. The Commission is overachieving on income, although this position might be less certain as some fees due in 2025 are being paid now. These would be allocated to the correct year. MP said there appeared to be a regular overachievement of income and this should be looked at for financial planning purposes.</p> <p>KC welcomed the added detail from previous years but highlighted a need to include or record information about the expanding role of the Commission so that the full picture of budget adjustments to fund the increased role was preserved.</p> <p>The Board agreed it was vital to preserve this information and expressed concerns that due to States wide savings in public expenditure the 2026 budget would be broadly in line with 2023 budget, despite the expanded role and significant increases in the pay budget over that period. KC highlighted this perspective would be particularly crucial to preserve as the Chair would be imminently leaving their post and taking with them a great deal of corporate memory.</p> <p>MP reminded the Board and team about the importance of accurate processing and accruing of invoices before year end. The Board would receive the final year end position at the February meeting, but all indicators are that the Commission will have an accrued underspend at year end. The Chair expressed his thanks for all the work and support he had received from MP throughout Board meetings.</p>	

6.	Risk Update	
	<p>The Head of Business and Performance MS presented document 6 and highlighted the following risks:</p> <p><b>Risk 11/23 Capacity and Capability Expansion</b>  Although there are concerns about the ability to hire external expertise, the inspection programme for 2025 and 2026 appears manageable within the expected resource, although it remains tight, especially if additional demands or requirements materialise.</p> <p>The Board agreed to continue to monitor the risk and may need to consider how the issue is escalated should there be a concern about the ability to deliver the inspection programme.</p> <p>KC suggested adding a specific reputational risk around the credibility of the Commission, particularly regarding the need for access to a broad range of specialist input. She emphasised that without the necessary resources and expertise, the credibility of the organisation could be undermined and proposed this should be a distinct risk, rather than implicitly covered by other risks, to ensure it is clearly communicated. The Board agreed this risk should be articulated separately.</p> <p><b>Action</b> Credibility risk to be articulated and proposed in risk register.</p> <p><b>Risk 7/23 Legal Risks</b>  MS updated the Commission on legal risks, including those relating to ongoing issues. As the Commission expands its role it is exploring options under the Regulation of Care (Jersey) Law. While progress is being made, the Commission is appropriately cautious about using untested powers in new situations. Advice has been received that the Commission’s enforcement powers could be strengthened through the legal framework.</p> <p><b>Risk 8/23 Impact of New and Differing Standards</b>  MS highlighted an ongoing risk related to the introduction of new standards, and working with different partners with different approaches to inspections, particularly in areas such as mental health services and the hospital. The Commission expects to move towards common standards across services, but this may cause some confusion in the short term, as care homes and newer services are inspected under different sets of standards. The Commission plans to review the impact of this once inspections of areas new to regulation begin but acknowledges that some risks are unavoidable.</p> <p><b>Risk 1/24 Cybersecurity</b>  Cybersecurity remains an ongoing concern. While the Commission benefits from strong IT infrastructure through Government of Jersey, it faces additional risks as it develops its own platforms, such as the Professional Registration Database. While new platforms provide opportunities for better risk mitigation, they also introduce potential vulnerabilities.</p>	

**Risk 2/24 Budgetary pressures**

MS reiterated the risk of budgetary pressures impacting on operations and the credibility of the Commission. The Board agreed the specific budgetary risk should remain in line with the earlier discussion around credibility. Following the decision at the September Board the risk has been raised with the Minister.

**Risk 3/24 Negative incident preparation**

MS outlined mitigation actions. The Commission has undertaken a Communicating in a Crisis exercise and identified a series of potential scenarios. These had informed the critical incident response plan. While the risk remains, the Commission is better prepared with contingency plans and staff training. Regular exercises will be held to keep plans up to date, though some residual risk is unavoidable.

**Risk 6/24 Information sharing**

MS explained that reviews of operations since Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) were put in place with professional regulatory bodies showed that challenges remain, including slow or insufficient sharing of information on fitness to practice issues. This varies by regulatory body. The Commission is exploring both technical and process solutions to strengthen information sharing and mitigate risk. The CI highlighted other regulators use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to help cross check data.

The Chair asked about progress as to when the Commission will take over publication of professional registers from Government of Jersey and highlighted it will be an opportunity to reinforce to professional regulatory bodies their role in providing information, ensuring they understand the Commission's oversight responsibilities. The CI said this would be covered in the Digital project item later on the agenda.

KC raised a concern regarding the potential risk of record-keeping as services expand, particularly in hospital settings. She emphasised the challenge of being able to locate all relevant inspection records, especially when challenged in legal cases. She questioned whether current systems enabled retrieval of data when needed.

KC highlighted the importance of ensuring systems allow easy access to data and raised concerns that as organisations grow, systems often lack required sufficiency and flexibility for managing records, making it difficult to prove when information was received and what actions were taken.

MS agreed with the importance of the issue and mentioned ongoing efforts to improve information management within current limitations, particularly focusing on structuring records. He suggested that this concern should be formally articulated as a risk. The Board agreed.

**Action** Record Management risk to be articulated and proposed in next risk register

The Chair commented on the robustness of the risk discussion and consistency in checking and analysing risks. The Board confirmed that all key risks had been identified.



7.	Inspection Report Template	
	<p>Fiona Mclaughlin (FM) Deputy Chief Inspector (DCI) presented document 7, updating the Board on the Inspection Project Plan and highlighted the following:</p> <p>The pilot template has been tested extensively this year on over 30 services, including 16 Care Homes, 8 Home Care Services, children’s homes, and adult day care services. There has also been a blend of public and private sector providers in each category, where possible.</p> <p>The initial phase ran from May to August with a review and changes made which subsequently led to further testing. Key changes were removal of repetitive summaries withing the main body of the report, a discussion over where evidence was best placed in the report, and a change in terminology from ‘areas of improvement’ to ‘areas of development’. Feedback on this last point especially had been mixed.</p> <p>Due to lead in times, feedback is still limited. It has been received from 14 services, but formal feedback has only been provided in two cases. Despite some areas of mixed feedback, generally the new template had been seen as positive. Further sessions to gather more feedback are planned. The current plan is to present the final template to the Board in February 2025. This will be in time to introduce the template for all new inspections starting in 2025.</p> <p>KC wondered whether the format changes would work adequately if a report needed to convey more negative feedback and suggested creating examples of more negative reports to test this. The DCI noted the challenge is balancing fairness and the importance of proportionality and balanced representation of evidence.</p> <p>NK highlighted inconsistencies in terminology. Noting the legislation and regulatory frameworks referred specifically to improvements, whereas areas for development had a different connotation.</p> <p>LB highlighted while she understood the need to gain provider perspectives it was important to balance this with service user experience as well. She felt improvements would resonate more with service users and their families.</p> <p>The Chair suggested using a standard wording to explain the role and background of the Commission as part of the introduction, including reference to the Standards.</p> <p><b>Action</b> Further feedback from Board and providers to be considered and final report format to be added to February 2025 agenda.</p>	



8.	Update on Business and Delivery Plan	
	<p>MS presented document 8. He explained this was intended to be an update on the 2025-2028 Business Plan, rather than a review of 2024 targets, although these were largely on track, with some possible issues caused by the move to a new professional registration system.</p> <p>The Commission had moved to a four year business planning cycle, in line with Government of Jersey (GoJ). Indicative budgets had been set, but the GoJ budget had not yet been agreed by the States Assembly.</p> <p>MS highlighted that as Strategic Priorities remain the same and are not expected to change, that the objectives and KPIs remained largely unchanged but had been updated to take account of progress on objectives during 2024.</p> <p>MS Highlighted that proposed legislative changes meant the Business Plan would change for 2026 onwards, as the proposed changes to legislation required the Commission to submit a strategic plan linked to funding requirements.</p> <p>NK asked that there be some way of tracking changes, either through a paper showing the tracked changes or perhaps a summary of key changes from year to year.</p> <p>MS Highlighted that one change was the description of objective 6. While the objective itself was largely unchanged it was now entitled “Developing organisational capability and resilience” which better captured the intention.</p> <p>KC highlighted the importance of being clear about the purpose and audience of the plan. MS explained its purpose would now be set out in legislation but was currently set out in the Framework Agreement as part of the accountability arrangements.</p> <p>KC suggested that in future the Plan should include a brief look at achievements and progress over the last year to provide a sense of continuity. She also suggested including a section on specific operational delivery risks.</p> <p><b>Action</b> Commissioners to review draft and provide any comments and input by 6 December. Final Business Plan sign off to February Board.</p>	

9.	Head of Business and Performance to present the digital analysis	
	<p>MS Presented document 9, a review of the digital and data analysis. This included initial work undertaken with the Care Quality Commission, as well as further follow on work undertaken in conjunction with other external partners.</p> <p>The scope of the work included understanding our current Digital and Data landscape and capabilities required to support regulatory and organisational decision making, reviewing and streamlining internal processes to improve both efficiency and</p>	

	<p>compliance with information management standards, and developing a data management strategy aligned with the Commission’s strategic objectives.</p> <p>Key outputs provided so far include a methodology to assess organisational capabilities, an assessment and prioritisation of strategic options for data management and digital transformation, and specific recommendations for leveraging the capabilities of the professional registration database.</p> <p>MS highlighted the specific challenges, notably limited financial resources, limited capability within permanent staff to manage such transformation and, as is usual in many organisations, an ‘emerging’ data maturity level.</p> <p>There was a general discussion, and Commissioners raised the following points. They were concerned about the complexity and scale of the work and emphasised the need to prioritise immediate requirements and identify manageable steps. There was agreement that data management requirements needed to be articulated as part of the organisation’s strategic goals, rather than as standalone objectives.</p> <p>KC highlighted the need to separate data management from digital transformation issues and explained digital transformation only supported use of data, and data management only supported delivery of objectives. She recommended a focus on the data, information management and strengthening the data culture as highlighted in the digital diagnostic.</p> <p>The Board agreed this was a long-term project with a multiyear horizon, that was of crucial strategic importance to the Commission. The Board asked that updates be provided via the Chief Inspectors report but that at appropriate milestone points a separate agenda item be included so that the Board will receive a full update and opportunity to discuss further.</p> <p>The Board reiterated the need for expert external assistance to navigate the complex delivery roadmap.</p>	
--	--	--

10.	Review of Business Continuity Plan	
	<p>MS presented document 10 a review of the Business Continuity Plan (BCP) providing an overview of its purpose, and arrangements.</p> <p>The BCP aligns with the Government of Jersey’s (GoJ) processes, leveraging their expertise and support where necessary and enabling escalation of issues as outlined in GoJ’s Business Continuity processes.</p> <p>The plan sets out clear roles and responsibilities, critical contacts, and guidance for addressing both Business Continuity and Critical Incidents.</p>	

	<p>A recent tabletop exercise to test aspects of the Critical Incident plan provided insights, leading to updates, particularly in the communications plan, which outlines key considerations and messaging templates.</p> <p>The updated plan includes an inventory of IT and other critical systems, identifying their importance in maintaining operations. It sets out detailed roles for staff, including Chief Inspector and Deputy Chief Inspector, with clear escalation points, assumptions such as the availability of GoJ IT systems and public telecommunications during incidents, a record-keeping framework for decisions and actions taken during an incident, and contact details for key services (e.g., IT, emergency services and utility providers).</p> <p>MS said it was intended to conduct an annual exercise to test the BCP, or related critical incident responses, involving Commissioners where appropriate.</p> <p>KC suggested reviewing the plan following each annual exercise to incorporate any lessons learned. Updates or changes could be included as a paragraph in the Chief Inspector's report or as an amended appendix for board review.</p> <p>It was agreed that the BCP does not need to be a stand-alone agenda item but should be revisited if significant changes occur after exercises.</p> <p>The Chair queried whether a civil emergency such as a fire in a care home or other similar incident affecting provision and continuity of care services would trigger the BCP. MS clarified that such events would more likely fall under critical incident management. However, the BCP outlined helpful communication and decision-making processes which could support management of a Critical Incident.</p> <p>The CI confirmed that such scenarios are covered under the Commission's Crisis Communications Plan and had been tested as part of the recent exercise.</p> <p>The Board endorsed the approach to reviewing the BCP following annual exercises and incorporating any updates into the Chief Inspector's report, or as an appendix when needed. Commissioners agreed that the plan provides a robust framework for continuity and incident management.</p>	
--	--	--

11.	Digital Registration Project Update	
	<p>Alaistair Jerrom-Smith (AJS) presented the Digital Registration Project update. He began by summarizing the project goals and objectives and provided an update on how far these had been achieved. He highlighted that one aim was for public registers to move to the Commission's website from the Government of Jersey's website and this had not yet been fully achieved, as there was a period of overlap when registers would appear on both sites. This was expected to be resolved shortly.</p>	

	<p>Integration with Government of Jersey Digital ID systems had also not been possible due to limitations with the service which were beyond the scope of the project. Other objectives had been to move to an up-to-date system that was fully supported as the previous legacy system was no longer supported.</p> <p>Users were now able to update personal details through a self-service portal, and the email functionality to enable reminders to be sent had also been enhanced. He highlighted some of the technical security improvements, and that the system would now enable the Commission to register a wider group of professionals, as originally envisaged.</p> <p>He explained that although there had been a £30k overspend, much of this was to develop a portal that was expected to save £20k annually in reduced licensing costs.</p> <p>AJS highlighted the key challenges the project had undergone and explained there would be a formal 'lessons learned' exercise that would assist both the Commission and Government of Jersey in future projects. He summarised the lessons around key areas such as initial scoping, stakeholder engagement, governance and the project onboarding process. The project was in the process of transitioning to business as usual.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Alastair for his presentation and for his commitment to the project in general.</p>	
--	---	--

12.	Inspection Project Plan and Handbook	
	<p>Valter Fernandes (VF) introduced the Inspection Project Plan and handbook supported by the CI and Amanda Hutchinson (AH). VF highlighted the methodology and approach covering the Single Assessment Framework (SAF) the "Inspection blocks" and timelines.</p> <p>VF explained the SAF incorporated the 34 overarching standards coupled with the service specific requirements. The Law would require each of the services to be inspected within three years of the Law coming into force. While annual inspections would take place, they would not cover all services each year. It was expected that the Ambulance service would have one inspection in the three-year cycle whereas there would be several inspections of different services within the hospital over that time.</p> <p>The overall approach would be to follow the patient journey ensuring their needs were met safely throughout the different services and departments they interacted with.</p> <p>The Inspection blocks were surgery, medicine, outpatients, and women and children, each evaluated against service specific requirements. The Inspections would involve a pre on site data collection phase as well as evidence collection from staff, patients, clinical data and observation.</p>	

The Board sought clarification on the different services within the inspection blocks, and about data requirements and information to support inspection.

AH explained the importance attached to leadership and governance assessments under the “Well Led” standard and that aspects of this would be covered at each inspection, including specific evidence gathering through for example interviews designed to evidence culture and leadership. This would also be a key theme of the annual conversation. Consideration is still being given as to whether separate focused work concentrating on the leadership team would also be required.

VF highlighted the need for assessments at all levels of leadership within an organisation, not only at senior or executive level.

KC asked about leadership findings in areas where we would have expectations of standards across the inspection blocks such as clinical audits, rotas etc. She expressed the concern that some recommendations and improvements might cross the inspection block but might not be picked up or acted on due to the three-yearly cycle. VF explained the process in detail, highlighting universal as well as service specific requirements and evidence sought. He agreed that this would be a learning process and some aspects might be challenging, requiring changes to take account of issues as they arose.

KC also raised issues, echoed by the Board, about how inspection teams would seek external views as part of the inspection methodology. For example, Healthcare Inspectorate Wales canvassed professional regulators and the Auditor General to gather intelligence to support inspection planning. This also helped to avoid issues already reviewed by other organisations. VF confirmed that how we interact with other organisations that had regulatory oversight, or views which might impact on inspections, was being considered but that no final agreement had been reached as to the best way forward.

LB asked about external accreditation such as with radiology or pathology and how this would be taken into consideration. VF explained current thinking that it would not be a good use of the Commission’s resources to go over ground already considered by specialist organisations with appropriate expertise, but would still consider the universal standard requirements, for instance “Well Led” and communication with families and patients. BS added that the handbook needed to capture as far as possible how we would work with these organisations.

VF then provided information on project and inspection timelines. The Board discussed the timelines for the inspection process and how this would be communicated to services, and how they would be kept informed about when specific actions would happen. BS explained what currently happens with Children’s Services and said a similar process would be in place. The Board briefly discussed the issue of building up familiarity and expertise with services while avoiding risks around regulatory capture. BS said while it was a concern, it was some way off and would be a nice problem to have.

	<p>BS and AH then updated the Board on progress on the Inspection Handbook. The Board commented that the draft was comprehensive, with no gaps. The Board thanked the team for the presentation and commented on what a strong piece of work this was.</p> <p>The Chair thanked both VF and AH for their work to date, commenting that the preparations were progressing well and at pace, and that the Board appreciated the attention to detail in the planning.</p>	
--	--	--

13.	Forward Look	
	<p>The Board reviewed the forward look. GH said he wanted to focus on items for the February Board meeting in particular.</p> <p>This included signing off the Business Plan and KPIs and an update on the Annual Report, the review of the Scheme of Delegation, and final sign off of the Inspection Handbook.</p> <p>GH asked that BS consult with Ruth Johnson Director for Health policy over timing for her and the Minister for Health and Social Services to attend the Board.</p> <p>Other items for February were confirmed. The summary of children’s standards and handbook revisions and the review of inspection policy.</p> <p>The Board discussed the timing of the May Board. Commissioners were advised this might need to be moved to facilitate participation in the European Partnership of Supervisory Organisations in Health and Social Care (EPSO) conference, which is expected to be held in Jersey in June 2025.</p>	

## JERSEY CARE COMMISSION

### Action Points

	Action Point	Owner	Status
1	Commissioners to be notified once a date for States debate on Law change is confirmed and provided with a link to States live webcast site.	Chief Inspector/Chair	
2	CI to confirm suitable timing for RJ presentation on Health and Social care integration plans	Chief Inspector	
3	Credibility risk to be articulated and proposed in next risk register	Head of Business and Performance	
4	Record Management risk to be articulated and proposed in next risk register	Head of Business and Performance	
5	Further feedback from Board and providers to be considered and final Inspection Report to be added to February 2025 agenda	Head of Business and Performance	
6	Commissioners to review draft Business Plan and provide any comments and input by 6 December. Final Business Plan sign off to February Board	Commissioners/ Head of Business and Performance	