Appendix A 2-C Remodelling Summary Investigation Points

Reference	Governance	Complaint	Statement	Service Delivery	Investigated	Finding
	IJB Decision					
1	Officers misled the board during the meeting	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
2	- False statements (included in transcript)	Yes			No (removed from complaint)	-
3	- Conduct of the Chair	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
4	- Did not afford enough weight to patient care	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
5	Conflict of interest: conflicts of interest arising from presence of certain members of the Leadership Team/ACHSCP management; access to information at OAMP	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
-	Stop the process/delay the decision: most correspondence stated that the decision should be deferred, revoked or that OAMP should be removed from the scope of the project		Yes		No	-
	Service and Model					
А	OAMP not unsustainable: queries stating OAMP is a stable, well-functioning practice which was not suffering from sustainability issues		Yes		Yes	Comments included in investigatory report
-	Benefit of 2c for OAMP: as the traditional funding model doesn't make it viable with low prevalence of chronic disease, OAMP should remain 2c practice		Yes		No	-
-	 Northfield/Mastrick Precedence: correspondences referencing a perceived reduction in services and increase in disadvantages to the Northfield/Mastrick communities following their procurement process 		Yes		No	-

Appendix A 2-C Remodelling Summary Investigation Points

Reference	Governance	Complaint	Statement	Service Delivery	Investigated	Finding
-	 Risks following GP resignations: several correspondences, highlighting the potential impact of the resignations on clinical services 			Yes	No	-
6	Timing					
	Rushed: correspondences from staff, and some from the public, state that the timescales for the remodelling process were rushed and during the summer holidays	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
	During a pandemic: several correspondences question the timing of the project, during the COVID-19 pandemic	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
	Consultation					
7	Staff: queries around how staff were consulted; how their views were considered; and how the ultimate recommended option did not reflect the views of the staff; ignoring staff opinions; impacts of stress on wellbeing	Yes			Yes	Partially upheld * Recommendation 1
8	Patients: queries around a lack of consultation and engagement; lack of opportunities for patients to design the service	Yes			Yes	Not upheld
	Privatisation					
-	Much of the correspondence from members of the public indicated a misconception of the "privatisation" of the GP practice,		Yes		No	-
	Equalities and Fairer Scotland					•
9	Assessment: queries on whether an EHRIA or Fairer Scotland assessment and what consideration has been made for equalities; what the possible impacts are	Yes			Yes	Partially upheld *Recommendation 3

Appendix A 2-C Remodelling Summary Investigation Points

Reference	Governance	Complaint	Statement	Service Delivery	Investigated	Finding
-	 Personal impact: several of the patient queries highlighted concerns for the quality of their own care and how this would be impacted 			Yes	No	-
	Positive feedback for practice					
В	Personal experience: patients raised positive feedback on the service received to date from OAMP; stating good relational continuity and high levels of care		Yes		Yes	Comments included in investigatory report
10	Complaints Process not being followed	Yes			Yes	Upheld *Recommendation 4

^{*} Please refer to section 3.9 in the covering report for the recommendations and the IJB response.