Title: Implementation of the NHS Choice Policy	
--	--

Name	Organisation	Version number	Action	Date	Notes
Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	0.1	Health Care (CHC) Choice Policy	16.6.21	

This summary sheet provides an overview of the staff involved, proposed change and a summary of the findings. This assessment consists of five domains: Patient Experience, Patient Safety, Effectiveness, Equality and Workforce.

Title of Scheme:	Imple	mentation of the NHS Choice Policy			
Project Lead:	Rache	l Morgan			
Clinical Lead:	Sue Pe	eckitt	Program	me Lead:	Julie Warren
Senior Responsible Officer:		Julie Warren	Date:	16.6.21	

Proposed change:

To implement a North Yorkshire CCG CHC choice policy as no such policy exists at present. The policy describes the way in which NHS North Yorkshire CCG will commission care for people who have been assessed as eligible for fully funded NHS Continuing Healthcare. The policy describes the way in which NHS North Yorkshire CCG will commission care in a manner which reflects the choice and preferences of eligible individuals but balances the need for NHS North Yorkshire CCG to commission care that is safe and effective and makes the best use of available resources.

Which areas are impacted? Hambleton, Richmondshire and **√** 1 **√** Scarborough& Ryedale Harrogate Whitby **Summary of Impacts** 18 16 **Patient Experience Positive** 14 12 **Patient Safety** 10 8 Effectiveness 6 Negative 4 Equality 2 0 Workforce **Patient Safety** Effectiveness **Patient Equality** Workforce -2 **Experience** -4

Summary of findings:

Implementation of the policy allows equity of access to Continuing Healthcare provision across North Yorkshire which will prevent untoward variation in health outcomes.

Summary of Next Steps:

To seek NHS North Yorkshire CCG governing body approval. Once approved upload to NYCCG website. Ensure staff are trained and briefed on the new policy to ensure understanding and compliance.

Has this been incorporated into the project	N/A
documentation?	

Initial Impact Assessment - Screening Tool

This is an initial assessment which will help determine whether a more detailed assessment is required. Please select yes or no for each option

Will the proposal have a disproportionate impact on:	Yes or No Please select from the list below	If yes please complete the relevant section of the tool by clicking the area below
People with one or more protected characteristics?	No	Equality section
Patient Experience	Yes	Patient Experience
Patient Safety	Yes	Patient Safety
Clinical Effectiveness	Yes	<u>Effectiveness</u>
Staffing within the service area or the wider workforce?	No	<u>Workforce</u>
In addition please consider if the proposal will:		
result in change noticeable to patients or carers?	Yes	
be likely to result in political, consumer champion or media interest or has already had significant public interest?	No	Full assessment is required please click
impact those eligible to access the service e.g. by changing referral criteria/method of access/ where or when it will be delivered?	Yes	here to start

Rationale for decision:

Having a NHS North Yorkshire CCG Choice Policy will give equity of access to CHC service provision across North Yorkshire. Positive impacts on all doma

SI	G	N	О	F	F:	

Project lead	Rachel Morgan	16.6.21
Programme Quality Lead		Date:
Programme Equality Lead	Sam McCann	16.6.21
Programme Lead		Date:

Full Quality and Equality Impact Assessment MENU The initial assessment has indicated that the proposed change will have an impact within the West Yorkshire and Harrogate Health and Home Care Partnership. Therefore you will need to consider each of the areas outlined below and provide a summary of the positive and negative impacts. Back to Initial Assessment **Patient Experience** Effectiveness Workforce Hints and Tips **Patient Safety** Equality Additional information to support completion can be found in the QEIA user guide. Helpful hints can also be seen if you click on the individual boxes within each page What evidence has been used to inform this assessment? National Framework for NHS Continuing Healthcare and NHS Funded Nursing Care (DH 2018). The NHS Continuing Healthcare (Responsibilities) Directions 2012 Human Rights Act 1998. Who Pays? Care Act 2014Establishing the Responsible Commissioner (revised 2020). Any gaps in evidence? No Documents can be attached in the workbook: Click here for workbook

Positive		Negative	Neutral	Description of impact	Consequence	Likelihood	Total Score	Mitigating Actions of Negative Impacts	Monitoring	Frequency of review	Lead
Patient Experience: This is Patient reported experience Patient choice			nde	This is a new policy implementation so whilst patient reported experience is not yet known it is intended that the Policy will provide clarity and equity of choice in relation to a person's care and support for those who are eligible for CHC funding. The policy aims to	will 2			Impact on patient/service user expe Until the Policy is implemented the true negative impacts are not yet known until clients in receipt of care are asked for feedback. This is a national policy change intended to make NHS funded care provision more equitable but cost effective	rience. Click on individual boxes for gui On policy implementation there will be a review of impact through seeking patient feedback	dance. Ongoing as per patient feedback, monitoring through complaints	RM
Patient access			V	offer more personalised and flexible commissioning. All patients in receipt of care will be able to view the Policy and provide their views and							
Compassionate and personalised care agenda				feedback through patient surveys							
Responsiveness				On implementation of this policy there is a potential of negative impact for those who are already in receipt of a package of care, this is only expected in exceptional circumstances. Overall							
Promotion of self-care and support for people to stay well				implementation of this policy will promote patient choice utilising already embeded practices. This will seek to formalise these processes to							
Other (please List)				provide clarity and transparency. Individuals and their families will continue to be supported to personalise their assessed needs through the use of personal health budgets should they choose. Choice will continue to be offered from systems of brokerage and discussions had with the individual and their family on available options. Consideration will continue to be given to meeting the Best Interests of individuals and their families.	-1	2	-2				
	1_			Completed by:				Name	Organisation	Date	
				Project lead Approved by:				Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	15.6.21	
				Quality Lead Programme lead				Nikki Henderson	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21	

	Positive	Negative		Description of impact	Consequence	Likelihood			Mitigating Actions of Negative Impacts	Monitoring	Frequency of review	Lead
Patient Safety: This is t	o u	nde	rsta	nd any positive or negative impacts th	e p	rop	ose	ed	change may have on patient safety. C	lick on individual boxes for guidance.		
Preventable Harm			>	The implementation of this Policy formalises the provision of choice and equity for our CHC funded clients; it continues to ensure that all					There are no known negative impacts in relation to patient safety	On implementation of the Policy each CHC funded client will continue to have a case worker assigned who will monitor the care provision and	ongoing	RM
Robustness of systems and processes	✓			care is commissioned in line with approved provider lists and for those who choose to have their care delivered via a Personal Health	2	4	8	3		escalate any issues		
Environment			V	Budget monitoring of care standards are ongoing. Negative Impacts								
Safeguarding			>		0	0	0)				
Other (please List)												
				Completed by:					Name	Organisation	Date	
				Project lead					Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21	
				Approved by:								
				Quality Lead				Ni	kki Henderson/Sam McCann	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21	
				Programme lead								•

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impact	Consequence	Likelihood	Total Score	iotal score	Mitigating Actions of Negative Impacts	Monitoring	Frequency of review	Lead
Clinical Effectiveness:	con	side	r h	ow the proposal may impact on clinical	eff	ecti	ive	ne	ess. Click on the individual boxes for a	dditional guidance.		
Improved patient outcomes				This is a new policy implementation and it is intended that the Policy will provide equity of choice in relation to a person's care and support for					Until the Policy is implemented the true negative impacts are not yet known until clients in receipt of care are asked for feedback. This is a	On policy implementation there will be a review of impact from the completed assessments and from the users of the policy	ongoing	RM
Clinical Engagement	>		П	those who are eligible for CHC funding. The policy aims to offer more personalised and flexible commissioning.	2	4	8		national policy change intended to make NHS funded care provision more equitable but cost effective			
Development and improvement of pathways	~											
Implementation of evidence based practice	~			On implementation of this policy there is a potential of negative								
Will it impact on variation in care?			\Box	impact for those who are already in receipt of a package of care, this is only expected in exceptional circumstances								
Will it deliver care in the most cost effective way?	7				-1	2	-7	2				
Other (please list)												
				Completed by:					Name	Organisation	Date	
				Project lead					Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21	
				Approved by:				NI.	illi: Handaran /Cam MaCan	NUIC North Variation CCC	16.6.21	
				Quality Lead Programme lead				IVI	ikki Henderson/Sam McCann	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	10.0.21	
				riogramme lead						J		

	Positive	Negative			Consequence	Likelihood	Total Score	Mitigating Actions of Negative Impacts	Monitoring and frequency of review	Lead	Н
Equality: Consider the impact on the	e ar	eas	of	equality including the impact on health inequalities. Positive impacts	Click	on	indi	vidual boxes for guidance. We believe age and disability is neutral but there	There are no current known or	RM	Back
				. South Chinipages	0	0	0	may be instances where age and disability may	intended inequalities		Dem
Socio-Economic Deprivation			✓					effect the choice and available options presented. For example there is greater resource in both the	associated with the implementation of this policy-		Demi
Socio-Economic Deprivation				Negative impacts				residential and community setting to meet none complex needs often associated with ageing. This	any changes to the policy will initiate a timely QEIA review		Eng
					0	0	0	allows more competative markets and greater	initiate a timely QLIA review		lava
				Positive impacts				choice for the CCG. Those with more complex needs in the younger age groups such as those			Impa
				·	0	0	0	with Autism and/or Learning Disabilty or younger adults with spinal injuries requiring mechancal			Hints
Age			✓					ventilation often require more bespoke			F.·II A
ngc .				Negative impacts				commisioning. There are often exceptional circumstances in the younger age adult, such as			Full A
					0	0	0	those that live with their children, partner that			
				Positive impacts				may compel the CCG to consider a more bespoke package that on face value could be perceived to			
				·	0	0	0	be inequitable. However, an evaluation and risk			
Disability			✓					assessment would be carried out for all cases to ensure equality.			
Disability				Negative impacts							
					0	0	0				
				Positive impacts							
				·	0	0	0				
Pregnancy and Maternity			✓								
r regulaticy and iviaternity			Ù	Negative impacts							
					0	0	0				
				Positive impacts							
				·	0	0	0				
Ethnicity			✓								
Limber				Negative impacts							
					0	0	0				
				Positive impacts							
					0	0	0				
Religion or Belief			✓								
				Negative impacts	0	0	0				
					U	Ü	0				
				Positive impacts							
					0	0	0				
Sex			✓	No saking in a sak							
				Negative impacts	0	0	0				
					Ŭ	Ĭ	,				
				Positive impacts							
					0	0	0				
Sexual Orientation			v	Negative impacts							
				Negative impacts	0	0	0				
				Positive impacts							
					0	0	0				
Gender Reassignment			✓	Negative impacts		\dashv					
				·	0	0	0				
				Positive impacts							
					0	0	0				
Carers			✓	Negative impacts		+					
					0	0	0				

Any other groups		Positive impacts	0	0	0			
Any other groups		Negative impacts	0	0	0			
Level of engagement requi	red							
		Completed by:				Name	Organisation	
		Project lead				Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21
		Approved by:						
		Equality Lead				Sam McCann	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impact	Consequence	Likelihood	Total Score	Mitigating Actions of Negative Impacts	Monitoring	Frequency of review	Lead
Workforce: Consider the	ne ii	npa	_	on the staffing and wider workforce. C	lick	on	indi	•			
Effective prioritisation and management of workload	▽			Provides a more robust and defined process to work to whilst providing a support mechanism in which staff can communicate such processes to				N/A	N/A	ongoing or at policy review	RM
Staff experience as a result of workforce changes	▽			CHC funded clients. This policy is aimed to reduce the inequity that currently exists among workforce provision across all	4	4	16				
Contractual obligations	✓			sectors. It will provide transparency and allow candid discussions to be held between CHC workforce, informal and formal carers.							
Workforce diversity			Ů	It will allow individuals and families to plan and consider their current There are no assessed negative impacts							
Workplace			V								
Sustainability of service due to workforce issues			>		0	0	0				
Other (please list)											
				Completed by:				Name	Organisation	Date	
				Project lead				Rachel Morgan	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	16.6.21	
				Approved by: Workforce Lead					I	<u> </u>	
				Programme lead							
				r rogramme leau							

Likelihood				
0		Not applicable		
1 Rare Not expected		Not expected to occur for years. Will occur in		
	Naie	exceptional circumstances.		
2	Unlikely	Expected to occur at least annually. Unlikely to		
		occur.		
3	Possible	Expected to occur at least monthly. Reasonable		
		chance of occuring.		
4	Likely	Expected to occur at least weekly. Likely to occur.		
5	Almost Certain	Expected to occur at least daily. More likely to		
		occur than not.		

	Opportunity								Consequence			
		5	4	3	2	1	0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
b	5	25	20	15	10	5	0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
hoc	4	20	16	12	8	4	0	-2	-4	-6	-8	-10
Likelihood	3	15	12	9	6	3	0	-3	-6	-9	-12	-15
5	2	10	8	6	4	2	0	-4	-8	-12	-16	-20
	1	5	4	3	2	1	0	-5	-10	-15	-20	-25

Category	
	Opportunity
	Low - Moderate Risk
	High Risk

			Opportunity and Consequence
lmapc t		Score	The proposed change is anticipated to lead to the following level of opportunity and/or consequence:
	5	Excellence	Multiple enhanced benefits including excellent improvement in access, experience and/or outcomes for all patients, families and carers. Outstanding reduction in health inequalities by narrowing the gap in access, experience and/or outcomes between people with protected characteristics and the general population. Leading to consistently improved standards of experience and an enhancement of public confidence, significant improvements to performance and an improved and sustainable workforce.
Positive	4	Major	Major benefit leading to long term improvements and access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Major reduction in health inequalities by narrowing the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Benefits include improvements in management of patients with long term effects and compliance with national standards.
	3	Moderate	Moderate benefits requiring professional intervention with moderate improvement in access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Moderate reduction in health inequalities by narrowing the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population.
	2	Minor	Minor improvement in access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Minor reduction in health inequalities by narrowing the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population.
	1	Negligible	Minimal benefit requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment. Negligible improvement in access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Negligible reduction in health inequalities by narrowing the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population.
	0	Neutral	No effect either positive or negative
	-1	Negligible	Negligible negative impact on access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Negligible increase in health inequalities by widening the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Potential to result in minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment, peripheral element of treatment suboptimal and/or informal complaint/inquiry
	-2	Minor	Minor negative impact on access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Minor increase in health inequalities by widening the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Potential to result in minor injury or illness, requiring minor intervention and overall treatment suboptimal
Negative	-3	Moderate	Moderate negative impact on access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Moderate increase in health inequalities by widening the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Potential to result in moderate injury requiring professional intervention.
	-4	Major	Major negative impact on access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Major increase in health inequalities by widening the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Potential to lead to major injury leading to long-term incapacity/disability
	-5	Catastrophic	Catastrophic negative impact on access, experience and /or outcomes for people with this protected characteristic. Catastrophic increase in health inequalities by widening the gap in access, experience and /or outcomes between people with this protected characteristic and the general population. Potential to result in incident leading to death, multiple permanent injuries or irreversible health effects, an event which impacts on a large number of patients, totally unacceptable level or effectiveness of treatment, gross failure of experience and does not meet required standards

ulation Dem	nographic Information		
	Scarborough and Ryedale	Hambleton Richmondshire and Whitby	Harrogate
Age	Data provided below is from Census 2011 Age Range Number (%) 0-14 17,672 (14.9) 15-44 39,530 (33.2) 45-64 15,427 (13.0) 65-74 9,083 (7.6) 85+ 3,820 (3.2)	Document embeded below is a summary of data	32.9% of the population (Joint Strategic Needs Assessment) are aged 0-29. The CCG has a relatively elderly population with 26.5% of its population aged over 60 (Joint Strategic Needs Assessment).
Disability	2011 Census Data % Long Term Health Problem/Disability 21.3 Limiting Long Term Illness 20.4 Projecting Adult Needs and Service Information (PANSI)-2017 Estimates Scarborough (Ryedale) Limiting Long Term Illness - day to day activities limited a little 7,507 (3,455) Limiting Long Term Illness - day to day activities limited a lot 6,513 (2,462) Mobility - unable to manage at least one activity on their own 5,210 (2,509) Learning Disability - Including Down's syndrome 947 (469) Learning Disability - Autistic Spectrum Disorders and Down's Syndrome 81 (134) Visual Impairment - Moderate or severe 3,232 (1,588) Hearing Impairment - some hearing loss 17,167 (8,370) Hearing Impairment - Moderate or Severe 2,215 (1,070) Dementia 1,973 (959) Depression 2,474 (1,585) Learning Disability - Baseline 1,454 (708) Learning Disability - Moderate - Severe 415 (1,128) Learning Disability - Moderate - Severe 415 (1,128) Learning Disability - Moderate 5,176 (2,620) Physical Disability - Moderate 5,176 (2,620) Physical Disability - Ferious 1,605 (824) Physical Disability - Personal Care 3,198 (1,639) Visual Impairment - Severe 395 (203) Mental Health Problems 4,331 (2,096)	Adobe Acrobat PDFXML Document	31.1% of people within the HaRD CCG population are living with a limiting long term illness or disability
ncy and Maternity	Live Births Scarborough 1,034 Ryedale 439 (ONS 2016) Still Births (ONS 2016) Scarborough 4 Ryedale 2		None available

	lava asses		The country is a second
	BME – 2011 Census Data		The Census 2011 indicates the race of the population in
	1.		Harrogate and Rural District CCG as:
	White 97.5		White 96.3%
	Mixed 0.8		Mixed 0.3%
	Asian 1.2		Asian 0.4%
	Black 0.2		Black 0.3%
	Other 0.2		Other 0.7%
	Languages – 2011 Census Data		
	%		
Race/Nationality	English 97.5		
	Polish 0.8		
	Other EU Language 0.6		
	Other 1.86		
	Gypsy and Travellers – 2011 Census Data		
	Scarborough 37		
	Ryedale 81		
	2011 - Census Data		According to the 2011 Census, 68.6% of the population identified
	\ %		themselves as Christian and 0.14% of the population is made up of other
	Christian 67		religions.
	Buddhist 0.3		The remainder of the population (30%) did not state anything or stated 'no
	Hindu H0.1		religion'.
			Teligion .
Religion and Belief	Jewish 0.1		
ŭ	Muslim 0.5		
	Sikh 0.1		
	Other Religion 0.4		
	No Religion 24.3		
	Religion not stated 7.4		
	JSNA 2016		The gender split in the Harrogate and Rural District CCG area is
	\ %		49.2% male and 50.8% female (Joint Strategic Needs
Gender	Male Residents 49.6		Assessment).
Gender	Female Residents 50.4		Assessmenty.
	l emale residents 50.4		
	In relation to sexual orientation, local population data is not known with any certainty. In part, this is		Local population data is not available for sexual orientation. In part, this is
	because until recently national and local surveys of the population and people using services did not		because until recently national and local surveys of the population and
Sexual Orientation	ask about an individual's sexual orientation. However, nationally, the Government estimates that 5%		people using services did not ask about an individual's sexual orientation.
Sexual Orientation	of the population are lesbian, gay or bisexual communities.		However, Stonewall estimates that 5 - 7% of the national population are
			lesbian, gay or bisexual.
	There are not any official statistics nationally or regionally regarding transgender populations, however,	er, GIRES (Gender Identity Research and Education Society - www.gires.org.ul	k) estimated that, in 2007, the prevalence of people who had sought medical
	care for gender variance was 20 per 100,000, i.e. 10,000 people, of whom 6,000 had undergone trans		
	data from the individual gender identity clinics, to anticipate that the gender balance may eventually		thow trans ment. However, there is good reason, based on more recent
Gender Reassignment	data from the marriada genuer identity clinics, to anticipate that the genuer balance may eventually i	occome more equal.	

Staff Demographic Information

North Yorkshire CCG				
Total Staff Number	167			
Age	Staff are under 30 7.8% Staff aged 30 – 55 62.9% Staff are over 55 29.3%			
Disability	% of staff employed in the CCG declared themselves as: Having no disability 78.4% Having a disability 1.2% Not stated/undefined 20.4%			
Pregnancy and Maternity	No information yet as the CCG has not been established long enough to build meaningful data			
Ethnicity	% of staff employed in the CCG declared themselves as: White 87.4% Black 0.6% Asian 0.6% Mixed Race 1.2% Not stated/undefined 10.2%			
Religion and Belief	% of staff employed in the CCG declared themselves as: Christian 43.7% Other faith or beliefs 27.6% Not stated/undefined 28.7%			

Sex	% of staff employed in the CCG declared themselves as: Female 63.5% Male 36.5%
Sexual Orientation	% of staff employed in the CCG declared themselves as: Heterosexual 66.5% LGBTQ+ 0.6% Not stated/undefined 32.9%
Gender Reassignment	No information available

	Engagement						
Definitions of reconfigu	uration proposals and s	tages of engagement/o	consultation				
	Stag	Stages of involvement, engagement and consultation					
Definition and examples of potential proposals	Informal Involvement	Engag	ement	Formal Consultation			
Definition and examples of potential proposals							
Major Variation or Development Major service reconfiguration - changing how/where and when large scale services are delivered. Examples: urgent care, community health centre services, introduction of a new service, arms				Category 4 Formal consultation required (minimum of 12 weeks)			
Significant variation or development Change in demand for specific services or modernisation of service. Examples: Changing provider of existing services, pathway redesign when the service could be needed by wide range of people			Category 3 Formal mechanisms established to ensure that patients/service users/carers and the public are engaged in planning and decision making. In most cases this means 12 weeks	Information and evidence base			
Minor Change Need for modernisation of services. Examples: Review of health visiting and district nursing, patient diaries		Category 2 More formalised structures in place to ensure that patients/service users/carers and patient groups views on the issue and potential solutions are sought	Information and evidence base				
Ongoing Development Proposals made as a result of routine patient/service user feedback. Examples: Proposal to extend or reduce opening hours	Category 1 Informal discussions with individual patients/service users/carers and patient groups on potential need for changes to services and solutions	Information and					

You will need to consult with the engagement lead to confirm the level of engagement or consultation required. Please use the Engagement Initial assessment form in the uploaded documents section to record your assessment. Examples of engagement planning templates will also be added to the uploaded documents section.

Please attach your documents in this workbook

Document Name	Embedded document
Initial assessment for engagement	assessment for engagement

	Hints and Tips		
Ctrl C and Ctrl V	Highlight the word or box and press Ctrl C and V to copy and paste		
Alt & enter	Hold Alt and press enter to go to the next line within a box in excel		
Spell check	Select review on top of the toolbar and click on Spelling		
Increasing text box	Right click in the box and select 'insert' and		
size	then select 'entire row'		
Decreasing text box	Right click in the box and select 'delete' and		
size	then select 'entire row'		

Quick solutions	
Not printing the area that I need?	Highlight the area that you would like to print, press page layout on top of your toolbar. Click print area and select set print area
Fullscreen	It may be easier to complete the form in full screen view. Buttons to enter and exit fullscreen mode are in the view section on the toolbar
Navigation	Use hyperlinks (underlined and in blue) or the grey boxes to move to different sections within the workbook
Navigation	Use the arrows in the bottom left corner to move along the tabs, or select the tab you require

The N	HS Constitution
The S	ocial Value Act
Patier	nt Safety
Equal	ity Act
Equal	ity Act 2010 Guidance
Public	Sector Equality Duty
Se	xual orientation monitoring standard
Plann	ing, assuring and delivering service
chang	e for patients