

Full EQIA Impact Assessment of the Moray Coast Medical Practice Proposed Closure of the Part-Time Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches, Impact Assessment begun 4th August 2022, completed 10th November 2022

| | |
|---|--|
| Organisation: | Full EQIA carried out by NHS Grampian on behalf of the Moray Integration Joint Board |
| | |
| Department carrying out the full EQIA: | Equality and Diversity Section of the NHS Grampian Corporate Communications Department |
| | |
| Person undertaking Full EQIA: | Nigel Firth |
| | |
| Title: | Equality and Diversity Manager, NHS Grampian, NHS Orkney and NHS Shetland |
| Date EQIA Started: | Thursday 4 th August 2022 |
| Date completed: | Tuesday 10 th November 2022 |
| | |
| Name of Policy, Strategy, or re-organisational proposal: | Proposed closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches by Moray Coast Medical Practice |

Summary of Main issue(s)

- The Moray Coast GP Practice has its main base in Lossiemouth. It also operates two GP Sub Branches, one in Burghead and one in Hopeman.
- Both Sub Branches are located in accommodation which is considered too small and below an acceptable standard for the provision of modern healthcare. The Burghead Sub Branch building is too small and cannot be brought up to an acceptable standard within its present footprint. The Hopeman building has serious structural faults and is deemed uneconomic to repair.
- The Sub Branches also involve lone working for a GP and a nurse which poses a potential risk to the staff involved.
- The Practice have proposed the closure of both Sub Branches. It is proposed that patients who currently access GP services in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches, would travel to Lossiemouth in future.
- The Sub Branches are popular with patients. Before their temporary closure due to COVID-19 in March 2020, on average there were 54 consultation per week in each locations, half with GP's, half with Practice nurses
- A final decision now requires to be made on the way forward.
- However, due to GP shortages across Grampian, it is important to establish at the outset whether the Moray Coast GP Practice have the GP capacity to re-open these two Sub Branches. If not, would there be any other viable alternative for the provision of GP services in these two locations.

Has the re-organisational proposal being Impact Assessed in terms of current equality and diversity legislation?

Yes, an Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment has been carried out on the Proposed closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches by Moray Coast Medical Practice. This was carried out using the Rapid Impact Assessment Checklist methodology.

NHS Grampian

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>A copy of the Rapid Impact Assessment Checklist (RIC) is attached at Appendix I.</p> <p>A copy of the RIC Summary Sheet is attached at Appendix II.</p> |
| | |
| <p>List any associated NHS Grampian policies or functions</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None |
| | |
| <p>List any other bodies involved</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moray Coast Medical Practice • Moray Health and Social Care Partnership (Integration Joint Board) |
| | |
| <p>Any associated policies or functions from the associated bodies which are relevant to the policy, strategy or re-organisational proposal</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Reform (Scotland) Act 2004 • Equality Act 2010 • Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012, as amended • The Fairer Scotland Duty 2018 • NHS Circular CEL 4 (2010) entitled: Informing, Engaging and Consulting People in Developing Health and Community Care Services • Scottish Health Planning Note (SHPN) 36, Part 1 which sets out the design guidance for General Medical Practice Premises in Scotland. |

NHS Grampian

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moray Health and Social Care partnership Strategic Plan 2019-2029.• Scottish Health Facilities Note 30: 'Infection control in the built environment' Version 2 and Healthcare Associated Infection System for Controlling Risk in the Built Environment (HAI Scribe) |
| | |

1. Aim/Status

| |
|---|
| (a) What is the aim/purpose of the policy/function? |
| To establish the best way forward for GP provided healthcare in the Burghead and Hopeman areas. |

| |
|---|
| (b) Who is intended to benefit from this policy/function and in what way? |
| Patients <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Patients who currently access GP services in Burghead and Hopeman, by travelling to Lossiemouth, would have access to a wider range of healthcare services. These include women's health screening, child health screening, minor surgery and tests, all carried out in better facilities. This may result in fewer visits and quicker diagnosis. There is also access to other supporting services in-site.• If the decision is taken to retain and upgrade or re-provide the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches, this would be a popular decision with most patients in these areas. |

NHS Grampian

- However, retaining the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches would mean that patients using the Sub Branches or re-provided facilities would not reap the benefits of accessing a much wider range of services in Lossiemouth.

Staff will benefit by having:

- A more efficient use of GP time and nursing staff therefore help to reduce waiting times.
- Safer working. A lone GP and one lone nurse working in unsuitable premises poses safety risks to the staff concerned.
- There was no information provided at the time of compiling the FULL EQIA on whether the Lossiemouth GP Practice are actually able to sustain the Sub Branches with their current level of GP staffing. If not, are there any other alternatives for the provision of GP services in these two areas.

(c) How have they been involved in the development of this policy/function?

Patients and the general public

- A Healthier Lives, Healthier Communities questionnaire was drafted on Survey Monkey and sent out in November 2021 via social media and the Moray Health and Social Care website and through partner agencies. It was also made available in hard copy and widely distributed. The survey highlighted the community concern that the temporary closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches might become permanent.
- The Moray integration Joint Board at a meeting on 26th May 2022 initiated a formal consultation with patients of Moray Coast GP Practice on the future model of healthcare provision, including the permanent closure of the two Sub Branch Surgeries.

Staff

- Moray Coast Practice staff have been closely involved throughout the discussion process.
- There was no information provided at the time of compiling the FULL EQIA on whether the Lossiemouth GP Practice are actually able to sustain the GP Sub Branches with their current level of GP staffing. If not, are there any other alternatives for the provision of GP services in these two areas?

(d) How does it fit into broader corporate aims?

(i) Moray Integration Joint Board

Moray Integration Joint Board in their Strategic Plan 2019-2029, highlighted their wish to:

- Improve the patient experience
- Improve the efficient use of healthcare resources
- Provide health and social care services in an integrated manner
- Provide services in premises fit for purpose.
- Provide all possible support to GP Practices.
- Avoid overcrowding

The only inconsistency is a commitment in the Strategic Plan to provide the services closer to the patient's home.

(e) What outcomes are intended from this policy/function

If the outcome is closure:

Patients who currently access GP services in Burghead and Hopeman, by travelling to Lossiemouth, would:

- have access to a wider range of healthcare services such as women's health screening, child health screening, minor surgery and tests
- Better facilities, compliant with current healthcare accommodation standards
- Have fewer visits and quicker diagnosis
- Access to other supporting services on-site

Closure of the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches would also:

- Be a more efficient use of GP and Practice nurse time and therefore help to reduce overall GP waiting times for the Lossiemouth Practice patients.
- Provide a safer working. A lone GP or a lone nurse working in unsuitable premises poses safety risks to the GP and any other staff concerned.

(f) What resource implications are linked to this policy and/or functions?

If would be a good idea as part of the consultation process, to establish any likely savings in both staff travelling time and revenue and capital building costs if the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches close. This could include:

- Opportunity cost saving of GP time and Practice nurse time used more efficiently?
- Cost saving of closing Burghead Sub Branch?
- Costs associated with termination of lease before November 2023?

NHS Grampian

- Savings on heat light and power?
- Any capital cost savings?
- Has the availability of more suitable accommodation in Burghead been explored and possible costs?

The Burghead Sub Branch accommodation is leased from a private landlord. A survey carried out by the NHS Grampian Estates Department identified an estimated cost of £116,000 +VAT to address immediate issues. However, these would be issues within the existing building footprint. It would not address the space issues such as:

- Inadequate disabled access
- Room sizes do not comply with current design standards
- Toilet facilities require to be shared between patients and staff
- No available staff rest/changing facilities
- Inadequate utility/cleaning areas
- Fire escape strategy for one direction of travel

The Hopeman Sub Branch accommodation is owned by the Lossiemouth GP Practice. To address the immediate issues identified by an NHS Grampian Estates Department Survey would require expenditure of £142,000 + VAT. However, these would be issues within the existing building footprint. It would not address the space issues.

In addition, the NHS Grampian Estates Department Survey identified cracking throughout the building and recommended a structural survey be carried out.

This was carried out by Cameron and Ross, Consulting Engineers from Aberdeen in February 2022. Their survey identified:

- Extensive cracking suggesting ongoing structural movement
- Over stressed roof timbers which are deflecting.
- The side elevations appear to be dropping relative to the central portion of the building

NHS Grampian

- Historical cracks which have been repaired, are e-opening
- There is anecdotal evidence of subsidence in the adjacent car park
- In the view of the Consulting engineers, repairs to the building would not be economically viable

Complete (g) to (i) for new policies/functions/re-organisational proposals only.

(g) What research or consultation has been done?

Research

- The Burghead and Hopeman buildings have both been surveyed by NHS Grampian Estates Department staff and Reports produced.
- The Hopeman Sub Branch has been the subject of a Structural Survey carried by Cameron and Ross, Consulting Engineers from Aberdeen in February 2022.
- A Healthier Lives, Healthier Communities questionnaire was drafted on Survey Monkey and sent out in November 2021 via social media and the Moray Health and Social Care website and through local organisations.

Consultation

- Engagement activity took place with the local population, community groups and key stakeholders between November 2021 and January 2022.
- Formal consultation, as required by NHS Circular CEL 4 (2010) entitled: Informing, Engaging and Consulting People in Developing Health and Community Care Services commenced on 16th September 2022, until 26th January 2023.

h) What stage is the policy/function/re-organisational proposal at?

Awaiting a formal consultation process as required by NHS Circular CEL 4 (2010) before the Integration Joint Board arrive at a final decision.

(i) What is the target date for completion?

Formal consultation began on 16th September 2022 until 26th January 2023.

2. Examination of Available Data

Data

(data collection could include consultations, surveys, databases, focus groups, in-depth interviews, pilot projects, complaints made, user feedback, academic publications, consultants` reports, citizens juries etc)

Information available for consideration in the EQIA includes:

- A Report to Moray Integration Joint Board dated 26th May 2022
- A Paper Entitled: Do I Need an EIA? Undated
- An NHS Grampian Estates Survey of the Burghead Sub Branch Building with an estimate of costs to improve the building, but it would not meet current minimum standards for a clinical building
- An NHS Grampian Estates Survey of the Hopeman Sub Branch Building with an estimate of costs to improve the building, but it would not meet current minimum standards for a clinical building
- A Structural Engineers Report on the Hopeman Sub Branch Building, carried out in February 2022
- A Healthier Lives Survey carried out in the Burghead, Hopeman and Lossiemouth areas in late 2021.

(a) Are there any experts/relevant groups whom you can/should approach to explore their views on the issues?

All relevant experts have been involved at the appropriate stages. No additional input is required.

(b) What do we know from existing data, research, consultation, focus groups and analysis in-house?

Quantitative:

The in-house quantitative data shows:

- That both the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branch buildings are not fit for purpose
- That patients who use the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches greatly value their ready access to GP and community nursing care, averaging 54 consultation per location per week prior to the temporary closure.
- There is no direct public transport links between Burghead and Hopeman to Lossiemouth. Burghead to Lossiemouth surgery is 7.8 miles. Hopeman to Lossiemouth surgery is 5.5 miles.
- A much wider range of health and social care services is provided at the main Lossiemouth GP Practice. These Include:
 - women's health screening
 - child health screening
 - minor surgery
 - on-site tests
 - The facilities are compliant with current building, hygiene and healthcare standards.
 - There is also access to other supporting services in-site.
- Closure of the two Sub Branches would enable a more efficient use of GP and community nurse time.

NHS Grampian

- No information was submitted for the FULL EQIA process on whether the Lossiemouth GP Practice are actually able to sustain the Sub Branches with their current level of GP staffing or if alternative GP resources are available.

Qualitative:

As stated above.

(c) What do we know from existing data, research, consultation, focus groups and analysis available externally?

- Any proposed closure of a GP Sub Branch causes great concern to members of the communities from which the Sub Branches are removed. Most perceive the removal as downgrading the status of their community and making the location a less attractive place for inward migration.
- There is a great deal of empirical evidence to prove the benefits of providing care close to a patient's home.

(d) What gaps in knowledge are apparent?

The main gap is a lack of information about the population who use the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. In these circumstances, it would be usual to have information on:

How many people who use the Sub Branches in each location are

- elderly
- have a limiting long term illnesses
- are disabled
- are families with young children
- car owners
- Morbidity data

At the time this FULL EQIA was being carried out, none of this information was available.

Accordingly, it was necessary to scrutinise the information which was available.

Public Health Scotland Locality Profile, Lossiemouth Sub-Locality August 2022

On page 11 of the profile is an illustration showing the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) for the Lossiemouth area. SIMD 1 is the most deprived, SIMD 5 is the least deprived.

The Lossiemouth area is generally prosperous. Most locations are shown to be in SIMD 4. The Lossiemouth town area is shown to be SIMD 5, while the Burghead and Hopeman areas are SIMD 4.

Scottish Health and Well Being Profiles For Lossiemouth Data Zones

The data shows that:

- People living in the Burghead, Roseisle and Laich are living in the 15% most “access deprived” areas
- People in the Burghead, Roseisle and Laich areas are overall, healthier than people living in Lossiemouth, East and Seatown and Lossiemouth West.

The Moray Coast GP Practice

- There is no indication as to whether the Moray Coast GP Practice are actually able to sustain the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches with their current level of GP staffing. If the Practice are unable to sustain the Sub Branches, are there alternative suppliers of GP services?

Fairer Scotland Duty 2018

The Fairer Scotland Duty came into force in Scotland from 1st April 2018 and places a legal duty on public bodies to consider how they can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage, when making strategic decision. Specifically:

“An authority to which this section applies must, when making decisions of a strategic nature about how to exercise its functions, have due regard to the desirability of exercising them in a way that is designed to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage.”

If the proposed closure of the Sub Branches goes ahead, steps should be taken to mitigate any potential negative health impacts in Burghead and Hopeman. The main issues being:

- the absence of any direct public transport links
- the associated additional travel costs
- additional travel time for patients.
- If the GP Sub Branches close, this will have a negative impact on geographical equity of access to GP services.

(e) If there appears to be any potential difficulties of access or compliance with the aims of the policy/function/re-organisational proposal, please describe these.

As at (d) above.

3. Rapid Impact Assessment Checklist (RIC)

After completing the RIC screening process, answer the following questions:

Have potential negative impacts been identified for people with a “protected characteristic”, as defined by the Equality Act 2010?

Yes No

| | |
|---|--|
| ✓ | |
|---|--|

If yes, has a full EQIA process been recommended?

Yes No

| | |
|---|--|
| ✓ | |
|---|--|

If no, are you satisfied that the conclusions of the RIC are accurate and comprehensive?

Yes No

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Signature of Impact Assessor: Nigel Firth

Date:

10th November 2022

4. Compliance with the Socio-Economic Duty (in Scotland called the Fairer Scotland Duty) enacted in April 2018

“Fairer Scotland Duty: Socio- economic deprivation

The Fairer Scotland Duty requires public bodies such as NHS Grampian and Health and Social Care Partnerships, when making strategic decisions, to take account of the need to improve equity of health and social care outcomes for area of multiple deprivation.

If a decision is made by the Integration Joint Board to allow the closure of the Sub Branches, all possible steps must be taken to mitigate any adverse effects. Things to consider would be:

- A mini bus service free to Scotland-wide concession card holders for patients in the Burghead and Hopeman locations to the Lossiemouth GP Practice.
- Consideration of other properties in the Burghead and Hopeman areas which might make suitable replacement Sub Branch buildings?
- Is an extended role of nurse post appropriate in both the Burghead and Hopeman areas?
- Can additional support be provided to patients in the Burghead and Hopeman locations to access digital healthcare from Lossiemouth? However, it is acknowledged that digital communication and information is not suitable for all patients in all circumstances.

5. Impacts

(a) What is the likely impact (whether intended or unintended), positive or negative of the initiative on individual service users or on the public at large?

Positive Impacts:

Patients will benefit by having:

- A much wider range of health and social care services provided at the main Lossiemouth GP Practice. These Include:
- women's health screening
- child health screening
- minor surgery
- on-site tests
- The facilities are compliant with current building, hygiene and healthcare standards.
- There is also access to other supporting services in-site.

Staff will benefit by having:

- Provide a safer working. A lone GP or a lone nurse working in unsuitable premises poses safety risks to the GP and any other staff concerned.
- A working environment compliant with NHS building and hygiene standards

Negative Impacts:

There are three main potential negatives:

- Patients who use the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches greatly value their ready access to GP and community nursing care, averaging 54 consultation per location per week prior to the temporary closure due to COVID-19. If the Sub Branches close, patients will have to travel further to access GP and nursing services.

NHS Grampian

- There is no direct public transport links between Burghead to Lossiemouth and Hopeman to Lossiemouth. Burghead to Lossiemouth is 9 miles. Hopeman to Lossiemouth is 6.3 miles.
- A risk of a widening of health outcomes between people in Burghead and Hopeman and patients in Lossiemouth.

(b) Is there likely to be any differential impact on people with a “protected characteristic” as defined by the Equality Act 2010? If yes, please state if this impact may be adverse and give further details (e.g. which specific groups are affected, in what ways and why do you believe this to be the case?)

(i) Race

Yes No

| | |
|--|---|
| | √ |
|--|---|

Adverse?

☐

Please give details

The size of local ethnic communities in the Burghead and Hopeman areas is small.

(ii) Disability

Yes No

| | |
|---|--|
| √ | |
|---|--|

Adverse?

☒

Please give details

The latest figures for Grampian show that 20% of the population have a limiting long term disability. Many people have a communication disability.

If a patient and their family members and carers have to travel further to access GP and nursing healthcare, this could seriously disadvantage disabled people. There would also be a cost implication.

NHS Grampian

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (iii) Age | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Yes No </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> | <div style="text-align: center;"> Adverse? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Please give details </div> |
| As per disability above. | | |
| (iv) Sex (male or female) | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Yes No </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </div> | <div style="text-align: center;"> Adverse? <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Please give details </div> |
| | | |
| (v) Sexual orientation | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Yes No </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </div> | <div style="text-align: center;"> Adverse? <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Please give details </div> |
| | | |
| (vi) Gender reassignment | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Yes No </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </div> | <div style="text-align: center;"> Adverse? <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Please give details </div> |
| (vii) Pregnancy and maternity | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Yes No </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> | <div style="text-align: center;"> Adverse? <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Please give details </div> |
| <p>Mothers with young children who do not have their own personal transport may find it much harder to access GP and nursing services if the GP Sub Branches close. Appointments in Lossiemouth might incur child care costs.</p> | | |

NHS Grampian

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| (viii) Marriage and civil partnership | <div>Yes No</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div> | <div>Adverse?</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Please give details</div> |
| (ix) Religion or belief | <div>Yes No</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div> | <div>Adverse?</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Please give details</div> |
| (x) Other grounds (e.g. poverty, mental health, homelessness, immigration status, involvement in the criminal justice system) | <div>Yes No</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> | <div>Adverse?</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div> <div>Please give details</div> |
| <p>Already covered in Section 5 (a) above.</p> | | |
| <p>(c) Is the policy directly discriminatory?</p> <div>Yes No</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div> | | |
| <p>(d) Is the policy indirectly discriminatory?</p> <div>Yes No</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <p>If yes, is this objectively justifiable or proportionate in meeting a legitimate aim?</p> <div>Yes No</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></div> <p>Yes, provided mitigating steps are put in place.</p> | | |

(e) Is this policy intended to increase equality of opportunity by permitting positive action or action or redress inequalities

Yes No

| | |
|--|---|
| | √ |
|--|---|

Please give details

- The proposed closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches is being proposed due to the current poor accommodation in these two locations.

If this policy/function/re-organisational proposal is unlawfully discriminatory, you must decide how to ensure the organization acts lawfully.

The proposed closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches is not unlawfully discriminatory, provided mitigating steps are put in place to avoid widening any existing health inequalities and there is no disproportionate impact on patients with a “protected characteristic”.

(f) If this policy/function/re-organisational proposal is not directly or indirectly discriminatory, does it still have an adverse impact?

Yes No

| | |
|---|--|
| √ | |
|---|--|

As detailed at 5 (a) above.

6. Modifications

In your consideration of the next questions, you should think about the following:

- **How does each option further or hinder equality of opportunity?**
- **How does each option challenge or reinforce stereotypes which influence equality of opportunity?**
- **What are the consequences for the group(s) and the public authority/organisation of not adopting an option more favourable to equality of opportunity?**
- **What are the social and economic costs and benefits of implementing each option? For the group? For the authority/organisation?**
- **Will the benefits of implementing the change outweigh the costs?**

(a) If you answered yes to Question 5(f) and the policy/function/re-organisational proposal could have an adverse impact on any new group, could you modify the initiative to reduce or eliminate any identified negative impacts, or to create or accentuate positive parts of the development?

- **Can the Lossiemouth GP Practice sustain the GP cover to the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches?**
- **If not, is GP provision from another sources possible?**
- **If the GP cover can be sustained, is there alternative accommodation available in Burghead and Hopeman of a better quality which could be developed to provide alternative accommodation of the required standard?**

NHS Grampian

- If the outcome of the review is the closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches, mitigating steps should be put in place. These should include consideration of:
 - A minibus service free to Scotland-wide concession card holders between Burghead and Lossiemouth and between Hopeman and Lossiemouth.
and/or
 - Consideration of the provision of an “extended role of nurse” service to the Burghead and Hopeman areas
 - Additional patient IT support to access the GP practice in Lossiemouth remotely

(b) If you make these modifications, would there be any impacts on other groups in society or on the ability of the initiative to achieve its purpose?

No

7. Further Research

(a) Given the analysis so far, what additional research or consultation is desirable to investigate the impacts of the proposals on diverse groups?

(i) New primary data?

| Yes | No |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Describe::

Ideally, the data described at 2(d) above should be obtained to enable the Integration Joint Board to make a fully informed decision. If this is not possible, the Integration Joint Board must accept that they may be making a final decision based on extensive but incomplete information.

(i) Secondary analysis of existing data?

Yes No

| | |
|--|---|
| | √ |
|--|---|

Describe::

(b) What steps do you need to take to ensure that the right people are involved in this research?

The correct people are already involved. The input of the NHS Grampian Public Involvement Team would be a sensible step for the consultation process.

8. Consultation

(i) The National Health Service Reform (Scotland) Act 2004 requires the involvement of the public in service change.

(ii) Involvement is also a legal requirement **the Disability Discrimination Act 2005, the Equality Act 2010 and the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012.**

(iii) There is also a Scottish Health department Circular giving Guidance on this topic: **Circular CEL 4 (2010) entitled: “Informing, Engaging and Consulting the Public in Developing Health and Community Care Services”.**

This circular sets out how the public should be informed, engaged and consulted when health and community services are developed. It also re-states the important role of the Scottish Health Council in ensuring that the informing, engaging and consulting process has been carried out appropriately. The importance of Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment in this process is also re-stated.

The formal consultation process began on 26th May 2022, with a target date for completion of 26th January 2023.

(a) What will be the aims of the consultation and involvement?

For Patients and the general public in the Burghead and Hopeman areas who access healthcare at the GP Sub Branches

- Involvement of patients and the general public in the Burghead and Hopeman areas in identifying possible solutions to the problems
- Encourage patients and the general public to contribute their knowledge and expertise
- Identify the issues which would be faced by patients should the Integration Joint Board take the decision to allow the closure of the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branches
- Identify any mitigating arrangements required to minimise the impact of the closure of the Sub Branches

For Moray Integration Joint Board

The aims will be to:

- Identify all of the current problems with the current arrangements which require to be addressed
- Involve all of the stakeholders in identifying possible solutions to the problems
- Encourage all stakeholders to contribute their knowledge and expertise
- Compliance with Circular CEL 4 (2010) and the NHS Reform (Scotland) Act 2004.

(b) What is the planned timescale?

26th May 2022 to 26th January 2023.

NHS Grampian

(c) What is the managing the consultation?

The consultation will be managed by Iain Macdonald Locality Manager Moray HSCP, in co-operation with Louise Ballantyne Public Involvement Manager NHS Grampian. The consultation will be managed on behalf of Moray Integration Joint Board.

(d) What methods of consultation will be used?

(These should be appropriate to the groups being consulted)

To be decided.

(e) What steps will be taken to ensure information was accessible so participants could contribute fully?

As a public body, Moray Integration Joint Board must be an exemplar of good practice. Accordingly, In compliance with the Equality Act 2010, the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 and the Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB) Good Practice Guidelines, Moray Integration Joint Board will make available any of its published material, in any other language or format, upon request. This offer is contained at the front of our policies, strategies and re-organisational proposals.

| | |
|---|---|
| √ | Accessible formats? |
| √ | Community languages? |
| √ | Oral information? |
| √ | Taking account of different needs? |
| √ | Taking account of different customs? |
| √ | Accessible venues? E.g. acoustics, transport, wheelchair access, loops, signing, interpreter facilities? |
| √ | Use of advocate? |

NHS Grampian

| | |
|---|---|
| √ | Training of other support for potential participants? |
| √ | Social Media |
| √ | Other- please give details |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online |
| √ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Patient and Public Reference Group |
| | |
| (f) What other consultation exercises are planned? (Can they be joined up?) | |
| None. | |
| | |
| (g) How will consultation outcomes be fed back into the process? | |
| Through the media outlets described above and through local groups and organisations. | |
| (h) Following consultation what is the Recommendation? | |
| Consultation has not concluded. | |
| 9. Decision making and reports to Line Management/Health Board | |
| | |
| (a) Who will make the decision? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Moray Integration Joint Board | |

(b) Following consultation, what is the decision?

The consultation process has not yet concluded. Therefore no decision has been made.

Reject the policy/function

Introduce the policy function

Amend the policy function

Other, please explain

Formal consultation began on 26th May 2022 until 26th January 2023.

10. Public availability of Report/Results

(a) What are the arrangements for publishing the Impact Assessment?

A communication/media campaign is now underway.

(b) The results of the Impact Assessment?

This Full EQIA does not contain sensitive financial information. Accordingly, it can be listed on the Moray Integration Joint Board website.

The Impact Assessment will be made available, upon request, as required by the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012. It will also be made available to stakeholders.

(c) The results of the consultation?

Formal consultation has not yet concluded. No decision has been made.

(d) Employment monitoring outcomes?

As highlighted in the Rapid Impact Assessment Checklist (RIC) service relocations and re-configurations always cause concern to the staff concerned. The changes may have implications for employment prospects. Any staff changes will be carefully monitored to ensure that they do not impact disproportionately on any group with a “protected characteristic”, as defined by the Equality Act 2010.

(e) Other monitoring outcomes?

(E.g. service users, non-users, stakeholder views)

A formal monitoring and review process involving all stakeholders will require to be put in place to check that the objectives intended, have been achieved and to determine what further steps might be required.

A more formal review should take place after the new arrangements have been in place one year.

An Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment Tool:

Appendix I

Moray Coast Medical Practice: Proposed Closure of the Part-Time Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches, Impact Assessment carried out in August 2022

Which groups of the population do you think will be affected by this proposal?

Other groups:

- Minority ethnic people (incl. Gypsy/travellers, refugees & asylum seekers)
- Women and men
- People with mental health problems
- People in religious/faith groups
- Older people, children and young people
- People of low income
- Homeless people
- Disabled people
- People involved in criminal justice system
- Staff
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender

Patients of the Moray Coast Medical Practice who access GP services in the Part Time Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. Staff who work in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. These individuals may be members of several of the above groups.

N.B The word proposal is used below as shorthand for any policy, procedure, strategy or proposal that might be assessed

What positive and negative impacts do you think there may be?

Which groups will be affected by these impacts?

What impact will the proposal have on lifestyles?

For example, will the changes affect:

- Diet and nutrition

None.

NHS Grampian

- Exercise and physical activity
- Substance use: tobacco, alcohol and drugs?
- Risk taking behaviour?

√ Positive. Patients who currently access GP services in Burghead and Hopeman, by travelling to Lossiemouth, would have access to a wider range of healthcare services. These include women's health screening, child health screening, minor surgery and tests, all carried out in better facilities. This may result in fewer visits and quicker diagnosis. There is also access to other supporting services.

√ Positive. The proposal, if implemented would result in a more efficient use of GP time and therefore help to reduce waiting times.

√ Positive. Single handed GP working in unsuitable premises poses safety risks for the staff concerned.

Negative. Patients who currently access GP services in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches would have to travel to Lossiemouth to access GP services. Burghead to Lossiemouth is 8.5 miles. Hopeman to Lossiemouth is 6.3 miles.

This would:

- Be a problem for patients who do not have their own transport because there are no direct public transport links between Burghead/ Hopeman and Lossiemouth
- Travel may pose a problem in Winter and inclement weather.

NHS Grampian

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and learning or skills? | <p>Additional problems may be faced by patients who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • elderly • have a limiting long term illnesses • are disabled • families with young children <p>√ Positive. The proposal is a learning opportunity for the Patients of the Moray Coast Medical Practice who access GP services in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. It is also a learning opportunity for the staff of Moray Coast Medical Practice who work in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches.</p> |
| <p>Will the proposal have any impact on the social environment? Things that might be affected include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social status • Employment (paid or unpaid) • Social/Family support | <p>Negative. A loss of a part-time GP Sub Branches may be perceived by many residents in Burghead and Hopeman as making these areas less attractive for existing residents and potential new residents.</p> <p>None, if the staff who currently work in the Sub Branches were redeployed on a “no detriment” basis.</p> <p>Negative. Patients who use the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches who do not have their own personal transport or who are elderly or have with limiting long term illnesses, or hare a disability or are families with young children, may require more</p> |

NHS Grampian

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress • Income | <p>family support. This is due to the lack of direct public transport links between Burghead/Hopeman and Lossiemouth.</p> <p>Negative. The closure of the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches would cause stress and anxiety to vulnerable groups in these areas and the wider community.</p> <p>None.</p> |
| <p>Will the proposal have any impact on the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discrimination? • Equality of opportunity? | <p>Negative. The move could potentially discriminate against patients who use the Sub Branches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who do not have their own personal transport. There are no direct public transport links between Burghead/Hopeman and Lossiemouth. • are elderly • have a limiting long term illnesses • are disabled residents • who are families with young children. <p>It is important to carry out research to quantify the numbers in each vulnerable category in Burghead and Hopeman and the healthcare needs and morbidity of the patients concerned. An assessment of car ownership in these locations would also be helpful.</p> <p>Negative. Sub Branch users would require to travel further. This will have a negative impact on geographical equity of access to GP services.</p> |

NHS Grampian

- Relations between groups?

Any proposed formal consultation process must be full and fair to avoid possible enmity developing between the patients who access GP services in Burghead and Hopeman and the GP Practice staff.

- Fairer Scotland Duty?

The Fairer Scotland Duty came into force in Scotland from 1st April 2018 and places a legal duty on public bodies to consider how they can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage, when making strategic decision.

The proposed closure of the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches requires:

(i) An assessment of the socio-economic standing of Burghead and Hopeman compared to Lossiemouth.

(ii) An assessment of relative health outcomes in the Burghead and Hopeman areas compared to Lossiemouth.

(iii) An assessment of car ownership in the Burghead and Hopeman areas.

(iv) If the proposal goes ahead, steps should be taken to mitigate any potential health impacts in Burghead and Hopeman.

The main issue being transport.

NHS Grampian

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Will the proposal have an impact on the physical environment?</p> <p>For example, will there be impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living conditions? • Pollution or climate change? • Accidental injuries or public safety? • Transmission of infectious disease? | <p>Negative. The proposed closure of the Sub Branches may make Burghead and Hopeman less attractive areas in which to live.</p> <p>Negative. If the proposal goes ahead, patients in Burghead and Hopeman will have to travel further to access GP services, leading to more vehicle pollution.</p> <p>√ Positive. Single handed GP working in unsuitable premises poses safety risks for the staff concerned. Following an expert assessment of both Sub Branch buildings, both buildings have been deemed unfit for purpose. The Lossiemouth premises meet modern healthcare standards.</p> <p>None.</p> |
| <p>Will the proposal affect access to and experience of services?</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and social services | <p>Negative. The proposal will be perceived by most people living in Burghead and Hopeman as a negative step.</p> <p>√ Positive. The co-location of social services with healthcare service at the Lossiemouth GP Practice is a positive advantage to patients in terms of integrated care.</p> |

NHS Grampian

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport • Housing services • Education | <p>√ Positive. The Lossiemouth facility provides an environment more conducive to the provision of modern health care and is compliant with current standards. The Lossiemouth facility is assessed as fit for purpose</p> <p>Negative. Patients who use the Sub Branches in Burghead and Hopeman will have to travel further to access GP service if the proposal goes ahead. This will take up more time and incur cost.</p> <p>Negative. The proposal could potentially discriminate against patients who use the Sub Branches who do not have their own personal transport. There are no direct public transport links between Burghead/ Hopeman and Lossiemouth.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>√ Positive. The proposal is a learning opportunity for the Patients of the Moray Coast Medical Practice who access GP services in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. It is also a learning opportunity for the staff of Moray Coast Medical Practice who work in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches.</p> |
|--|---|

For further information contact: Nigel Firth, Equality and Diversity Manager NHS Grampian, by email on: Nigel.firth@nhs.scot

Rapid Impact Checklist: Summary Sheet

Moray Coast Medical Practice: Proposed Closure of the Part-Time Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches, Impact Assessment carried out August 2022

Positive Impacts (Note the groups affected)

The Proposal would:

- Give patients who access GP services in Burghead and Hopeman access to a wider range of healthcare services in Lossiemouth. These include women's health screening, child health screening, minor surgery and tests, all carried out in better facilities. This may result in fewer visits and quicker diagnosis. There is also access to other supporting services.
- Result in a more efficient use of GP time and therefore help to reduce waiting times.
- Avoid single handed GP working.
- Avoid healthcare being provided in unsuitable premises.
- Enable patients attending Lossiemouth Medical Practice to access the co-located of social services.
- Be a learning opportunity for the Patients of the Moray Coast Medical Practice who access GP services in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches. It is also a learning opportunity for the staff of Moray Coast Medical Practice who work in the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches

Negative Impacts (Note the groups affected)

The Proposal would:

- Require patients who use the Burghead and Hopeman GP Sub Branch to travel 8.5 miles and 6.3 miles respectively, to Lossiemouth.
- There is no direct public transport link between Burghead and Hopeman for people without their own transports. This is a serious issue for patients who use the Burghead and Hopeman Sub Branches who do not have their own personal transport or who are elderly or have with limiting long term illnesses, or have a disability or are families with young children.
- Travelling to Lossiemouth will take time and incur cost.
- Be perceived by many residents in Burghead and Hopeman as making these areas less attractive for existing residents and potential new residents.

Additional Information and Evidence Required

To explore the negative issues highlighted above, a FULL EQIA is required.

Recommendations

A FULL EQIA is required.

From the outcome of the RIC, have negative impacts been identified for race or other equality groups? Has a full EQIA process been recommended? If not, why not?

Yes, but if a FULL EQIA is carried out, this should generate the additional information required to explore the issues highlighted above more fully.

A FULL EQIA is required.

Signature(s) of Level One
Impact Assessor(s)

.....

Date:

Signature(s) of Level Two
Impact Assessor(s) Nigel Firth,
 Equality and Diversity Manager,
 NHS Grampian

Date: Friday 4th August 2022