

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Consultation Proposals - Part 1

Control of Entry (Pharmacy Applications) and Dispensing GP Practices

The stability of NHS services in remote and rural areas

Proposal 1:

The Scottish Government proposes amending legislation that will introduce the designation of '*controlled remote, rural and island localities*' for the purposes of considering pharmacy applications in these areas of Scotland and introducing a 'Prejudice Test' in addition to the test of 'necessary or desirable' (the adequacy test).

Do you agree with this proposal?

Yes X No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

The prejudice test should not assume dispensing income is required to fund primary medical services.

Evidence of effect on local practice and primary medical services, where dispensing practices are concerned, the onus should be on the practice to provide.

Proposal 2:

The Scottish Government proposes that the designation of an area as a '*controlled remote, rural and island locality*' should be reviewed periodically by NHS Boards so that NHS provided or contracted services are responsive to population changes, and changing healthcare needs and priorities both locally and nationally. It is proposed that the review should be carried out at a minimum of every three years.

Do you agree with this proposal?

Yes X No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

Controlled remote, rural and island locality may need to be defined. Formalising a review every 3-5 years seems reasonable to assess any change in circumstances. It is unlikely there would be a benefit from more frequent review.

Proposal 3:

The Scottish Government is of the view that people living in remote, rural and island areas should have access to NHS pharmaceutical services and NHS primary medical services that are no less adequate than would be the case in other parts of Scotland.

Where the dispensing by a GP practice is necessary, it should be supplemented with pharmaceutical care provided by a qualified clinical pharmacist sourced by the NHS Board to ensure the person-centred, safe and effective use of the medicines. NHS Boards would be required to develop local plans sensitive to local circumstances to achieve this.

Do you agree with this proposal?

Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

Plans need to be flexible to manage the risk and arrangements will require clear lines of responsibility and accountability e.g. impact on responsible pharmacist if there was a dispensing error. The public and patients may need guidance on what pharmaceutical services can be expected as standard and what may be additional.
We would not want this to be a compulsory arrangement.
Funding will need to be clarified.

Consultation Proposals - Part 2

Wider Pharmacy Application Processes

The proposals discussed in Part 2 apply to all applications to open a community pharmacy whether in a remote, rural or island area, or in other parts of Scotland.

Public consultation and the community voice

Proposal 4:

The Scottish Government proposes that the regulatory framework going forward will look to include a community representative among those who should be notified, as an 'interested party or persons', of any application to open a community pharmacy in the locality. The community would therefore in statute be considered as a body or party whose interests may be significantly affected by the pharmacy application.

This would be a nominated representative from, for example, the local Community Council or the local Residents Association or another appropriate local community representative body recognised by the NHS Board.

As an 'interested party' the community representative would be entitled to make written representations about the application to the Board to which the application is made within 30 days of receipt of the Board's notification of the application.

In addition, where the NHS Board PPC decides to hear oral representations, the community representative will be entitled to take part, together with the applicant and the other interested parties, and would be given reasonable notice of the meeting where those oral representations are to be heard. Once each interested party, including the community representative, has presented their evidence in turn they would then leave the hearing leaving the PPC to consider all the evidence presented.

As an 'interested party' the community representative will also have a right of appeal against the decision of the NHS Board PPC to represent the views of the local community.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

Yes to involve "interested parties" in making representation. A clear appeals framework must be in place.
A clear framework would be required to ensure this representation reflected consensus views from the local community rather than individual views.
Experience has shown that an "interested party" represents selective views rather than consensus and could negatively influence the decision or disrupt process.

Proposal 5:

The Scottish Government is of the view that in the future PPC hearings should be handled in such a way so that no one person or organisation is able to dominate the entire hearing. This might include options such as limiting the time allocated to give oral representations or the issuing of guidance to PPCs. The Scottish Government thinks that all PPC meetings in future should follow a standard process in the management of PPC Hearings.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

No one individual or company should dominate proceedings.
A standard process would allow consistency of process across all Boards but it must allow a degree of flexibility to take into account local circumstances.

Proposal 6:

The Scottish Government proposes that going forward those assisting in oral representations by the applicant; the community and other interested parties in attendance are able to speak on behalf of those they are assisting.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

Need to have a framework and defined process on who and how many can provide assistance. There is a worry that lawyers could take over. Numbers may need to be limited e.g. what if 20 people want to speak.

Proposal 7:

The Scottish Government proposes that going forward those applying to open a pharmacy, for the purpose of providing NHS pharmaceutical services, should first enter into a pre-application stage with the NHS Board to determine whether there is an identified unmet need in the provision of NHS pharmaceutical services.

This would assist NHS Boards in determining the urgency of the demand for NHS pharmaceutical services identified by the applicant. NHS Boards Pharmaceutical Care Services Plans would need to reflect an assessment of service gaps and where need is most urgent.

Where an application proceeds, the applicant must be able to provide evidence to the NHS Board and the affected communities that every effort has been made to publicise the intention to open a community pharmacy and to consult and obtain responses from residents in the associated neighbourhood. Also, the notice must be advertised in a newspaper and all circulating local news free-sheets and newsletters in the neighbourhood in order to reach the vast majority of residents.

NHS Boards will also be required to do the same level of advertising in relation to its consultation activities.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

There is concern that this could create a disproportionate workload to the Board and could favour some applicants over others. Health Boards should be proactive in planning their needs through the Pharmaceutical Care Services Plan.
Normal Board consultation process as applicable to other consultations should apply.

Proposal 8:

The Scottish Government proposes that going forward NHS Boards specify to what extent the views of the community have or have not been taken into account in their published decisions on the outcome of a pharmacy application.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

In accordance with normal consultation process

[Securing NHS pharmaceutical services](#)

Proposal 9:

The Scottish Government considers that NHS Boards should be able to take into account how NHS pharmaceutical services would be delivered in practice in the long term after an application has been received. This includes taking into account the financial viability of the pharmacy business proposed. This is an important factor in securing these services in the long term.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

PPC members would not necessarily have the knowledge and skills to assess financial viability.
There would need to be a standard model or agreed framework to test financial viability and that the decisions don't leave the Board financially responsible.

Timeframes for reaching decisions

Proposal 10:

The Scottish Government proposes that going forward the regulatory framework would require NHS Board PPCs to make a decision within 6 weeks of the end of the public consultation process and the NAP to make a decision within 3 months upon receipt of an appeal (or appeals) being lodged.

In more complex cases the timeframe would be made extendable where there is a good cause for delay.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes x No

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

There is concern that 6 weeks is too short for the PPC to be sufficiently prepared and able to consider the application especially over peak holiday periods. However, decisions on applications should be made within a reasonable timescale.

Expert advice and support to PPCs during deliberations

Proposal 11:

The Scottish Government proposes that going forward the regulatory framework would make provisions for the appropriate role of an independent legal assessor acting in a supporting and advisory capacity, including providing advice and guidance on technical and legal aspects of the application process during PPC deliberations.

Do you agree with this proposal? Yes No X

Please tell us the reason for your answer in the box below

If it ensures decision is correct then yes. Is it affordable and who would pay?
Who would they be advising?
What would happen if advice was wrong?
Someone knowledgeable and independent would be helpful.