

Present:

Ms A Archibald	Airedale NHS Foundation Trust
Ms C Hibbert	
Ms M Thompson	Calderdale and Huddersfield NHS Foundation Trust
Ms C Howard	Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust
Mr M Waugh (Chair)	Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust
Ms N Easey	NYCRIS
Mr P Melling	Yorkshire Cancer Network

Apologies

Mrs G Barnard, Ms V Cook, Mrs N Slater

2. Action Log from the last meeting			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
22	The action log from the last meeting was agreed as a true record.	N/A	N/A
3. Cancer Waiting Times			
3.1 Latest Data			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
23	Philip presented the latest CWT and the group discussed the latest performance. October and November data was also discussed as well as challenges raised by the recent winter weather.	N/A	N/A
3.3 Reallocation of 62-day inter-Trust transfer breaches			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
24	Philip presented the outcomes from the Breach Reallocation Exercise which has been requested by the YCN Board. The pilot looked at all shared breaches from Q1 2010/11 and included data from both referring and treating hospitals. He explained that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) have subsequently withdrawn the re-allocation process for 2010/11 and therefore the YCN will not be implementing a network wide reallocation policy as originally proposed to the Board. The pilot highlighted a number of important issues that remain valid even though a formal reallocation process will not be continuing. The key definition of "handover" or referral date between Trusts continues to be difficult to define. It was agreed in the last Lead Managers meeting that the formal definition (until potentially national guidance is issued) will be the date the alert is created on PPM. This is the actual computer generated date and not the date entered by the co-ordinator creating the alert. Work needs to continue to improve the use of PPM for inter-trust transfers for all cases. To continue the use of PPM for all inter-trust transfers.	All	Review next meeting

3. Cancer Waiting Times			
3.4 Breach reasons - agreement prior to upload			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
25	<p>Philip asked the Group if it would be possible to improve the quality of CWT breach reasons for the shared patients.</p> <p>Often the reasons given are primarily entered by the treating Trust and do not include supporting information from the referring Trust.</p> <p>Martin explained that there is a report available in PPM which will allow referring Trusts to look at all their shared breaches and allow editing of reasons prior to upload to Exeter.</p> <p>To use the PPM report to improve the quality of shared breach reasons within the monthly upload timescales on Exeter.</p>	All	Review next meeting
4. Cancer Registration Dataset			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
26	<p>Nicola gave an overview of the current YCN Trusts position in relation to progress towards the end of March 2011 deadline for submitting the electronic cancer registration dataset.</p> <p>Airedale, Bradford, Calderdale-Huddersfield, Harrogate, Leeds and York remain rated amber.</p> <p>Mid Yorkshire are almost green with another test dataset due by the end of December.</p> <p>NYCRIS have been identified as the lowest performing Registry in England in relation to progress towards this standard.</p> <p>Major problems still exist with provision of the pathology dataset as most systems are still unable to produce coded data extracts.</p> <p>The group raised their concerns of the difficulties involved in trying to collect the full dataset and asked if NYCRIS could possibly produce a priority list of fields of essential items.</p> <p>Philip reported that he was working with the NSSG groups to stress the importance of the dataset and to prioritise the reporting and recording of staging for every cancer.</p> <p>To investigate the possibility of producing a priority list of data items.</p>	N Easey	Review next meeting
27	To continue working towards achieving the full collection of the cancer registration dataset by the target deadline of March 2011.	All	Review next meeting

5. NCASP and Local NSSG Audit			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
28	<p>Philip gave another update on the latest local participation in the national cancer audits.</p> <p>He reported that he had recently circulated the provisional national lung cancer audit report for the 2009 data. The group highlighted the improvements made in data quality in this latest report.</p> <p>The deadline for the national head and neck cancer audit was the end of November 2010 and the report is due out next year.</p> <p>The group welcomed the extension to the deadline for the national bowel cancer audit and appreciated the regular updates provided by the national team. Philip again stressed the importance of staging completeness for this audit.</p> <p>To continue to work with the local MDTs to ensure the submission of excellent quality complete data by the future deadlines.</p>	All	Review next meeting
29	<p>Philip highlighted the chapter in the Board Performance Report relating to all the NSSG agreed audits for the Network.</p> <p>Recently circulated new audits include a melanoma referral audit and a pancreatic specialist MDT discussion audit. A new availability of key data at MDT discussion for breast cancer MDTs is also currently under development and will be circulated soon.</p> <p>Martin asked if the MDTs through the NSSGs could work together to define key outcome measures for their tumour sites. A standard set of measures across the Network could then be incorporated as routine reporting within PPM which would be available to all.</p> <p>To continue to support the NSSG audit programmes to meet the requirements of peer review.</p>	All	Review next meeting
30	<p>To work with the NSSGs to develop standard outcome measures for inclusion in PPM as regular reports.</p>	P Melling	Review next meeting
6. PPM			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
31	<p>Martin provided the group with the latest PPM update.</p> <p>Airedale now have a read-only installation of PPM and are starting work on developing a PID for a full write version.</p> <p>Bradford and Calderdale-Huddersfield are continuing rollouts. Current work includes developing the radiology feed and importing all Calderdale-Huddersfield's cancer waiting times legacy data.</p> <p>Harrogate continue to use their read-only version.</p> <p>Mid Yorkshire have started discussions with moving towards a full write version of PPM.</p> <p>York continue to use their read-only version.</p> <p>Martin reported that additional resources have been identified to support a new developer appointment and to look at a dedicated integration developer to work on additional system feeds.</p> <p>To continue work with PPM partners towards Network wide coverage.</p>	M Waugh	Review next meeting

7. NYCRIS			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
32	<p>Nicola gave a general NYCRIS update.</p> <p>National priorities will now include a target to improve staging data.</p> <p>Cancer Registries are being aligned within the new public health strategy and will be moving towards a single cancer registry for England with a number of "regional" offices. No timescales for this have been announced yet.</p> <p>Timeliness target is being shortened from 18 months to 15 months this year and then 12 months in the future. The deadline for completion of the 2009 registrations will therefore now be the end of March 2011.</p> <p>Philip raised the question of NYCRIS access to all the new local instances of PPM. Registration staff currently have access to the Leeds instance of PPM and would benefit greatly from being able to access local Trust versions as well.</p> <p>To work with Bradford and Calderdale-Huddersfield to agree access for NYCRIS to their instances of PPM.</p>	M Waugh	31/12/2010
33	To provide a list of NYCRIS PPM users for Martin.	N Easey	31/12/2010
8. Future of the group			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
34	<p>Martin explained that the original purpose of the Group had been to setup CWT and data collection process across the various Trusts within the Network but time has moved on and the focus is now on performance and it was felt that this was mainly a Lead Manager role rather than an information specialists role.</p> <p>The proposal therefore was to discontinue the Cancer Information Group and merge with the Lead Managers Group. It was not envisaged that attendance at all the Lead Manager Group meetings would be necessary and perhaps an information focus could be scheduled for every other meeting.</p> <p>The Group discussed the issues and agreed to trial the merger to ensure it worked with the option of reviving this Group in the future if needed.</p> <p>To discuss and facilitate the merger with Angie Craig (current Chair of the Lead Managers Group)</p>	M Waugh	31/12/2010
10. Date and time of next meeting			
Log No	Action	Lead(s)	Deadline
35	To confirm future dates with the Lead Managers Group.	P Melling	31/12/2010

Date of Next Meeting(s)

To be confirmed