# Wiltshire Council 

Where everybody matters

## AGENDA

| Meeting: | Great Western Ambulance Service |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Joint Health Overview \& Scrutiny Committee |
| Place: | Council Chamber, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER |
| Date: | Friday 14 October 2011 |
| Time: | $\underline{11.00}$ am |
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## Agenda Annex



## GREAT WESTERN AMBULANCE SERVICE JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Date \& Time: $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011 at 11.00 am
Venue: Wiltshire Council, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER.

## Members of the Committee:

- Councillor Anthony Clarke, Bath \& North East Somerset Council (Chair)
- Councillor Sharon Ball, Bath \& North East Somerset Council
- Councillor Eleanor Jackson, Bath \& North East Somerset Council
- Councillor Lesley Alexander, Bristol City Council
- Jenny Smith, Bristol City Council
- Councillor Sylvia Townsend, Bristol City Council
- Councillor Ron Allen, Gloucestershire County Council
- Councillor Sheila Jeffery, Cotswold D C (Glos. County Council)
- Councillor Gordon Shurmer, Gloucestershire County Council
- Councillor Bob Garner, North Somerset Council
- Councillor Reyna Knight, North Somerset Council
- Councillor Nick Pennycott, North Somerset Council
- Councillor Janet Biggin, South Gloucestershire Council
- Councillor Sue Hope, South Gloucestershire Council
- Councillor Ian Scott, South Gloucestershire Council
- Councillor Fionuala Foley, Swindon Borough Council
- Councillor tba, Swindon Borough Council
- Councillor tba, Swindon Borough Council
- Councillor Christine Crisp, Wiltshire Council
- Councillor Mike Hewitt, Wiltshire Council
- Councillor Ian McLennan, Wilshire Council


## Contact Officers:

Romayne de Fonseka, Bristol City Council, 0117 9222770, romayne.de.Fonseka@bristol.gov.uk or Norman Cornthwaite, Bristol City Council, 0117 9222390, norman.cornthwaite@bristol.gov.uk

## Web site addresses:

Bath \& North East Somerset Council - www.bathnes.gov.uk Bristol City Council - www.bristol.gov.uk
Gloucestershire County Council - www.gloucestershire.gov.uk
North Somerset Council - www.n-somerset.gov.uk
South Gloucestershire Council -www.southglos.gov.uk
Swindon Borough Council - www.swindon.gov.uk
Wiltshire Council - www.wiltshire.gov.uk

|  | AGENDA |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Apologies for |
|  | To receive and note any apologies from Members of the Committee. |
| 2. | Declarations of Interest |
|  | Members are reminded that at the start of the meeting they should declare any known interests in any matter to be considered, and also during the meeting if it becomes apparent that they have an interest in the matters being discussed. |
| 3. | Public Question Time |
|  | See explanatory note below. Please contact the Officers whose names and numbers appear at the top of this agenda if you need further guidance. |
| 4. | Chair's Update |
|  | To receive any information from the Chair. There will not normally be any discussion on this item. |
| 5. | Minutes of the Meeting Held on $10{ }^{\text {th }}$ June 2011 |
|  | To approve the Minutes of the Meeting for signature by the Chair. |
| 6. | Monthly Performance Information Comprising: |
|  | A. Commissioners' Monthly Report for October 2011; |
|  | B. Trust Activity and Performance; |
|  | C. Hospital Handover Summary. |
|  | To comment and note. |

## 7. Organisational change at GWAS

 To comment and note.8. National Audit Office report on VFM To comment and note.
9. Ambulance Quality Indicators Presentation.
10. Update On GWAS Estates Strategy To comment and note.
11. Update from HOSCs To comment and note.
12. Report from Joint Working Group To comment and note.
13. Work Programme To agree the priorities for future meetings of the Committee.
14. Dates of Future Meetings

Proposed date of next meeting:
15. Urgent Business

Date of Dispatch: $6^{\text {th }}$ October 2011

## Public Question Time

Up to 15 minutes will be allowed at the start of all Joint Committee meetings for questions to the Chair from members of the public about the work of the Committee. Questions must be relevant, clear and concise. Because of time constraints, Public Question Time is not an opportunity to make speeches or statements. Prior notice of a question to the Scrutiny Officers supporting the Joint Committee is desirable, particularly if detailed information is needed.

## Access Arrangements

The Venue is wheelchair accessible and an infrared receiver hearing system is provided. If you would wish to attend the meeting but have any special requirement to enable you to do so please contact the Scrutiny Officers whose names and numbers appear at the top of this agenda as soon as possible prior to the date of the meeting.

If you would like to receive any of the pages contained in this agenda in a larger print size, please contact the Scrutiny Officers whose name and numbers appear at the top of this agenda.


Agenda Item No. 5

## GREAT WESTERN AMBULANCE SERVICE JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY $10^{\text {th }}$ JUNE AT BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL AT 11.00 AM

## Members of the Committee:

P Councillor Anthony Clarke, Bath \& North East Somerset Council (Chair)
A Councillor tba, Bath \& North East Somerset Council
A Councillor tba, Bath \& North East Somerset Council
P Councillor Lesley Alexander, Bristol City Council
P Jenny Smith, Bristol City Council
P Councillor Sylvia Townsend, Bristol City Council
P Councillor Ron Allen, Gloucestershire County Council
P Councillor Terry Hale, Gloucestershire County Council (for Cllr Shurmer)
P Councillor Sheila Jeffery, Cotswold D C (Glos. C C)
A Councillor Gordon Shurmer, Gloucestershire County Council
P Councillor Reyna Knight, North Somerset Council
A Councillor tba, North Somerset Council
A Councillor tba, North Somerset Council
P Councillor Janet Biggin, South Gloucestershire Council
P Councillor Sue Hope, South Gloucestershire Council
P Councillor Ian Scott, South Gloucestershire Council
A Councillor tba, Swindon Borough Council
A Councillor tba, Swindon Borough Council
A Councillor tba, Swindon Borough Council
A Councillor Christine Crisp, Wiltshire Council
A Councillor Mike Hewitt, Wiltshire Council
A Councillor Ian McLennan, Wilshire Council

## Also in attendance:

Rod Barnes - GWAS
Keith Scott - GWAS
John Oliver - GWAS
Patrick Mulcahy - GWAS
Juliette Hughes - NBT
Dr Kirsten Jones - NBT
Sue Watkinson - NBT
Jan Bergman - UHBT
Jim O'Connell - UHBT
Linda Prosser - NHS Gloucestershire
Albert Weager - Gloucestershire LINk
Ros Low - Wiltshire Council
Lauren Rushen - Bath and North East Somerset Council
Romayne de Fonseka - Bristol City Council
Norman Cornthwaite - Bristol City Council

## GWAS

1.6/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Crisp, Hewitt, McLellan and Shurmer.

## GWAS

2.6/11

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were received and noted:

Councillor Knight - Portishead Day Centre
Councillor Townsend - UHBT Foundation Governor

## GWAS

## 3.6/11

## CHAIR'S UPDATE

The Chair advised the Committee that he had visited GWAS HQ and met the new Chief Executive, and discussed a number of issues with him.

# RESOVED - that the Minutes of the Meeting held on $28^{\text {th }}$ January 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair. 

## GWAS

5.6/11 MONTHLY PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (Agenda Item No. 6)

The Committee considered and debated this report.
Rod Barnes, Keith Scott and John Oliver were in attendance for this item.

Councillor Hope reminded the Committee that at the previous Meeting it had been agreed that the Lead Commissioner (NHS Gloucestershire) would present the Commissioner's Report (Minute No. 150 refers). In response Linda Prosser confirmed that for future Meetings NHS Gloucestershire would produce a covering report and present the item to the Committee.

Councillor Knight noted that the figures for North Somerset are included in the figures for Avon and requested that the figures for North Somerset be shown separately. In response Linda Prosser stated that whilst figures for each Council could be produced, the Trust can only be held to account for its performance at Trust level.

During the debate and questioning that followed the following points were highlighted:

- Handovers times to be provided (subsequently received)
- The handover times for each hospital are not available at present but can be provided for future meetings
- As there has been changes to call categorisations some figures are not available at present
- The term transport refers to a vehicle sent and the patients treated at the scene; conveyance refers to
patients taken to hospital
- The Committee should concentrate on scrutinising poor performance and a commentary in the report would help with this
- GWAS is concentrating on recruiting Community First Responders where they are required and the recruitment is sustainable
- Keith Scott to provide a list of CFRs and locations


## RESOLVED - (i) that the report be noted; and

(ii) that the Lead Commissioner (NHS Gloucestershire) to provide covering report and commentary for future meetings.

## GWAS

6.6/11

## GWAS QUALITY ACCOUNT (Agenda Item No. 7)

The Committee considered and debated this report.
Patrick Mulcahy was in attendance for this item.
During the debate and questioning that followed the following points were highlighted:

- GWAS provides the GP Out of Hours Service for Gloucestershire; GWAS consider they provide a good service with added value; each area commissions its own GP Out of Hours Service
- In response to a 999 call GWAS may send a single vehicle which is backed up by an ambulance; all vehicles have a standard list of equipment that is carried
- The work being done on providing defibrillators was noted
- The improvement in performance of GWAS was noted


## RESOLVED - (i) that the report be noted; and

(ii) that Members comments are to be used as the response from Committee.

## GWAS

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 7.6/11 } & \text { A \& E HANDOVER TIMES - NBT AND UHBT ACUTE } \\ & \text { TRUSTS (Agenda Item No. 8) }\end{array}$
Juliette Hughes, Dr Kirsten Jones and Sue Watkinson (NBT); Jan Bergman and Jim O'Connell (UHBT) were in attendance for this item.

## NBT

Sue Watkinson provided a verbal update highlighting the following: the Trust works closely with UHBT across the City; they have a scoring system for beds which reflects how busy they are and the number of ambulances with patients; if they become too busy ambulances can be diverted to other hospitals; Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire work closely together; GP admissions are also factored into the system; a lot of work is put into smoothing demand and managing the service effectively; the discharge of patients is very important and work is being done across the area to ensure the discharge of patients from hospitals as soon as it can be achieved; handover times are being improved; electronic systems ensure the recording of accurate times; the Trust is ensuring that good practice is being followed.

Dr Kirsten Jones stated that they did not want ambulances to be kept waiting; there was now greater engagement by the Trust in meeting targets; but it was more important to meet the needs of patients rather than just meet targets; the new hospital at Southmead will have a well designed ambulance handover bay.

Juliette Hughes stated that there was a need to ensure the accuracy of the data recording and work closely with GWAS to validate the data; times for handovers have to be accurate; NBT have acquired more trolleys for patients but there is a need to ensure that patients are not left in
corridors as this is a bad patient experience.

## UHBT

Jim O'Connell stated that his Trust works closely with NBT; they do operate a divert system especially when things are difficult in the winter; they focus on the flow of patients from admission to discharge; they focus on patients who have been in hospital for more than 14 days; they also have care protocols for the assessment and treatment of patients; the Trust is using best practice to improve the issue.

Jan Bergman stated that improvements to the A \& E Service was a key priority for the Trust; a new consultant has been appointed and other staffing resources have also been put into the service; new protocols have also been introduced; there has been improvements to capacity, flow and management; reduced lengths of stay in hospital are being achieved; a new Medical assessment Unit is being built and will improve services; 7 day staffing is being improved; the ward matron system is also being improved.

## RESOLVED - that the verbal updates be noted.

## GWAS

8.6/11

## UPDATES FROM HOSC's (Agenda Item No. 9)

## RESOLVED - that the report be noted.

## GWAS

9.6/11 LINK JOINT WORKING GROUP REPORT (Agenda Item No. 10)

## RESOLVED - that the report be noted.

## GWAS

10.6/11

## COMMISSIONING PLAN 2011-13 (Agenda Item No. 11)

Linda Prosser gave a presentation on this item.
It was noted that there is a range of non urgent services provided by the NHS.

## RESOLVED - that the report be noted.

## GWAS

11.6/11

GWAS ESTATES STRATEGY (Agenda Item No. 12)
Rod Barnes introduced this report and summarised it for the Committee.
During the debate and questioning that followed the following points were highlighted:

- There will be full consultation on changes to the estate
- Estimates are being prepared for demolition/rebuilding of old properties but cannot be made public
- The possibilities of sharing facilities is being considered
- The population in the area is growing and the Trust is working with Local Authorities and other partners to ensure the provision of health facilities
- There is a need to make sure that the strategy is self financing but it is not intended to sell any sites
- There are a number of work streams that need to be completed so the initiative is likely to take more than a year to complete


## RESOLVED - the report be noted.

## GWAS

12.6/11 GWAS APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION TRUST STATUS (Agenda Item No. 13)

Rod Barnes introduced the report and summarised it for the Committee.

Although only 2 Ambulance Trusts have been awarded Foundation Trust Status all 11 Trusts have applied but there are issues about gauging performance against targets. No Trusts have yet been refused Foundation Status.

RESOLVED - (i) that the report be noted; and
(ii) that the Committee receive further update(s) in due course.

## GWAS

13.6/11 WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED - that the work Programme be agreed.

## GWAS

14.6/11 NEXT MEETING

RESOVLED - that the next Meeting of the GWAS JHSC be held on Friday $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011 at 11.00 am at Wiltshire Council, Monkton Park, Chippenham.
(Meeting ended at 1.40 pm. )

CHAIR

## Review of Issues Arising from Performance Information

## Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee

 $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011Author: Chair, Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee

## Purpose

To present Members with monthly performance information, including handover times/delays broken down by hospital

## Recommendation

The Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee is requested to:

Consider the appended information and identify any issues requiring further clarification or discussion with the Great Western Ambulance NHS Trust or NHS Gloucestershire as lead commissioners.

### 1.0 Reasons

1.1 The Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee had previously resolved to review the monthly "Managing Our Performance" Report that was presented to the Great Western Ambulance NHS Trust Board. This report has subsequently been revised and renamed as the "Board Performance Report".

### 2.0 Detail

2.1 Performance information is attached. The attached information outlines GWAS performance by month, broken down by sector, PCT and local authority.
2.2 Also attached is a breakdown of handover times/delays by hospital. This provides more detailed localised information which Committee members may find helpful.

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
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Activity
N/WS
Gloucestershire
currencies of
new currencies of
These 'hear-and-treat' and 'see-and-treat' activities now
also form two of the new quality indicators by which
ambulance services are measured nationally.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { P13-15: Those incidents where GWAS does convey } \\
& \text { patients, comparing the current year with last. } \\
& \text { - The year-to-date conveyance rate of } 59 \% \text { is an } \\
& \text { improvement compared to the same period in } 2010-11 \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$
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Performance Cont Gloucestershire

- P17-19: The following charts provide activity and
performance at Authority level
- The 8-minute performance for Red calls ranges from
89.8\% (Swindon) to $67.0 \%$ (South Glos). Further work is
ongoing into reasons for differences, beyond usual
factors
- P20-22: GWAS as a whole is also meeting the
secondary Red 19-minute standard
- At authority level there is less variation in performance
levels - from 99.1\% (Swindon) to 93.9\% (Wiltshire) the
majority are close to or exceeding the $95 \%$ threshold
- Handover delays remain a challenge
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Great Western Ambulance Service Appendix B
TRUST SUMMARY - ACTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE AGAINST NATIONAL TARGETS
ACTIVITY:

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 20,749 | 22,380 | 21,475 | 21,977 | 21,378 | 21,361 | 22,603 | 21,622 | 25,214 | 22,844 | 20,355 | 22,605 | 107,959 |
| 2011/12 Contract | 21,372 | 23,051 | 22,118 | 22,636 | 22,020 | 22,001 | 23,282 | 22,271 | 25,971 | 23,528 | 20,966 | 23,284 | 111,197 |
| 2011/12 Actual | 21,888 | 21,790 | 21,906 | 22,806 | 21,678 | + | * | * | + | * | * | * | 110,068 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variance from Contract | 516 | -1,261 | -212 | 170 | -342 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | -1,129 |
| Variance from Contract \% | 2.4\% | -5.5\% | -1.0\% | 0.8\% | -1.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | -1.0\% |
| Variance from 2010/11 | 1,139 | -590 | 431 | 829 | 300 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2,109 |
| Variance from 2010/11 \% | 5.5\% | -2.6\% | 2.0\% | 3.8\% | 1.4\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2.0\% |


|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 13,944 | 14,785 | 14,232 | 14,395 | 14,145 | 14,407 | 15,121 | 14,551 | 16,423 | 15,232 | 13,681 | 15,242 | 71,501 |
| 2011/12 Actual | 14,624 | 14,506 | 14,350 | 14,877 | 14,178 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 72,535 |
| Variance from 2010/11 | 680 | -279 | 118 | 482 | 33 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,034 |
| Variance from 2010/11 \% | 4.9\% | -1.9\% | 0.8\% | 3.3\% | 0.2\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1.4\% |

Conveyance Rates (Transports over Responses):

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 67.2\% | 66.1\% | 66.3\% | 65.5\% | 66.2\% | 67.4\% | 66.9\% | 67.3\% | 65.1\% | 66.7\% | 67.2\% | 67.4\% | 66.2\% |
| 2011/12 Actual | 66.8\% | 66.6\% | 65.5\% | 65.2\% | 65.4\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 65.9\% |


TRUST SUMMARY - ACTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE AGAINST NATIONAL TARGETS
ACTIVITY excluding card 33 \& 35 (Card 33 \& 35 are Healthcare Professional \& Interfacility Transfers)
Incidents with Response:

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 16,595 | 18,031 | 17,062 | 17,624 | 17,169 | 16,952 | 17,982 | 16,919 | 20,030 | 17,709 | 15,672 | 17,736 | 86,481 |
| 2011/12 Actual | 17,289 | 17,154 | 17,338 | 18,217 | 17,114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 87,112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 9,999 | 10,702 | 10,065 | 10,341 | 10,179 | 10,264 | 10,795 | 10,220 | 11,690 | 10,489 | 9,341 | 10,724 | 51,286 |
| 2011/12 Actual | 10,383 | 10,220 | 10,150 | 10,641 | 9,978 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 51,372 |
| Variance from 2010/11 | 384 | -482 | 85 | 300 | -201 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 86 |
| Variance from 2010/11 \% | 3.8\% | -4.5\% | 0.8\% | 2.9\% | -2.0\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0.2\% |

Conveyance Rates (Transports over Responses):

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 60.3\% | 59.4\% | 59.0\% | 58.7\% | 59.3\% | 60.5\% | 60.0\% | 60.4\% | 58.4\% | 59.2\% | 59.6\% | 60.5\% | 59.3\% |
| 2011/12 Actual | 60.1\% | 59.6\% | 58.5\% | 58.4\% | 58.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 59.0\% |


1 - Template New HOSC Report Final 2014242.xls
All Activity 2010/11 vs. 2011/12 Gloucestershire PCT

All Activity 2010/11 vs. 2011/12 Bristol PCT

All Activity 2010/11 vs. 2011/12 South Gloucestershire PCT


All Activity 2010/11 vs. 2011/12 GWAS

Activity by PCT
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Activity (excluding card 33 and 35 ) by PCT


Conveyance Rates by PCT
Incidents with a response

|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 5,455 | 5,46< | 5,32¢ |
| Swindon | 1,873 | 1,86 | 1,90¢ |
| Bristol | 4,713 | 4,53€ | 4,692 |
| North Somerset | 2,045 | 2,09 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 1,987 |
| South Gloucestershire | 2,053 | 2,03C | 1,957 |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 1,532 | 1,50< | 1,642 |
| Wiltshire | 4,000 | 4,07؟ | 4,20C |
| Other/Unknown | 217 | 221 | 195 | Total

## Incidents with transport

|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 3,664 | 3,70< | 3,557 | 3,77き | 3,63E | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 18,331 |
| Swindon | 1,201 | 1,164 | 1,19¢ | 1,197 | 1,096 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 5,857 |
| Bristol | 3,026 | 2,91( | 3,02€ | 3,00C | 2,801 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 14,763 |
| North Somerset | 1,466 | 1,44乏 | 1,36\% | 1,46C | 1,50؟ | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,251 |
| South Gloucestershire | 1,478 | 1,461 | 1,344 | 1,42 | 1,38؟ | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,095 |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 1,058 | 1,07( | 1,124 | 1,135 | 1,011 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 5,398 |
| Wiltshire | 2,589 | 2,617 | 2,60¢ | 2,72€ | 2,58€ | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 13,124 |
| Other/Unknown | 142 | 134 | $12 ¢$ | 163 | 151 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 716 |


Conveyance Rates by PCT excluding Card 33 \& 35

| Incidents with a response |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Gloucestershire | 4,221 | 4,191 | 4,05( | 4,35: | 4,15i | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 20,972 |
| Swindon | 1,543 | 1,53\& | 1,57¢ | 1,596 | 1,51! | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,775 |
| Bristol | 3,933 | 3,775 | 3,93i | 4,097 | 3,71( | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 19,448 |
| North Somerset | 1,593 | 1,67¢ | 1,551 | 1,67! | 1,62( | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 8,119 |
| South Gloucestershire | 1,544 | 1,50< | 1,48i | 1,55¢ | 1,46í | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,544 |
| Bath and North East Somerse | 1,197 | 1,16\& | 1,29! | 1,27( | 1,115 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 6,053 |
| Wiltshire | 3,057 | 3,10 | 3,26i | 3,415 | 3,301 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 16,147 |
| Other/Unknown | 201 | 201 | 176 | 251 | 225 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,054 |
| Total | 17,289 | 17,15 | 17,338 | 18,21 | 17,11/ |  |  | * |  | * |  |  | 87,112 |

## Total

Incidents with transport

|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 2,512 | 2,511 | 2,354 | 2,55 | 2,446 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 12,377 |
| Swindon | 912 | 868 | 903 | 89¢ | 80ミ | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 4,382 |
| Bristol | 2,305 | 2,201 | 2,337 | 2,27¢ | 2,12i | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 11,245 |
| North Somerset | 1,043 | 1,061 | 977 | 1,083 | 1,06( | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 5,224 |
| South Gloucestershire | 1,000 | 962 | 895 | 981 | 91E | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 4,756 |
| Bath and North East Somersel | 748 | $75 ¢$ | 797 | 794 | 706 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,801 |
| Wiltshire | 1,736 | 1,744 | 1,77\& | 1,91( | 1,79 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 8,960 |
| Other/Unknown | 127 | 117 | 10¢ | 144 | 13 C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 627 |
| Total | 10,383 | 10,22( | 10,15( | 10,64 | 9,978 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 51,372 |


| Total | 10,383 | $10,22($ | 10,15 | 10,64 | 9,978 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 59.51\% | 59.91\% | 58.12\% | 58.67\% | 58.84\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 59.0\% |
| Swindon | 59.11\% | 56.44\% | $57.19 \%$ | 56.14\% | 52.86\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 56.4\% |
| Bristol | 58.61\% | 58.30\% | 59.42\% | 55.63\% | 57.22\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 57.8\% |
| North Somerset | 65.47\% | 63.31\% | 62.99\% | 64.50\% | 65.43\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 64.3\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 64.77\% | 64.05\% | 60.35\% | 63.21\% | 62.75\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 63.0\% |
| Bath and North East Somerse | 62.49\% | 64.73\% | 61.35\% | 62.52\% | 63.09\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 62.8\% |
| Wiltshire | 56.79\% | 56.20\% | 54.42\% | 55.86\% | 54.29\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 55.5\% |
| Other/Unknown | 63.18\% | 58.21\% | 61.93\% | 57.37\% | 57.78\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 59.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 60.1\% | 59.6\% | 58.5\% | 58.4\% | 58.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 59.0\% |

trust summary - Activity and performance against national targets
PERFORMANCE:
Category RED 8 Minute Target Performance:

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010/11 | 77.79\% | 77.45\% | 75.80\% | 76.79\% | 75.08\% | 74.24\% | 74.87\% | 73.86\% | 64.67\% | 72.26\% | 73.91\% | 77.81\% | 74.3\% |
| 2011/12 Target | 75.50\% | 76.60\% | 75.00\% | 76.50\% | 75.50\% | 76.50\% | 76.00\% | 75.50\% | 70.00\% | 75.00\% | 75.50\% | 77.00\% | 75.4\% |
| 2011/12 Actual | 75.47\% | 76.91\% | 74.73\% | 76.40\% | 77.58\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variance from Target | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | -0.3\% | -0.1\% | 2.1\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0.8\% |
| Variance from 2010/11 | -2.3\% | -0.5\% | -1.1\% | -0.4\% | 2.5\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1.9\% |
| Category RED 19 Minute Target Performance: * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| 2010/11 | 95.98\% | 96.46\% | 95.85\% | 95.28\% | 95.59\% | 95.72\% | 95.19\% | 95.21\% | 93.20\% | 93.44\% | 94.96\% | 95.35\% | 95.1\% |
| 2011/12 Target | 95.79\% | 96.50\% | 95.80\% | 96.00\% | 96.50\% | 97.00\% | 97.00\% | 96.25\% | 92.75\% | 96.00\% | 96.50\% | 97.00\% | 96.0\% |
| 2011/12 Actual | 95.71\% | 96.38\% | 95.57\% | 96.00\% | 96.28\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 96.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variance from Target | -0.1\% | -0.1\% | -0.2\% | 0.0\% | -0.2\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0.0\% |
| Variance from 2010/11 | -0.3\% | -0.1\% | -0.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0.9\% |

Category GREEN Performance: *

|  | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011/12 Target | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% | 90.0\% |
| 2011/12 Actual | 91.6\% | 90.7\% | 89.1\% | 88.2\% | 90.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 90.0\% |
| Variance from Target | 1.6\% | 0.7\% | -0.9\% | -1.8\% | 0.6\% | * | , | * |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
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RED 8 Minute Performance by PCT


|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 75.9\% | 77.5\% | 77.5\% | 76.5\% | 78.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 77.1\% |
| Swindon | 87.9\% | 90.6\% | 88.4\% | 89.4\% | 92.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 89.8\% |
| Bristol | 83.8\% | 83.2\% | 81.1\% | 83.9\% | 85.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 83.5\% |
| North Somerset | 68.2\% | 71.4\% | 69.3\% | 70.8\% | 68.4\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 69.6\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 66.2\% | 70.0\% | 65.3\% | 65.8\% | 67.7\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 67.0\% |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 75.0\% | 78.0\% | 75.6\% | 76.8\% | 77.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.5\% |
| Wiltshire | 69.8\% | 69.6\% | 66.5\% | 71.0\% | 71.9\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 69.7\% |
| Other/Unknown | 17.0\% | 17.5\% | 19.6\% | 30.5\% | 20.0\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 21.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 75.5\% | 76.9\% | 74.7\% | 76.4\% | 77.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.2\% | Total

Percentage of Total Responses being Red Responses by PC1

| RED Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Gloucestershire | 37\% | 37\% | 36\% | 35\% | 34\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 36\% |
| Swindon | 36.6\% | 39.3\% | 37.0\% | 38.1\% | 37.1\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 37.6\% |
| Bristol | 38.1\% | 39.7\% | 40.3\% | 40.0\% | 39.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 39.5\% |
| North Somerset | 38.3\% | 38.2\% | 37.0\% | 39.3\% | 40.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 38.7\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 36.2\% | 35.6\% | 39.5\% | 39.2\% | 36.2\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 37.3\% |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 33.9\% | 36.5\% | 35.7\% | 36.8\% | 35.5\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 35.7\% |
| Wiltshire | 38.0\% | 37.9\% | 39.1\% | 37.9\% | 37.3\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 38.1\% |
| Other/Unknown | 21.7\% | 18.1\% | 26.2\% | 21.8\% | 14.1\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 20.1\% |
| Total | 37\% | 38\% | 38\% | 38\% | 37\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 37\% |

RED 8 Minute Performance by District Council / Unitary Authority

| ED Responses | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bristol | 1,796 | 1,80́ | 1,892 | 1,94! | 1,75\% | , | * | * | * | * | * | * | 9,191 |
| South Gloucestershire | 743 | 723 | 773 | 796 | 710 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3745 |
| North Somerset | 783 | 80 C | 735 | 82ミ | 848 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3989 |
| Bath and North East Somersel | 520 | 549 | 586 | 600 | 512 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2767 |
| Forest of Dean | 300 | 274 | 251 | 257 | 246 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1328 |
| Cotswold | 256 | 247 | 225 | 256 | 257 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1241 |
| Tewkesbury | 256 | 221 | 227 | 237 | 204 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1145 |
| Cheltenham | 398 | 375 | 375 | $39{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 390 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1931 |
| Gloucester | 468 | 521 | 494 | $48 ¢$ | 444 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2416 |
| Stroud | 347 | 357 | 353 | 362 | 333 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1752 |
| Wiltshire | 1521 | 1546 | 164i: | 1647 | 1567 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7924 |
| Swindon | 686 | 732 | 705 | 735 | 681 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3539 |
| Other/Unknown | 46 | 40 | 50 | 58 | 34 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 228 |


|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bristol | 83.8\% | 83.2\% | 81.19 | 83.9\% | 85.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 83.5\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 66.22\% | 69.99\% | 65.339 | 65.83\% | 67.75\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 67.0\% |
| North Somerset | 68.20\% | 71.38\% | 69.25\% | 70.849 | 68.40\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 69.6\% |
| Bath and North East Somerse\| | 75.00\% | 77.96\% | 75.60\% | $76.83{ }^{\circ}$ | 77.349 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.5\% |
| Forest of Dean | 68.00\% | 60.58\% | 67.739 | 61.879 | 63.419 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 64.4\% |
| Cotswold | 44.53\% | 57.899 | 53.33\% | 49.22\% | 57.20\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 52.4\% |
| Tewkesbury | 78.91\% | 72.85\% | 74.019 | $76.37{ }^{\circ}$ | 77.45\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.0\% |
| Cheltenham | 89.95\% | 92.27\% | 92.80\% | 93.13\% | 94.36\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 92.5\% |
| Gloucester | 91.03\% | 93.09\% | 91.50\% | 91.62\% | 90.549 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 91.6\% |
| Stroud | 66.86\% | 68.91\% | 66.299 | 67.68\% | 71.17\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 68.2\% |
| Wiltshire | 69.76\% | 69.60\% | 66.52\% | 70.989, | 71.92\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 69.7\% |
| Swindon | 87.76\% | 90.57\% | 88.239 | 89.25\% | 92.519 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 89.7\% |
| Other/Unknown | 17.39\% | 17.50\% | 20.00\% | 31.03\% | 20.59\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 21.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 75.5\% | 76.9\% | 74.7\% | 76.4\% | 77.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 76.2\% |

$100.0 \%$
$99.0 \%$
$98.0 \%$
$97.0 \%$
$96.0 \%$
$95.0 \%$
$94.0 \%$
$93.0 \%$
$92.0 \%$
$91.0 \%$
$90.0 \%$
PCT Red 19 Performance

Gloucestershire

RED 19 Minute Performance by PCT

| RED Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Gloucestershire | 2,025 | 1,995 | 1,925 | 1,994 | 1,874 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 9,813 |
| Swindon | 685 | 732 | 704 | 734 | 68C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,535 |
| Bristol | 1796 | 1802 | 1892 | 194¢ | 1752 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 9,191 |
| North Somerset | 783 | 80C | 735 | 823 | 848 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,989 |
| South Gloucestershire | 743 | 723 | 773 | 796 | 71 C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,745 |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 520 | 545 | 586 | 60 C | 512 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2,767 |
| Wiltshire | 1521 | 1546 | $164 E$ | 1647 | 1567 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,924 |
| Other/Unknown | 47 | 40 | 51 | 59 | 35 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 232 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 8,120 | 8,187 | 8,30؟ | 8,602 | 7,97\& | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 41,196 |

RED 19 Min Performance

|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 95.1\% | 96.4\% | 95.7\% | 95.9\% | 96.5\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 95.9\% |
| Swindon | 98.39\% | 99.45\% | 99.15\% | 98.64, | 99.85\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 99.09\% |
| Bristol | 97.10\% | 96.78\% | 96.62\% | 97.23 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 97.60\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 97.1\% |
| North Somerset | 96.81\% | 96.25\% | 95.92\% | 95.14, | 94.58\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 95.7\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 96.37\% | 96.68\% | 96.25\% | 97.99, | 97.89\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 97.0\% |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 95.38\% | 97.09\% | 95.05\% | 94.17\% | 95.90\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 95.5\% |
| Wiltshire | 93.56\% | 94.57\% | 93.00\% | 94.23\% | 94.19\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 93.9\% |
| Other/Unknown | 76.60\% | 77.50\% | 74.51\% | 79.66 \% | 57.14\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 74.1\% |

Percentage of Total Responses being Red Responses by PC1

| R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Gloucestershire | 39\% | 37\% | 37\% | 38\% | 36\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 37\% |
| Swindon | 41\% | 39\% | 39\% | 37\% | 37\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 39\% |
| Bristol | 40\% | 37\% | 41\% | 41\% | 38\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 40\% |
| North Somerset | 39\% | 40\% | 37\% | 38\% | 44\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 40\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 38\% | 33\% | 38\% | 38\% | 35\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 36\% |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 35\% | 34\% | 39\% | 41\% | 34\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 37\% |
| Wiltshire | 40\% | 37\% | 40\% | 40\% | 38\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 39\% |
| Other/Unknown | 24\% | 15\% | 22\% | 25\% | 16\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 20\% |
| Total | 39\% | 37\% | 39\% | 39\% | 37\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 38\% |

RED 19 Minute Performance by District Council / Unitary Authority

| RED Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Bristol | 1,796 | 1,80́ | 1,892 | 1,94¢ | 1,752 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 9,191 |
| South Gloucestershire | 743 | 723 | 773 | 796 | 71C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,745 |
| North Somerset | 783 | 800 | 735 | 823 | 848 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,989 |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 520 | 549 | 586 | 600 | 512 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2,767 |
| Forest of Dean | 300 | 274 | 251 | 257 | 246 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,328 |
| Cotswold | 256 | 247 | 225 | 256 | 257 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,241 |
| Tewkesbury | 256 | 221 | 227 | 237 | 204 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,145 |
| Cheltenham | 398 | 375 | 375 | 393 | 39 C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,931 |
| Gloucester | 468 | 521 | 494 | 48C | 444 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 2,416 |
| Stroud | 347 | 357 | 353 | 362 | 333 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 1,752 |
| Wiltshire | 1521 | 1546 | 1643 | 1647 | 1567 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 7,924 |
| Swindon | 686 | 732 | 705 | 735 | 681 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 3,539 |
| Other/Unknown | 46 | 40 | 50 | 58 | 34 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 228 |



|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bristol | 97.1\% | 96.8\% | 96.6\% | 97.2\% | 97.6\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 97.1\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 96.37\% | 96.68\% | 96.25\% | 97.99\% | 97.89\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 97.0\% |
| North Somerset | 96.81\% | 96.25\% | 95.92\% | 95.14\% | 94.58\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 95.7\% |
| Bath and North East Somerset | 95.38\% | 97.09\% | 95.05\% | 94.17\% | 95.90\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 95.5\% |
| Forest of Dean | 93.00\% | 95.62\% | 96.02\% | 92.22\% | 94.31\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 94.2\% |
| Cotswold | 80.86\% | 84.21\% | 82.67\% | 89.06\% | 87.16\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 84.9\% |
| Tewkesbury | 99.61\% | 97.74\% | 94.71\% | 97.89\% | 99.51\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 97.9\% |
| Cheltenham | 99.50\% | 99.73\% | 99.47\% | 99.49\% | 99.49\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 99.5\% |
| Gloucester | 99.57\% | 99.81\% | 99.60\% | 99.18\% | 99.55\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 99.5\% |
| Stroud | 92.80\% | 96.36\% | 95.18\% | 93.65\% | 95.80\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 94.7\% |
| Wiltshire | 93.56\% | 94.57\% | 93.00\% | 94.23\% | 94.19\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 93.9\% |
| Swindon | 98.40\% | 99.45\% | 99.01\% | 98.50\% | 99.71\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 99.0\% |
| Other/Unknown | 76.09\% | 77.50\% | 76.00\% | 81.03\% | 58.82\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 75.0\% |

## GREEN Performance by PCT

| GREEN Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| Gloucestershire | 3428 | 3464 | 3398 | 3644 | 3551 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 17,485 |
| Swindon | 1188 | 1132 | 1200 | 119 C | 115: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 5,863 |
| Bristol | 2917 | 2734 | 280 C | $292 \varepsilon$ | 2701 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 14,080 |
| North Somerset | 1262 | 1292 | 1251 | 1268 | 125\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 6,326 |
| South Gloucestershire | 1310 | 1307 | 1185 | 123: | 125: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 6,288 |
| Bath and North East Somerse | 1012 | 955 | 1056 | 102 ¢ | $93 C$ | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 4,982 |
| Wiltshire | 2479 | 253; | 2557 | 2691 | 2636 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 12,896 |
| Other/Unknown | 94 | 111 | 83 | 105 | 12 C | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 513 |
| Total | 13,690 | 13,52\} | 13,53 | 14,088 | 13,59i | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 68,433 |


|  | Apr-11 | May-11 | Jun-11 | Jul-11 | Aug-11 | Sep-11 | Oct-11 | Nov-11 | Dec-11 | Jan-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gloucestershire | 93.9\% | 93.1\% | 92.7\% | 93.3\% | 94.5\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 93.5\% |
| Swindon | 96.13\% | 93.90\% | 92.42\% | 90.67\%, | 91.07\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 92.8\% |
| Bristol | 80.70\% | 84.82\%, | 78.86\% | 79.64\% | 84.19, | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 81.6\% |
| North Somerset | 86.61\% | 87.62\% | 84.09\% | 84.38\% | 85.79\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 85.7\% |
| South Gloucestershire | 83.44\% | 87.99\% | 81.77\% | 84.75\% | 87.63\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 85.2\% |
| Bath and North East Somerse | 91.80\% | 91.83\% | 90.53\% | 88.63\% | 90.11\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 90.6\% |
| Wiltshire | 92.62\% | 92.66\% | 89.95\% | 88.26\% | 90.86\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 90.8\% |
| Other/Unknown | 89.36\% | 86.49\%, | 87.95\% | 93.33\% | 87.50\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 88.9\% |
| Total | 89.2\% | 90.3\% | 87.3\% | 87.4\% | 89.7\% | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 88.8\% |

Percentage of Total Responses being Green Responses by PC•
Green Responses
Gloucestershire
Swindon
Bristol
North Somerset
South Gloucestershire
Bath and North East Som
Wiltshire
Other/Unknown
Total
05/10/201112:40
Appendix C

| ［セł01 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | N | $\stackrel{\llcorner }{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\text { N }}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\text { J }}}{\substack{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\underset{\sim}{\wedge}}$ | － | 欠\％ | $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \％ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $F$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\checkmark$ | フ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
|  | ¢ٌ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | ®্ণ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\leftarrow}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | 옹 | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
| S．HH $\dagger$＜ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SJH $\boldsymbol{t}-\varepsilon$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S．H $\mathcal{\varepsilon}-\tau$ | $\checkmark$ |  | م |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 은 |
| sat $\mathrm{C}-1$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bullet$ | $\infty$ |  | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ |
| 6S：6S－00：St | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | N | ก | $F$ | $\cdots$ |  | $\sim$ | 산 | － |
| 6S：tt－00：0t | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | F | N | 10 | $\nabla$ |  | $\sim$ | $F$ | $\bar{\infty}$ |
| 6S：68－00：s | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 앙 | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | ＋ |  | $\ulcorner$ | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |
| 6S：t\＆－00：0¢ | 앙 | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\overline{6}$ | N | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\sim$ | $F$ | \％ |
| 6s：6z－00：sz | 옹 | ¢ | $\stackrel{\circ}{1}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\leftharpoondown$ | m | $\wedge$ | 욱 |
| 6S：tz－00：0z | 음 | 8 | 5 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | N |  | $\infty$ | ¢ | ¢ |
| 6S：6L－00：Sl | N | N | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\llcorner }{\square}$ | is | $\pm$ | － | $\infty$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ 8 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 00：Sl＝＞ | $\stackrel{\widetilde{N}}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\stackrel{\curvearrowleft}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{c}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { 윽 }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{N}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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# Great Western Ambulance Service <br> NHS 

NHS Trust

## Joint HOSC Meeting

To be held on Friday 14 October, 2011 at 11am
At Wiltshire Council Monkton Park offices, Chippenham

## Key in title here

## 1 Purpose

To update members on trust plans to seek a partnership rather than pursue an independent application for foundation trust status.

The following report details the position as at time of submission to the Joint HOSC - any subsequent developments will be outlined verbally at the meeting.

# Great Western Ambulance Service NHS 

NHS Trust

## UPDATE FOR JOINT HOSC ON PARTNERSHIP/FT ARRANGEMENTS

In August, GWAS announced it was exploring the possibility of partnering with another organisation as the best way of continuing to improve patient care for the future.

The decision, supported by NHS South West and lead commissioner NHS Gloucestershire, was taken by the trust Board, which came to the conclusion that it was not viable for GWAS to continue to pursue an independent application to become an NHS foundation trust.

All NHS trusts are required to become foundation trusts and are facing financial challenges, needing to become more efficient while simultaneously improving patient care.

The announcement included GWAS's preference that the partnership would be with another ambulance trust, while acknowledging that the process would need to follow very clear rules that govern co-operation and competition in the NHS.

Expressions of interest have been sought from all English ambulance trusts and South Western Ambulance Service subsequently publicly declared its interest in exploring a partnership with GWAS. This is the only ambulance service to do so. Discussions between GWAS and the SHA have been ongoing since then to determine the most appropriate way of taking the partnership process forward.

This will require us to take into account the views of the Competition and Cooperation Panel, which advises on competition in the NHS.

Therefore, the current situation is that progress towards securing an agreement on a preferred partner is continuing - GWAS Chairman Peter Carr hopes to conclude this and be able to make a further announcement before the end of October.

Alongside this work, GWAS is also in the final stages of arranging an interim chief executive for the next 12 months, following Martin Flaherty's return to his substantive post with London Ambulance Service. Again, the expectation is for an announcement on this to be made during October.

In the meantime, Dr Ossie Rawstorne - Medical Director and Chief Operating Officer - will act as interim CEO until the longer term replacement is announced.

In addition, Kieran Lappin has joined GWAS as Director of Finance, replacing Rod Barnes, who has left to take up a similar post with Yorkshire Ambulance Service.

GWAS will, of course, ensure members are updated outside this meeting as and when further announcement are made.

# Great Western Ambulance Service <br> NHS 

NHS Trust

Joint HOSC Meeting

To be held on Friday 14 October, 2011 at 11am
At Wiltshire Council Monkton Park offices, Chippenham

## Key in title here

1 Purpose
To provide members with clarification of issues raised in a recent National Audit Office report looking at value-for-money within ambulance services.

Paper supplied - 5 October, 2011

Great Western Ambulance Service NHS

## NHS Trust

## MEASURING COST-EFFECTIVE IN AMBULANCE SERVICES - UPDATE REPORT FOR JOINT HOSC

## Background

In June 2011, the National Audit Office published Transforming NHS ambulance services - a report looking at the cost-effectiveness of ambulance trusts individually and collectively, in comparison with expectations on them in the form of performance standards and activity levels.

This brief update for Joint HOSC members highlights some of the NAO report's key findings and recommendations and provides an insight into some of the activity taking place within GWAS that address the issues raised.

## Key findings and recommendations

- Performance over the last decade has been driven by response time targets and not outcomes
Prior to April 2011, the sole measure of ambulance performance was its speed of response. The category A 8-minute response time target - one of the most demanding in the world - has undoubtedly ensured more patients suffering lifethreatening conditions have survived, while also meeting public expectations for a fast response.

However, it was recognised that speed of response in isolation of any measure of clinical outcomes created a narrow view of what constituted 'good' performance, while also led to ambulance services over-allocating resources to incidents deploying multiple vehicles then standing down the surplus.

Therefore, the introduction in April of a new range of indicators is now starting to produce a better, more rounded picture of ambulance service performance. Members are receiving an update on these new indicators in another agenda item for this meeting.

- There is scope for improved efficiency as evidenced by variations between ambulance services in costs per call, the way resources are deployed to meet demand, the take-up of different approaches to responding to calls and reliance on overtime.
The report highlighted GWAS as having the highest cost per call at $£ 216$. Clearly an element of this is the fact that GWAS is the smallest of England's 11 standalone ambulance services (the Isle of Wight is part of NHS Hampshire) the trust has to have the same level of governance and other 'fixed cost' items as
larger trusts. Also, in terms of cost per incident, GWAS sat more in the middle of the pack (less than Yorkshire, East of England and South Central) at $£ 235$.

The growing use of 'hear-and-treat' and 'see-and-treat' - assessing and treating patients over the phone or on scene without the need to convey to hospital - was identified by the NAO as a key area whereby ambulance services could help the NHS as a whole save up to $£ 280$ million/year. This ability to provide care for patients without the need to take them to A\&E is one of the quality indicators in place since April - for the April-July year-to-date data, GWAS was in the top three ambulance services, in that $43.5 \%$ of incidents attended did not result in the patient having to go to A\&E.

One of the issues highlighted by the NAO report in identifying comparative cost effectiveness among ambulance services was the fact that there was often no consistency in the information requested/provided. An example of this was in the comparison of the percentage of incidents in which ambulance services sent more than one resource in response.

GWAS was identified as the trust most often dispatching dual or multiple resources to incidents (on 62\% of occasions). However, the GWAS data included those incidents where a static defibrillator or community first responder was dispatched (and which would therefore have to include a professional ambulance clinician response as well). Other ambulance services only included data where two or more ambulance service vehicles were dispatched. Directly comparative data shows GWAS as far more in the middle of the pack.

In terms of extensive use of overtime, the NAO report identified that historically high sickness levels among frontline ambulance staff, as well as the ability to match staff availability with demand, meant ambulance services currently rely on overtime at a combined cost of almost $£ 80$ million/year.

GWAS was identified as having the lowest level of frontline staff sickness - $5 \%$ among ambulance services.

Also, in terms of matching staff resources to demand, the trust last year introduced a new operating model based on extensive analysis of 999 demand. This has allowed us to better match the level of resources to the level of demand - not simply in actual numbers but also ensuring more of the right resource is available in the right place at the right time.

In addition, the trust's continuing investment in paramedic training of its existing technician/practitioner level staff means it will soon be in a position to ensure a paramedic on every vehicle responding to 999 calls - thereby increasing the potential for treating more patients on scene.

- A lack of alignment of objectives between urgent and emergency care providers, including ambulance services, means that work remains to achieve cost-effective integrated emergency care.

The NAO identified that more than $20 \%$ of patient handovers at hospital A\&E departments take longer than the recommended 15 minutes - resulting in more ambulances being unavailable to respond to 999 emergencies as they are queuing outside hospitals.

GWAS continues to work with its acute hospital partners to reduce handover delays within its areas - such as by the introduction of handover screens in every A\&E department to give hospital staff a clearer picture of how many patients are currently waiting to be handed over from ambulance care and how long they have been waiting.

In addition, commissioners are now including financial incentives in hospital and ambulance service contracts to encourage smoother turnaround times.

- The ability to improve performance is limited by a lack of data on patient outcomes and a lack of comparative information that can be used to benchmark performance.

The new ambulance quality indicators include clinical outcomes - among them, for the first time, a measurement of the proportion of patients experiencing a cardiac arrest in a non-hospital setting who go on to survive and are ultimately discharged from hospital.

Other clinical measures give an indication of how successfully ambulance services are in responding to and treating patients suffering particularly clinical emergencies - stroke and STEMIs. For the first time, these are being displayed and updated monthly by all ambulance services in the form of a web-based clinical dashboard.

This dashboard shows activity and performance for all ambulance trusts - it is important to note that the majority of these new indicators (apart from the 8minute and 19-minute response standards) - are not 'targets', in that they do not have a pass-or-fail threshold. Instead they will, over time, develop into a fuller picture of comparative information by which ambulance trusts can be benchmarked.
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ค
Ambulance Quality Indicators
from time

- 11 new ambulance quality indicators for
England's ambulance services.
- Used to measure patient experience
and outcomes.
$\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$
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Ambulance Quality Indicators
Outcome from STEMI
Outcome from cardiac arrest - return of spontaneous circulation
Outcome from cardiac arrest - survival to discharge
Outcome following stroke
Proportion of calls closed with telephone advice or managed
without transport to A\&E (where this is clinically appropriate)
Unplanned re-contact from the patient within 24 hrs of discharge
of care
Call abandonment rate
Time to answer calls
Patient experience
Red 8 minute and 19 minute response times
Time-to-treatment by ambulance dispatched health professional
for Red calls.
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Ambulance Quality Indicators

Ambulance Quality Indicators
 July 2011
Percentage re-contact rate following discharge of care on scene

$$
\begin{array}{|c|r|}
\hline \text { Incidents } & \text { Performance (\%) } \\
\hline 13,779 & 5.2 \\
\hline 21,387 & 7.1 \\
\hline 7,171 & 4.0 \\
\hline 433 & 0.9 \\
\hline 38,427 & 3.9 \\
\hline 6,197 & 6.3 \\
\hline 13,673 & 6.2 \\
\hline 12,062 & 6.0 \\
\hline 14,799 & 2.7 \\
\hline 11,539 & 9.6 \\
\hline 19,010 & 4.1 \\
\hline 9,725 & 8.1 \\
\hline 168 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$ East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust

East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Great Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust
¡snı SHN aכ|Mas aכue|nquy uopuo 7

 South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust
South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust
$\cdots$
Ambulance Quality Indicators

Percentage of Face Arm Speech Test (FAST) positive stroke patients (assessed face to face) potentially eligible for
stroke thrombolysis, who arrive at a hyperacute stroke centre within 60 minutes of call

|  |  | Incidents | Performance (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 52.3 | 86 | 52.3 |
| East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 46.6 | 116 | 46.6 |
| Great Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 65.2 | 66 | 65.2 |
| Isle of Wight NHS PCT |  | 22 | 0.0 |
| London Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 64.0 | 478 | 64.0 |
| North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 90.9 | 164 | 90.9 |
| North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 83.9 | 186 | 83.9 |
| South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust | ${ }^{62} 3$ | 175 | 62.3 |
| South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust | 65.6 | 366 | 65.6 |
| South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust | 53.9 | 421 | 53.9 |
| West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 77.0 | 209 | 77.0 |
| Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust | 72.2 | 418 | 72.2 |

Overall for period Higher is better
Ambulance Quality Indicators Stroke

- Call to hospital door within 60mins
- Clinical Performance Indicator 'care bundle'
for stroke:
- FAST positive
- Blood pressure
- Blood glucose level
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Ambulance Quality Indicators Stroke

- April call to hospital door within 60 mins
performance $=65 \%$
- No 'target'
- Improvement plan - root cause analysis
- Ambulance clinicians to report on patient care
record reason why call to hospital door
greater than 60mins.
Ambulance Quality Indicators
- Monthly total: cardiac arrest, plus STEMI,
plus stroke = about 400 patients.
- Per month GWAS manages about 20000
public 999 calls.
- Expand quality indicators to increase the
evidence of the quality of our care.
- End of Life - preferred place of death
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Ambulance Quality Indicators
?

Page 64

# Great Western Ambulance Service NHS 

NHS Trust

Joint HOSC Meeting<br>To be held on Friday 14 October, 2011 at 11am<br>At Wiltshire Council Monkton Park offices, Chippenham

## Key in title here

## 1 Purpose

To update members on the trust's Estates Strategy, including any potential impact from the announcement on the planned partnership arrangement.

Paper supplied - 5 October, 2011

# Great Western Ambulance Service N/HS 

NHS Trust

## GWAS Estates Strategy Implementation - Joint HOSC update October 2011

As previously reported, Great Western Ambulance Service Trust Board approved the Estates Strategy on 26 May 2011. The Estates Strategy sets out the ambitions and priorities of the trust alongside the challenges of the current estates portfolio.

In broad terms the strategy will:

- Enhance the quality and responsiveness of patient services;
- Prepare the trust for expected increased demand;
- Improve working conditions for staff;
- Improve infection control and safety of services provided through integration of fleet maintenance and deep cleaning facilities;
- Support the Government's Spending Review and QIPP agenda to get best value for money, reducing overheads and ensuring the trust estate is as cost efficient as possible;
- Reduce the trust's carbon footprint.

There are a number of legacy sites and facilities with the estates portfolio that date back to before the creation of Great Western Ambulance Service. In some cases there is a duplication of facilities across the GWAS area. A programme to implement the strategy has been established and resourced. There are three initial key projects within the programme.

They are:

## 1. Bristol estate review

The project will explore opportunities to provide effective patient care across the greater Bristol area maximising the use and location of estates assets in the area. Through a review of existing buildings (including office and ambulance station sites) and strategic location of trust services, opportunities to achieve economies of scale and improve standards of facilities across an ageing estate will be explored.

The project aims to achieve an estates solution for the greater Bristol area that meets current and future needs for the provision of patient care, improving working conditions for staff and reducing the environmental impact of sites. Specifically for patients this will provide an assurance that the trust can place the right mix of responding vehicles and the most appropriately skilled clinicians in locations that meet the needs and demands of the community. Future housing and employment site developments will be taken into consideration to ensure that the trust can meet the changing demands of the greater Bristol area as it grows.

This project will begin with a review of what GWAS currently has, including where it is located, how it serves to meet demand, patient care and compares to a benchmark of

$$
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standards for facilities. A projection of what is needed both now and in the future forms the basis of that review.

The trust has a vision to create new standards of excellence in emergency and urgent care. Key to the delivery of this will be modelling analysis that will look at the impact of where trust facilities, vehicles and clinicians could be best placed within the greater Bristol area to achieve the best mix of location, facilities, affordability and ability to respond to patient demand and deliver excellent patient care where and when it is required.

It should be noted that financial savings made as a part of this project will be reinvested in the delivery of emergency and urgent care by the ambulance service.

## 2. Trust-wide offices review

The project will review existing office accommodation across the trust, identify the needs and requirements to support the delivery of high quality services to patients and the public, meeting demand now and in the future. This project will focus on the offices and facilities occupied by non-operational services and senior operational managers. Offices provided within operational ambulance stations (typically for operational management roles) fall outside of the scope of this review.

The trust currently provides offices at nine locations across the GWAS area. Due to the multiple locations of office facilities, much officer time is spent travelling between office locations; this is costly in terms of time and travelling expenses. There is a general lack of appropriate meeting space across the offices and a review of training facilities will need to be included.

This project will identify and review current facilities and usage. Current and future need will be explored and possible options identified. An options appraisal will examine a number of possible solutions / alternatives to the current arrangements.

## 3. Trust-wide operations centre review

This project will review the provision of all operations centres within the trust, managing both emergency and non-emergency calls and dispatch. The project will work towards a model that will support cost-effective delivery of high-quality services to patients and the public, and meet the needs of the trust and the community now and in the future.

The review will include all call handling, dispatch and call resolution for Accident and Emergency, Patient Transport Services and Out of Hours giving consideration to potential demands and opportunities created by the 111 project.

Members of the public will not experience any change to the current 999 service that is provided by GWAS. Calls will be answered in the normal way and the most appropriate vehicle and clinician dispatched to respond to the call.

The trust is currently maintaining three emergency operations centres (EOCs), a separate Patient Transport Service (PTS) control room and the Gloucestershire Out-of-Hours (OoH) control function is incorporated into the Gloucestershire EOC resulting in the operation of four separate locations.

When considering future options, the following will to be taken into consideration:

- Potential for increased efficiency and reductions in management overhead requirements by reducing the total number of locations;
- Improved responsiveness and flexibility to cater for variations in demand, including projected growth in call volumes and possible major incidents, through the ability to allocate resources flexibly and at short notice to meet changes in demand;
- The provision of a new clinical delivery model, following intelligent dispatch of resources and dispatch desk remodelling;
- Responding to patient needs quickly, equitably and appropriately day or night;
- In order to be considered as a potential provider of the 111 service there will be a need to increase capacity, efficiency and effectiveness of control rooms;
- Resilience, through implementation of effective backup and contingency arrangements.


## Stakeholder engagement

Each of the projects will impact on GWAS staff, with real potential to result in significant change. External stakeholders, including members of the public, will have an interest in the outcomes and impacts of the projects. Discussions have taken place with the Strategic Health Authority to ensure that the gateway process for managing significant service change is followed throughout the implementation of the strategy.

Engagement of stakeholders is being managed on a project-by-project basis with the strategic overview at programme level. In all cases there is an ambition that the programme will be as open as possible in the review of provision and will keep regular communication and involvement with the most effected and most interested parties.

Regular updates will be shared with the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate. Where specific projects have a greater significance to a particular geographical level, updates will be provided to the relevant overview and scrutiny committee.

The recent announcement that the trust is seeking a partner has prompted a review of this programme of work. Conversations with potential partners have concluded that the drivers and pressures highlighted in the estates strategy remain. The work to implement the estates strategy will continue as the trust continues to work towards a partnership.

## Planned timescales

Project initiation documents for each of the projects were approved in September. The programme board requested that the timescales for both the Bristol estate review and the trust-wide offices review be revisited. This work was originally scheduled to begin quarter one and quarter two of the 2012-13 year. A revised timetable and the resource implications will be presented to the programme board in October.

The trust-wide review of operations centres is the most advanced of the three projects. It is anticipated that the programme board will present a recommendation and outline business case to trust Board by the end of November 2011.

Once the trust has approved the timescales, this information will be used to finalise the engagement timeline and the information will be shared with partners.

# Update from Individual Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees 

Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011

Author: Chair, Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee

## Purpose

To enable individual Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees to advise the Joint Committee of any work they are undertaking in relation to ambulance services and the outcomes of such work.

## Recommendation

The Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee is requested to:

Consider any written and verbal updates provided by Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees and determine whether the Joint Committee requires any further action.

### 1.0 Reasons

> 1.1 Recommendation 5 of the Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee's "Review of the Operation of the Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee, February - October 2008" required that a standing agenda item be included at each meeting of the Joint Committee to enable individual Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees (HOSCs) to provide an update on any work they are undertaking in relation to ambulance services and the outcomes of such work.

### 2.0 Detail

2.1 The rationale for this recommendation was to ensure that the Joint Committee was kept informed of any local work that is being carried out by individual HOSCs. This will enable the Joint Committee to identify any issues that may benefit from its involvement and will reduce the likelihood of duplication of work occurring between the Joint Committee and individual HOSCs.
2.2 Submissions from those local authority HOSCs which are undertaking any such work are included in the appendices to this report for the information of Members.
2.3 Members from each local authority HOSC may also wish to provide the Joint Committee with a verbal update.
2.4 Members are requested to consider the updates provided by HOSCs and determine whether any further action is required by the Joint Committee in relation to any of the issues raised.

### 3.0 Background Papers and Appendices

Appendix 1: Update from B\&NES Wellbeing Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

## Appendix 1

## Update to GWAS Joint Scrutiny Committee from B\&NES Wellbeing Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

The Wellbeing Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel are due to receive an update from the Great Western Ambulance Service given by Paul BirkettWendes (GWAS General Manager for Wiltshire locality) and John Oliver (GWAS External Communications Manager) at their meeting on the $7^{\text {th }}$ October.

This update will mainly focus on Ambulance Quality Indicators (AQI) for the GWAS area and a specific update on the number of 999 calls received in the Bath \& North East Somerset area.

The Panel will also receive a verbal update on the recent announcement by the Great Western Ambulance Trust to establish a partnership arrangement.

Date: $29^{\text {th }}$ September 2011
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# LOCAL INVOLVEMENT NETWORK (LINk) <br> Joint Working Group (JWG) for Ambulance Services UPDATE FOR THE JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (JOSC) 

October 2011

The JWG met in July and September 2011. The speaker at the July meeting was Dave Coates, Emergency Care Practitioner (ECP) Great Western Ambulance Services (GWAS), who talked about the Emergency Pathways across the GWAS area. He specifically talked about the Stroke Pathway and the Cardiac Care pathway. Members found the presentation very interesting and informative. They noted there was some variance in critical timings across the area.

The speaker at the September meeting was Marija Kontic, Chief Project Manager for the GWAS Emergency Departments Arrival Screens project. Members learnt that Arrival Screens are now present in the eight acute hospitals in the GWAS area. The screens are designed to give advanced information to Emergency Departments on incoming patients and to provide a detailed, accurate measurement of handover times.

At a previous meeting, JWG members had expressed their concerns about the variance in handover times at acute Hospitals. Members discussed the Arrival Screens presentation and agreed to undertake a piece of work which would be centred on the screens and the processes around them.

Chair LINk JWG for ambulance services
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Agenda Item No. 13

## Work Programme

## Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011

Author: Chair, Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee

## Purpose

To agree the next stages of the work programme for the Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee for 2011/12.

## Recommendation

The Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee is requested to:

- Agree the future items on the Work Programme and authorise the Chair and support officers to make arrangements for the delivery of the Work Programme
- Agree the proposed date and hosting arrangements for the forthcoming meeting in February.


### 1.0 Reasons

1.1 In order to facilitate the preparation of meetings, the Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee has agreed to develop a work programme that outlines its priorities.

### 2.0 Detail

2.1 At the last meeting on $10^{\text {th }}$ June 2011, Members agreed a work programme up to the $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011.
2.2 Members are requested to confirm the date of the next meeting. The proposed date is $24^{\text {th }}$ February 2012.
2.3 Members are requested to confirm work programme priorities for the next meeting of the Committee.
2.4 A draft Work Programme is attached, which includes the standing items that are reported to every meeting of the Committee.

### 3.0 Background Papers and Appendices

Appendices
Appendix A - Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2011/12

## Appendix A

## Work Programme

## Great Western Ambulance Joint Health Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2011/12 (Updated $3^{\text {rd }}$ October 2011)

Please note:

- Where possible, a 45 minute pre-meeting will be held before all formal Committee meetings. These will be held in private.
- Members are reminded that the Work Programme is a live document and will be reviewed at every Committee meeting to ensure that it remains relevant and to plan future meetings.

Friday $14^{\text {th }}$ October 2011 at Wiltshire Council, Monkton Park, Chippenham

| Agenda Item | Issues to be Considered | Witnesses Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To consider any issues arising from the Monthly Performance Report, and response times for district councils. <br> (also included will be a full breakdown of handover times/delays by hospital) | - To consider the latest data regarding key performance information <br> - To raise any issues with officers from GWAS and Gloucestershire PCT <br> - To determine whether any further action is required by the Joint Committee | - Representative from GWAS <br> - Representative from Gloucestershire PCT |
| Report from Joint Working Group |  | - Local LINK rep and/or Chair of JWG |
| (prov) Briefing: Organisational change and leadership in GWAS | $\bullet$ | - Representative from GWAS |
| Report from Audit Commission | - Requested by Chair | - Linda Prosser, NHS Glos |
| Update from local authority Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees (HOSCs) | - To enable individual HOSCs to advise the Joint Committee of any work they are | - N/A |


|  | undertaking and the <br> outcomes of such <br> work |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| GWAS Joint Health <br> Scrutiny Committee <br> Work Programme | -To review the <br> Committee's work <br> programme to <br> ensure that it <br> remains relevant | • Scrutiny Officer |

February $24^{\text {th }} 2012$ (host to be confirmed)
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|}\hline \text { Agenda Item } & \text { Issues to be Considered } & \text { Witnesses Required } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { To consider any } \\ \text { issues arising from the } \\ \text { Monthly Performance } \\ \text { Report, and response } \\ \text { times for district } \\ \text { councils. } \\ \text { (also included will be a } \\ \text { full breakdown of } \\ \text { handover times/delays } \\ \text { by hospital) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { - To consider the } \\ \text { latest data } \\ \text { regarding key } \\ \text { performance } \\ \text { information } \\ \text { To raise any issues } \\ \text { with officers from } \\ \text { GWAS and } \\ \text { Gloucestershire } \\ \text { PCT }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { • }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{ll}\text { Representative } \\ \text { from GWAS }\end{array} \\ \text { Re determine } \\ \text { Representative } \\ \text { from } \\ \text { Gloucestershire } \\ \text { action is required by } \\ \text { the Joint Committee }\end{array}\right]$
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