

Cabinet – second dispatch



Date & time
Tuesday, 26 May
2020 at 2.00 pm

Place
REMOTE

Contact
Vicky Hibbert or Angela Guest
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020 8541
9075



Chief Executive
Joanna Killian

We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or
angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Members: Mr Mel Few, Mr Matt Furniss, Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mrs Julie Iles, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Tim Oliver and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Mrs Becky Rush, Miss Marissa Heath, Miss Alison Griffiths and Mr Mark Nuti

Supplementary Agenda

- 5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 1 – 4)
- To consider any reports received. There is one report from Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee on Item 9 - PRU Capital Strategy.
- 7 CABINET MEMBER UPDATES** (Pages 5 - 6)
- This item will include updates from Cabinet Members for noting. Briefing notes will be sent as a supplement to the agenda or be contained within the minutes of the meeting.
- 8a Covid-19 Update** (Pages 7 - 14)
- This paper is being presented under the General Exception Standing Order as it has not been possible to give 28 days' notice of decisions to be taken.
- Further to the report to Cabinet on 28 April 2020, this report will set out (i) an overview of how the Council is responding as an employer to the Government's COVID-19 recovery strategy; (ii) updated forecasts and modelling from Public Health on the impact of COVID-19; (iii) an overview of the approach to testing in Surrey as well as an update around the government's approach to track and trace and implementation locally; (iv) updated financial impact of COVID-19 on the Council and (iv) an update on the Council's response to supporting vulnerable residents who are being shielded.

[Where necessary a waiver for call-in will be sought from the relevant Select Committee Chairman.]

8b Covid-19 Delegated Decisions

(Pages
15 - 42)

To ensure transparency of decisions taken in response to COVID-19, Cabinet are asked to note the attached decisions taken since the last meeting.

**Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
26 May 2020**

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2020****SUBJECT: SCRUTINY OF THE PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT (PRU) CAPITAL STRATEGY**

Note: this paper should be read in conjunction with the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) Capital Strategy (Item 9, Cabinet, 26 May 2020).

INTRODUCTION:

1. On 19 May 2020, we met with officers from the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Directorate (the Directorate) to scrutinise a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) Capital Strategy which is to be subject to a Cabinet decision on 26 May 2020. Owing to the coronavirus pandemic, scrutiny was conducted remotely via a video call. We heard evidence from:
 - Liz Mills, Director – Education, Lifelong Learning and Culture;
 - Jo Twine, Property Lead & Independent Living; and
 - Dee Turvill, Alternative Provision and Participation Manager.
2. As outlined in the PRU Capital Strategy (the Strategy), the PRU accommodation within Surrey is dilapidated, does not comply with Department for Education minimum space standards¹, and lacks capacity to provide adequate places in appropriate locations; it lacks facilities and space to provide a suitable learning environment in which a broad and balanced curriculum may be delivered. Therefore, it does not support Surrey County Council's ambition to adequately meet the needs of some of our most vulnerable children and young people; and it does not allow the Council to effectively meet its statutory duty to ensure all children of statutory school age receive suitable education.²
3. The Strategy is one of number of capital strategies being developed by the Directorate with the aim of promoting independence, supporting vulnerable children and remediating the backlog of issues associated with the existing education estate. It seeks to improve the condition and review the capacity, suitability and locations of existing sites. It provides a policy framework to enable joint working between the Directorate and property colleagues to undertake more technical evaluation which can deliver practical solutions within realistic timescales.
4. Exclusion from a mainstream education setting into alternative provision (AP) can have a significant impact on young people and set their lives on certain, often undesirable, pathways. The Strategy is focused on creating localised solutions and providing outreach services into mainstream settings. Young people who attend PRUs are to do so on a programmed basis which will facilitate re-integration into

¹ The Schools Premises (England) Regulations 2012; and Building Bulletin 104 Ref: DFE-00306-2015

² Subsection 19(1) Education Act 1996

normal school life where possible. The proposals form part of a wider reform of AP services.

5. The proposals seek to secure the funding needed to test site options and to develop a business case that will renew the PRU estate, in a phased programme, over the next ten years – beginning with the urgent relocation of the Pewley Hill PRU in the short term, to mitigate the poor condition of the facility. The Strategy recommends that:
 1. *Cabinet agrees the approach set out in [the] report to provide appropriate PRU provision that adheres to the statutory requirements and accommodation guidelines for alternative provision to support our ambition for children and young people.*
 2. *Approval of £1m to support the relocation of the Pewley Hill PRU as set out in [the] report.*
 3. *Approval of £1m to carry out a feasibility study for long term accommodation requirements and inform a business case to be considered at Cabinet in the Autumn 2020.*

KEY AREAS OF DISCUSSION:

6. Existing PRU provision is made up of eight providers (across Primary and Secondary phase and including hospital-based provision) delivered across 14 different sites. The geographic distribution of which is unplanned, having developed over time.
7. We heard that not one of the current PRU sites had been deemed fit-for-purpose by external assessors. The PRUs in which AP is delivered are not conducive to delivering the nurturing support which attendees require; the ‘uninspiring’ sites can cause further challenging behaviours. Furthermore, a lack of outdoor spaces means that attendees often cannot access an adequate range of provision. For example, one PRU in Woking consists of two portable buildings on a small plot of concreted land enclosed by wire fencing. Many settings are in old buildings which have been unsuitably repurposed.
8. Officers commented that the rationalisation of sites would not necessarily be advantageous and that they are working closely with head teachers to identify suitable locations for future provision.
9. The Chairman asked how the PRUs had, despite their physical condition, received Good and Outstanding Ofsted ratings. An officer explained that this is because the Ofsted framework does not penalise settings for the condition of their physical condition, provided there is evidence of strong and effective leadership and management; a lack of capital investment is not factored into an inspection if head teachers are working effectively.
10. Liz Mills commented that there is a high demand for places, which are often over-allocated, meaning that not all pupils can attend simultaneously and limiting the ability of staff to provide outreach support. Despite this, the Directorate considers that the present number of PRU places will be sufficient to meet demand once effective outreach services are operational. An aim of the Strategy is to transform PRUs into places where children can both receive additional support whilst continuing to attend mainstream settings and from which outreach support can be

delivered into mainstream settings. The assumption is made that further outreach support will help to alleviate demand on PRU settings by enabling greater numbers of pupils to remain in mainstream education. The Strategy is to be situated within a wider, more holistic approach which will be underpinned by the development of a new AP strategy.

11. A Member raised concerns that the co-location of Primary and Secondary phase provision may lead to younger pupils being inappropriately influenced by their older schoolmates. An officer responded that, whilst there were not yet any agreed plans to co-locate, any such risk would be mitigated by designing spaces in a manner which enables each year group to function in a suitable environment.
12. A Member questioned whether the Strategy included provisions for the commissioning of PRUs within the academy system, as this may alleviate some of the pressures on both state and academy governing bodies which are mindful of the pressures exerted on PRU capacity and make compromises accordingly. Liz Mills responded that three of the current PRUs are academies and had recently formed a multi-academy trust, and that the transformation of PRUs was being developed using a sector-led approach involving all providers of alternative provision in Surrey and the phase leads for education. The Directorate is adopting a commissioning approach which builds upon the expertise in the AP sector. Furthermore, the Council annually delegates a sum of money each year (circa £1.2 million) for secondary colleagues to create localised learning solutions, which has been successful in preventing exclusions by providing extra AP support and capacity.
13. A Member highlighted the importance of blended packages of support, whilst also cautioning that locations must be appropriate to each pupil, due to the impact that can have on a child's self-esteem. Liz Mills agreed with the Member and explained that there are number of outdoor of learning facilities which allow pupils to engage in new activities which promote their development.
14. Officers were asked how Surrey benchmarks against comparator authorities in terms of investment in PRUs and AP spend. Surrey was said to benchmark well in terms of revenue expenditure and investment into the running of PRUs, but added that the AP estate has not been prioritised, with emphasis being placed on basic need, pupil numbers and the expansion of the mainstream estate. With regard to AP spend, which comes from the high needs block, officers commented that Surrey benchmarks highly and that any efficiencies likely to be seen will be in the external provider market for alternative provision, rather than in the PRUs, whilst more effective use of outreach support and better learning environments will create better value for money.
15. An officer commented that a considerable sum of money was being spent on spot purchasing AP and this was being reviewed by the commissioning team as part of the Strategy. Spot purchasing is often used to cater for SEN needs whilst trying to source the right full-time placement for children. Emphasis was placed on taking a child-centred approach to placements.
16. Concerns were raised about the cost of £1 million for the feasibility study. This is to be conducted over four years, involve detailed analysis of the existing sites, scope a range of a projects using multi-disciplinary design, cost consulting, and environmental assessments.

CONCLUSIONS:

17. We welcome this long-overdue investment in Surrey's inadequate PRU estate and thank the officers who took the time to meet with us to discuss these proposals. We welcome the wider reform of how AP is delivered and support the Directorate's ambitions to use AP and PRUs to support pupils to remain in mainstream education where possible.

Contact Officer: Benjamin Awkal, Scrutiny Officer, benjamin.awkal@surreycc.gov.uk

Cllr Julie Iles Cabinet Member of the Month Update

I am pleased to be able to share with you some of the work that we have been doing to support our children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and their families throughout the unprecedented circumstances of the pandemic.

For many families of children with SEND these past eight weeks have been particularly testing. Change in daily routines and more restricted access to the community resources they rely on have caused greater stress and anxiety for these children and their families.

Since the lockdown began in March, we have met weekly with Family Voice, our Parent Partnership, to understand the challenges parents are facing and what they need to support them. These meetings have strengthened our work with Family Voice and led to innovative new initiatives.

- We created a dedicated Covid-19 parents' information webpage which has now become the most popular page on the Local Offer site, with over 3600 visits in its first month.
- We have commissioned online mental health and wellbeing support for the parents of children with SEN in Surrey. This provides immediate and stigma free access to professional support, preventing issues from escalating and reaching crisis. QWELL, as it is known, will be in place in June.
- We are creating a series of YouTube videos for parents, in which professionals across a range of areas including Speech and Language and Educational Psychology offer hints and tips on supporting children's development at home, and have worked in partnership with London South Bank University to provide parents of children with ASD with a range of expert advice.

The safety of children with SEND has been our top priority. In the first week of lockdown, our SEND teams identified and risk assessed 800 of our most vulnerable learners. This was an unprecedented exercise, which included bringing together information and decision-making across the council, our education sector and health colleagues. For those children who could stay at home, safety plans were developed with the families, and for those who needed to remain in specialist settings, contingency plans were put in place should the setting need to close.

In week two, our teams risk assessed the remaining 9,200 children with education, health and care plans (EHCPs) in partnership with early years settings and schools. Over four days, our small Graduated Response Advisor team responded to 180 requests for advice from schools, and in the space of five working days our Graduated Response Early Years Advisors spoke to settings for 100 children with EHCPs to talk them through their risk assessments.

Not only has this work strengthened and improved our relationships with our partners across health and education, it has provided a model of collaborative leadership, achieving good outcomes swiftly and effectively.

We are worried about the impact of Covid 19 on our specialist independent, early years and school transport sectors, and significant work has gone into securing their sustainability. We have funded taxi firms who have lost school transport income to carry out deliveries of essential items such as PPE, food and medicine to vulnerable families, and we have found innovative ways to use inclusion funding to help our early years settings to stay open to support our most disadvantaged children.

SEND Transformation activity has not stopped throughout this period. Operational improvements across our Vulnerable Learners teams are underway, and we are continuing

to commission new pathways to employment for young people with SEND. SENCO networks have continued, delivered in partnership with SAfE, our school improvement partnership. This has been successful in bringing SENCOs together to share good practice and build essential relationships between schools and with partner agencies.

The SEND Task Group established by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee made recommendations to Cabinet on 31 March regarding the provision of SEN support services. The recommendations are fully supported by Cabinet and are in line with the improvements the Council has been seeking to deliver through the SEND transformation programme. In these unprecedented times, the Service will endeavour to deliver these recommendations as it is reasonable and practical to do so.

Our focus is now on starting the planning to revive and restore all our lines of activity, building on the improved relationships and better ways of working we have created with partners and families. The next few months will see, among other things, the launch of the Front Door, the delivery of an all-age Autism consultation, development of plans for a new local offer, with SEND Transformation on course to deliver a significantly improved, high quality and efficient SEND support offer to families.

Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
26 May 2020

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: TUESDAY 26 MAY 2020****REPORT OF: MR TIM OLIVER, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL****LEAD OFFICER: MICHAEL COUGHLIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR TRANSFORMATION, PARTNERSHIPS AND PROSPERITY****SUBJECT: COVID-19: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - UPDATE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council has a vitally important role in leading the local response to COVID-19, to save lives, protect the NHS, ensure our residents are protected wherever possible and crucial council services continue to operate in these unprecedented times.

As the national and local situation develops rapidly, the purpose of this report is to set out the latest Public Health information about COVID-19, and update Cabinet on the strategic and sensitive issues arising from the extensive response work and initial recovery planning, going on across Surrey.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet are asked to:

1. Note the latest public health situation with regard to COVID-19 and the latest information regarding the government's Test and Trace programme,
2. Note the support being provided to the council's most vulnerable residents and the plans to ensure that this continues into the next phase of the COVID-19 pandemic,
3. Note the updated assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on Surrey County Council's short and medium-term financial position,
4. Note the council's response as an employer to support staff and ensure appropriate guidance is followed to ensure safety in the workplace.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The county and council continue to face unprecedented challenges due to the COVID-19 crisis. In addition to response activity, attention is turning to the re-starting, restoration and recovery of services and day-to-day life, as lockdown measures are eased nationally.

The recommendations set out in this report ensure Cabinet are appraised of the work going on across the council to protect, sustain and support our residents and communities and the economy of Surrey.

DETAILS**Public Health Update**

1. Further to the report on Surrey's response to COVID-19 to Cabinet on 28 April 2020, this information provides an update on the impact of COVID-19 in Surrey and the activity underway across the county, following the declaration of a 'Major Incident' for the COVID-19 outbreak on Thursday 19 March 2020.
2. The following information is accurate at time of writing (18th May 2020). This is an extremely fluid situation, therefore up-to-date information about the current numbers of COVID-19 cases in the UK and Surrey can be found here:
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public>.
3. The total number of confirmed cases of Coronavirus worldwide (COVID-19) has reached 4,589,526 and the total number of deaths is 310,391.
4. At present the Government's assessment of the existing risk to the UK population is HIGH. The first case of COVID-19 in United Kingdom was reported on 31 January 2020 and to date 1,818,712 people have been tested, of whom 243,695 have tested positive.
5. The latest data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) states that there have sadly been 33,841 deaths in England and Wales involving COVID-19. This figure is based on deaths in all settings between 1st March and 30th April 2020 and includes cases where COVID-19 is suspected but no test has taken place.
6. In Surrey, we had the first death registered which involved COVID on 14 March 2020. Between 14 March and 1st May 2020 (the last day for which we have available data), we have sadly had 794 registered deaths involving COVID. Because residents can take up to 14 days to register deaths, these numbers could still go up.
7. In Surrey the total number of confirmed cases is 2,811. At present, this means Surrey is ranked 6th out of 150 counties and unitary authorities in England for total number of confirmed cases. When we present this information as a proportion of total population however, this changes to 84th out of 150.
8. The Prime Minister announced a series of lockdown easing measures on 10th May 2020. These include increasing the amount of time people can spend outdoors, encouraging people to go to work if they cannot work from home and allowing people to meet with one member of another household outside as long as social distancing guidance is followed. He presented a rough plan of how lockdown measures will be eased over the coming months whilst emphasising that these plans are subject to change based on the number of COVID-19 cases and the NHS's ability to cope with the demand. The message from the government is to stay at home as much as possible but to be alert and to adhere to social distancing guidance when outside.
9. As of 18th May 2020, the definition of a suspected case of COVID-19 has been updated to include anosmia – a lack or change in sense of smell or taste. Therefore, individuals who have a new continuous cough, fever or anosmia are to self-isolate.

Overview of the government's approach to Test and Trace

10. The council has a local leadership role in supporting the national Test and Trace Programme which consists of three operational levels.
11. At the national level (Tier 3), PHE will use a web-based Contact Tracing and Advisory Service (CTAS) and phone-based contact tracing with 15,000 call handlers. The *NHS COVID-19 app* will provide an automated system for rapid symptom reporting, ordering of swab tests, and sending tailored and targeted anonymous alerts and advice to other "app" users who have been in close contact with someone displaying symptoms. Ensuring privacy and security of the app users' data is a priority for the NHS
12. At the Regional level (Tier 2), phone-based contact tracing by 3,000 health professionals will provide more complex contact tracing, testing and advice. This will be based on the nine PHE regions. Regional networks are currently being established to oversee the programme locally, working with local authorities and Local Resilience Forums (LRFs), and will be chaired by a regional director of public health (or deputy).
13. Finally, at the local level (Tier 1), PHE local Health Protection Teams, and local authorities will focus on the most complex outbreaks (for example in care homes) to provide local targeted support. Arrangements for local oversight are currently being developed by local authorities working with PHE South East.

Update on our response to supporting vulnerable residents

14. Supporting vulnerable individuals and communities in Surrey remains a key priority, in which council staff have played a leading role. The Government has identified three categories of vulnerable people:
 - a. Category A- Clinically Extremely Vulnerable People are at particularly high risk due to their serious health conditions and have been advised to self-isolate until the end of June. We now estimate there are 39,000 Surrey residents in this category.
 - b. Category B- Clinically Vulnerable People is a larger group of people who are at increased risk of severe illness for whom there is a need to be particularly stringent in following social distancing measures and to self-isolate to protect themselves..
 - c. Category C- Vulnerable People (Non-clinical) are individuals not at increased risk of severe illness but are at risk due to the restrictions that have been put in place through increased social isolation such as worsening mental and physical health or increased domestic abuse.
15. The key elements that have been developed to support our vulnerable residents include:
 - a. The Community Helpline has now received over 7,500 calls.
 - b. A range of information is available on the Council's website and we have received just over 400 online requests for help.
 - c. A networked offer of support is available to those who contact us, delivered by the County Council, district and borough councils, parish councils and a significant voluntary and community sector effort.
 - d. Over 1,500 food parcels have been delivered to residents from the food distribution hub at the Guildford Spectrum, with many more provided by districts and borough councils, voluntary and community organisations and food banks.

- e. Redeployed County Council staff and district and borough staff have made contact with over 32,400 residents who are shielding, including over 3,800 welfare visits.
16. Collectively there remains a need to support vulnerable residents, but as we transition from the Response to the Recovery phase of the pandemic, so will our support. We are now moving from a rapid response phase to a more steady and consistent state. Many of our vulnerable residents have in place a range of support mechanisms which will ensure they can receive the support they need, including support from friends and family, regular government food parcels or a prioritised supermarket delivery slot, a means to have their prescriptions collected, and befriending calls from volunteers to help prevent social-isolation. While these support mechanisms will need to adapt and change as the pandemic progresses, and lockdown measures are eventually eased, the focus will shift to ensuring that residents know how to access support should their situation change, and that provision is in place to meet longer term or complex needs, including mental health support.

COVID-19 Finance Update

17. On the 28 April, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, announced the allocation of a second tranche of the COVID-19 Response Fund grant. The council has received £21.8m of this funding. This is in addition to the £25.2m received in April. In total, the council has received £47m of COVID-19 related funding, a material amount but insufficient to cover the financial impact of the crisis on the council.
18. We have continued to refine our estimated costs and loss of income as a result of COVID-19 on a weekly basis and have cross-checked our assumptions with the County Councils' Network and other sector partners. We have also reviewed the deliverability of efficiencies based on different scenarios involving potential public health measures.
19. After finalising the financial position for 2019/20 which provided an outturn of £0.9m in COVID-19 costs, the council submitted the latest estimates of our financial pressures to MHCLG, on the 15 May. The submission included forecasted costs and loss of income of £57.4m; in addition to £15.8m in non-delivery of efficiency proposals. The gross cost to the council was estimated to be £73.2m in 2020/21. However, when offsetting this amount against the remaining government funding from the COVID-19 Response Fund, the latest projections show of a shortfall in council finances in 2020/21 of **£27.1m**.

20. Table 1 – COVID-19 Finance Forecast

	MHCLG 1 £'m	Total £'m	MHCLG 2 £'m	Total £'m	Variance £'m	Commentary
2019/20*	1.3		0.9			
Total 2019/20		1.3		0.9	(0.4)	Final 19/20 COVID-19 costs of £0.9m
Costs and Loss of Income	48.4		57.4			
Non-Delivery of Efficiencies**			15.8			
Total Reported to MHCLG 2020/21		48.4		73.2	24.8	Inclusion of efficiencies and updated cost pressures and risks predominantly in ASC provider support and PPE costs
Funding - Tranche 1	(25.2)		(25.2)			
Funding - Tranche 2			(21.8)			
Total Funding		(25.2)		(47.0)	(21.8)	Additional COVID-19 Response Fund grant
Non-Delivery of Efficiencies**		18.0			(18.0)	Efficiencies not included in MHCLG 1
Shortfall in Funding	April	42.6	May	27.1	(15.3)	

*At the time of submitting the first return the 19/20 outturn was being finalised

**The MHCLG1 form did not allow for our estimate for non-delivery of efficiencies to be included

21. The Society of County Treasurers (SCT) Technical Support Team have since analysed and summarised responses sent to MHCLG, representing 100% of members. Their analysis shows SCT members could face a net unfunded pressures of £1.4bn in 2020/21. Using the same distributions as the government has used thus far, the COVID-19 Response Fund (currently at £3.2bn) would need to be increased to over £6.8bn to cover SCT costs.

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

22. The Surrey Local Resilience Forum (LRF) signalled its intent to act as a provider of last resort for PPE where supplies from Central Government sources are insufficient to meet demand. However, as the LRF isn't a legal entity, the council was considered best placed to adopt this responsibility and fulfil the LRF's intent, in a market where there is competition due to global demand.

23. A number of options were developed, including bulk buying to secure short-term supply, based on criteria around quality, reliability of supply, payment terms and forecasted need. These options ranged between £1.3m and £2.7m in costs. Due to the urgent nature of this situation a decision has been taken by the Chief Executive under the Council's urgency procedures (Standing Order 54) to approve the option to bulk purchase from UK distributors at a cost of £1.7m. This is for an estimated 6 weeks of supply, so it is likely further procurement will be required.

24. There is a possibility to recharge some of the costs of the preferred option, but if recharging were either not to be introduced or customers failed to pay, the council would have to fund the entire cost from the COVID-19 Response Fund. Before the approval to support the LRF in fulfilling its commitment, the council had already spent £3.3m on PPE.

25. In April, the council launched a campaign asking local businesses and residents to help by donating and making PPE and other support items. We received an outstanding response from across the county with over 1,500 offers of help. We

linked up with many established local groups who have come together and are now supplying to local hospitals and or other care settings.

26. The council has now established new 'anchor voluntary groups' who will help to further support our efforts. The majority of the groups are made up of skilled sewers who are ready to respond to needs and gaps in provision. Of the volunteers that came forward, approximately 100 were tailors, seamstresses and teachers with specialist skills. This campaign has contributed to the donation of over 100,000 high specification PPE items and hundreds of front-line workers are benefiting as a result of this work by these voluntary groups.

Update on the Council's response as an employer

27. As we transition from the Response to Recovery phase of the pandemic, we continue to work with colleagues across the Surrey system to develop plans to support our workforce, with a focus on the following key areas:
- a. Workforce physical and mental wellbeing
 - b. Managing built up demand in the system
 - c. Resuming "Business as Usual" for non-critical services
 - d. Managing workforce policy issues, including principles to manage a safe return to the workplace
 - e. Learning from the experience and retaining positive and innovative ways of working/behaviours

28. These key areas of focus for the council are summarised below.

Workforce physical and mental wellbeing

29. Targeted support has been developed for staff who have been long-term shielding or absent from work. Using the latest government and Public Health England (PHE) information, advice and guidance has also been developed to support infection control and returning to work safely.
30. The council is prepared for a surge in emotional support required by individuals and teams who have experienced bereavement, trauma and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).
31. The council has been proactive in offering support to teachers and school staff as schools reopen.

Resuming "Business as Usual" for non-critical services

32. A return to "Business as Usual" is being managed on a service by service basis and will take into account government and PHE guidance; in particular social distancing and personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements. The nature of an individual's role and their personal circumstances is being considered in order to understand the ability of staff to work remotely wherever possible.

Managing workforce policy issues

33. In response to the Government's 'Working Safely during Coronavirus' guidelines, council services have been asked to carry out risk assessments for each area and team by 1 June, in addition to individual risk assessments for staff within vulnerable groups. This will ensure that full safety measures are in place for each work setting and in order to minimise risks, work patterns and other factors are being considered.
34. The council will consider which policies and ways of working developed during the response to the COVID-19 pandemic should continue or be adapted as we move into

the “Recovery” phase. This will include the identification of any policies and Terms & Conditions that may require fundamental review and formal consultation with staff and Trade Unions.

Learning from experience

35. The council has begun a month-long schedule of activity to capture lessons learned during the pandemic and identify areas of focus for the future, which will also inform a redefinition of the council’s Moving Closer to Residents Programme. This activity will include feedback from staff surveys to capture the experience of staff, qualitative feedback from redeployees, and quantitative analysis of relevant workforce data (for example numbers redeployed, where staff were redeployed to and sickness levels).

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

36. Risk implications are stated throughout the report and COVID-19 related risks are managed through the Strategic Coordination Group governance structure.

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

37. The pressures identified at the time of submitting our May forecasts to MHCLG (as part of the DELTA 2 return), resulting from COVID-19 totalled £73.2m, for 2020/21.
38. The pressures identified are in relation to spend and income shortfall forecasts based on four months of lockdown measures, with gradual easing over the remainder of the financial year. The pressures also include our current estimates on the non-delivery of efficiencies, as a result of the pandemic. However, all assumptions continue to be validated for accuracy as new information emerges and will not represent an exhaustive list of pressures.
39. At the time of submitting our forecasts to MHCLG, we had allocated £0.9m of the COVID-19 Response Fund against 2019/20 costs incurred in March 2020. If the balance of the COVID-19 Response Fund (£46.1m) was allocated to fund the pressures in 2020/21 (£73.2m) that would leave unfunded pressures of £27.1m. This shortfall is before any potential contributions from other sectors, such as the NHS and any reimbursement for PPE purchases from LRF partners. Therefore, a gap against funding remains a real issue.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

40. There are no specific legal implications raised in the report further to the Council’s legal obligations and statutory duties in service provision to residents and for an employer to provide a safe working environment for staff and those visiting Council premises

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

41. The national picture for COVID-19 is shifting rapidly, and with new guidance coming from the government daily, we are continuing to assess the equality implications for residents and staff. This report draws attention to the work being done to shield some of Surrey’s most vulnerable residents (Category A), many of whom will be older and

have a disability or long-term medical condition and some may not have close networks of friends or family they can rely on for support.

42. The measures in place to support the council's workforce will be crucial for supporting existing or emerging mental health conditions arising from the crisis. The individual risk assessment process will also ensure our more vulnerable staff members are able to return to work safely. In addition, the lessons learned exercise represents an opportunity to embed positive working practices adopted for the pandemic that enable colleagues to feel supported and better meets the needs of groups that need extra support, such as unpaid carers.
 43. The local Test and Trace process will ensure support is targeted at complex cases, such as care home outbreaks, so protections for older and disabled people are strengthened.
 44. This report highlights a £27.1m funding shortfall for 2020/21 despite receiving £47m government funding to respond to Covid-19 pressures. Any in-year efficiency plans to address this shortfall will prioritise minimising impacts on service delivery. If service transformation is required to cover the efficiency gap, the equality implications will be presented to Cabinet to pay due regard to them ahead of taking any final decisions.
-

Contact Officer:

Sarah Richardson, Head of Strategy, 07971 091475

Consulted:

- Cabinet Members
- Corporate Leadership Team and other staff

Record of decisions taken by an officer under Standing Order 54 – urgent decision making



Title:	COVID-19 Surrey County Council Response to Covid – PPE Procurement
Divisions Affected:	All / List
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Over £1m / Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Standing order 54 – urgent decision making

Meeting date/time	15/5/2020
Meeting title	<i>Decision by Chief Executive on PPE Bulk Procurement</i>

Summary

The Council is responding to the Covid-19 major incident and therefore needs to make urgent decisions to ensure that residents are protected. Urgent decisions taken at the above named meeting are listed below with reasons.

The Local Resilience Forum (LRF) has signalled its intent to act as a provider of last resort for Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) where supplies from Central Government sources are insufficient to meet demand. The LRF is currently servicing upwards of 800 individual customers with PPE. The volumes involved outstrip the supply provided by MHCLG, donations and the “make” initiative by approximately 70%. *The decision to seek to provide additional supply via private procurement was agreed by the LRF via [decision of the joint chairs/sign off at SCG] on 15/5/2020*

The LRF is not a legal entity and does not instruct its members, who simply have a duty to co-operate. To enable the fulfilment of the LRF’s intent, one of the partner bodies needs to undertake the procurement on behalf of the LRF. The County Council is considered best placed to adopt this responsibility based on available capacity, resources and expertise.

The current supply routes have been unstable due the national shortage of PPE and have created a ‘hand-to-mouth’ daily struggle to obtain and reprioritise stock, mainly through expensive spot purchase arrangements, in order to meet essential demand. This creates an ongoing threat of not being able to supply critical PPE with the associated health and reputational risks.

As it stands today, the PPE team have been able to meet current demand and there have been no occasions where failure to supply PPE has resulted in premises closing or

staff/public being placed at significant risk. However, this is an ongoing situation, and this may not continue to be the case without significant procurement action. Ensuring that this situation does not arise, and that the welfare of carers and other front-line responders and service providers is prioritised, is considered to be an overriding objective.

The national Clipper service was forecast to be in place to deal with all PPE supply but is unlikely to be functional in the medium or potentially even long term. MHCLG supplies are not intended to meet all needs and are designed to be additional to LRF/local authority procurement. Their availability to Surrey will continue to be unpredictable as they are servicing the whole country.

The current market for PPE in the UK is extremely volatile. As a base example, the price for a pack of 100 Nitrile examination gloves has increased approximately 400% in 4 months. UK based suppliers make up less than 10 % of available supply and as such, the astronomical growth in PPE requirement has led to a supply chain that was previously based on next day delivery being now being up to 6 weeks for some products.

The inflated pricing in the marketplace has attracted suppliers who do not class PPE as a core activity, or even general sales of consumables. Their knowledge of their supply chains outside the EU, and the regulatory requirements of the products are minimal, which is leading to very questionable proposals and a much-increased need for vigilance on the part of any procurement activity.

In order to try and mitigate some of risks within the supply chain, the SCC procurement team have introduced, with assistance from the internal Audit team, a systematic process to establish an appropriate and reasonable level of assurance on the goods, supply chain and manufacturer through certification. This is especially required where goods are being sourced directly from Chinese based suppliers or trading companies.

The competition for PPE is extremely fierce and the availability of the product is constantly changing, which is leading to an even steeper growth in pricing and an ever-growing need for procurement decisions to be made in uncomfortable time frames. However, buying in small quantities has meant additional costs of around 40% over the benefits of bulk ordering.

The LRF logistic team have worked to forecast the PPE demand which are informed by most recent forecasts taking into account the demand mitigation processes put in place to ensure providers are not over-ordering (this has been a significant issue) and presumes continuation of receipt of MHCLG stock at the current somewhat unpredictable level. Without these mitigation processes the amount and cost of stock will be significantly higher, or the stock procured will last for a shorter period.

As such, the LRF has requested that the SCC Procurement Team identify and source supply routes for certain categories of PPE and manage the procurement process accordingly.

Appendix 1 outlines the recommendations for bulk purchase, and these are based on the following key points:

- **Volume revisions** – Based on the latest information from Wray Park and MHCLG deliveries being more frequent, the total number of lines ordered has reduced. Gloves

and Aprons have been removed from the bulk buy scenario as Glove supply has been secured at a much below market rate and Aprons are a regular purchase with a UK supplier along with a significant supply from MHCLG. We have no need for additional hand sanitiser as stocks are currently plentiful. Some volumes have been revised upwards based on Wray Park requirements and the demand need.

- **Future forecasts** – Based on the current situation, MHCLG deliveries, the procurement of 5 weeks orders in order to ascertain usage together with the potential for a greater pull on the LRF as lockdown conditions alter, there is no available evidence that the volumes required will decrease over the next 12 weeks. The much more likely occurrence is that needs will stay stable with definite spikes based on outbreaks.
- **Risks from a ‘Direct to China supply’ policy** – The risks of this approach include non-supply, competitors buying stock that was dedicated for SCC, loss of funds, lack of control, and inability to return stock (which can be partially mitigated through Letters of Credit and contract penalties which are being investigated by Finance).
- **Direct to China supply is therefore not recommended** based on the risks involved and feedback received. Given some the price changes recently seen in the marketplace and the reduction of the risk premium by using UK distributors, the recommendation focuses on procurement through a UK based channel. The volume involved allows for breathing space to continue to review future supply lines including those direct from China. Given this greater time capacity, the team will now have the potential for independent testing of products received by other councils before SCC purchase to assure quality. Whilst a risk premium is payable for UK sourcing, the benefits in terms of contractual actions in the event of failure, improved commercial terms, and financial risk exposure outweigh the increased pricing.
- There is still an inherent risk of the UK Sourced products suitability due to the specific medical nature and regulatory standards. To mitigate this, the Internal Audit team have put in a robust process to verify all documentation, such as test certificates. The County Council’s Health and Safety Team will remain the final point of sign off before any purchases can be made. **No UK purchases will be made on 100% upfront payments. They will be made up of 50% upfront/50% on passing QA after delivery or standard 30-day terms thereby further mitigating some of the financial and commercial risks associated with this procurement activity.**
- **All prices outlined are correct as of 14th May 2020.** The market is extremely volatile and another spike, a change in policy from China, India/Malaysia restarting export, or any number of factors could change that.
- All prices quoted **include freight and insurance costs where appropriate**
- It is likely that further PPE orders will be needed in the coming weeks and months. As the demand stabilises and supply routes through centralised routes become established, sources routes and bulk purchase considerations will be tested at each stage to ensure appropriate purchasing decisions are considered.
- **In summary, the three options considered and estimated spend for 6 weeks supply (at prevailing prices and demand estimates) are:**

Spot Buying	UK Distributor Bulk Buy	Direct to China Bulk Buy
£2,665,000	£1,665,000	£1,316,000

It should be worth noting that this request for purchase from the LRF is based on current

known volumes. Although the situation can be seen to be a little more under control, the LRF are still only seeing orders from approximately 35% of the customers registered with the LRF for potential supply.

Section 151 Comments:

Based on current prices, the bulk purchase for 6 weeks supply from UK distributors is estimated to be £1,655,000. If the same stock is to be purchased at current spot prices, it is estimated to cost £2,655,000. The cost of this PPE will be charged to the government Covid response grant and has been assumed in projections.

However, the possibility of recharging for the stock is being explored, which would reduce the call on the grant (which is already over-committed). If recharging were either not to be introduced or customers failed to pay, the council would have to fund the entire cost.

Given the current nature of the emergency, the s151 Officer supports the recommendation that the bulk purchase is agreed from UK distributors, subject to all procurement checks, and that officers work with the LRF to agree a distribution and recharging policy.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

Surrey County Council act as the lead agency to procure PPE on behalf of the LRF in fulfilling that requirement, the County Council adopts the procurement approach set out in Appendix 1

Surrey County Council Officers will work with the LRF team to establish an appropriate distribution and recharging policy that meets the agreed objectives.

Reasons for Decision:

Secure the short-term provision of PPE for the Council and meet the LRF obligations to ensure that all organisations/staff requiring PPE have appropriate PPE and the residents and carers are kept safe

There is an expectation, that the Council should use the COVID-19 Grant funding towards meeting or contributing to the costs of providing essential equipment and services, for which there is no other source

The LRF is also exploring the possibilities of recharging part of the spend on PPE and the Surrey County Council Officers will work with the LRF team to establish an appropriate distribution and recharging policy that meets the agreed objectives

Forward-purchase (bulk buy) items of PPE through a distributed supply chain thus minimising the risk PPE supply outages and over exposure to spot purchase and price fluctuations, ensuring that all organisations and staff requiring PPE have access to a regular supply thereby ensuring the safety of residents and carers.

Build a resilient and reliable supply chain that reduces the risk of using non-compliant PPE

and stabilises costs in the short term.

To minimise the risk of reduced supply from the government supply chain which to date has been inconsistent both in quantity and scheduling.

Create a buffer of PPE stock of around 6 weeks. This will help us to better support providers and clients. Given the current demand forecast, it is unlikely that any PPE will remain unused given the ongoing demand. If in the unlikely event there is surplus stock, it is expected that it could be provided to other parties such as the NHS as the items meet approved standards. However, at this stage any potential recharging mechanism hasn't been agreed.

Create a stock level in order to maintain services until such times as government supply chain and demand.

Government, Donations and requests to 'Make' do not support the current demand.

Factor in a level of contingency into the pricing assumption to alleviate any price/currency fluctuations

Decisions taken by:	Joanna Killian, Chief Executive
Decisions taken on:	14 th May 2020
To be implemented on:	15 th May 2020

Decision taken in consultation with

Leader of the Council

SCC Finance – Leigh Whitehouse, Section 151 Officer

SCC Legal

LRF logistic lead

LRF Goods and Service Cell Lead

TCG

SCG

SCC Procurement

Appendix 1 Supplier List

The table below set out the PPE product to the purchase, the suggested volumes to be procured, current costs and recommended supplier route in Green.

Product	Spot Buying unit Price	UK Distributor Bulk Price	Direct to China Bulk Price
Coveralls	£20.00	£8 - sole supply	£20 - sole supply
Goggles EN166	£7.00	£4.12 - sole supply	£3.48 - sole supply
Gowns	£11.50	£11.50	£5.43 - sole supply
Type I Mask	£0.55	£0.52 - split supply	£0.43 - sole supply
Type IIR Mask	£1.18	£0.53 - split supply	£0.44 - split supply
Visors	£4.75	£3.85 - sole supply	£1.30 - sole supply

Product	Original Bulk Volume	Altered request	Spot Buying Cost	UK Distributor Bulk Cost	Direct to China Bulk Cost	Reasoning
Coveralls	5,000	10,000 - Based on Wray Park information, there is a larger requirement	£200,000	£80,000	£200,000	The product being offered from China is a higher specification than the one noted in Gov guidelines
Goggles EN166	50,000	50,000	£350,000	£206,000	£174,000	The Chinese supplier will only release unredacted, English test reports if an order is placed. We are also liaising with a UK safetywear supplier who is proposing a £4 price for 50k goggles but has not submitted the full proposal yet
Gowns	10,000	10,000	£115,000	£115,000	£54,300	The specification, availability and reliability of gown supply is extremely volatile. We would recommend trying to work on sourcing a trusted supplier on this product, even if it takes a little longer
Type I Mask	600,000	800,000 - Based on Wray Park information, there is a larger requirement	£440,000	£416,000	£344,000	The direct to China price is based on market assumptions. Neither of the routes investigated offered this product but it is easily sourcable
Type IIR Mask	2,000,000	1,000,000 - Reduced due to demand being managed and MHCLG deliveries - gives time to review continued usage and consider a further order	£1,180,000	£530,000	£440,000	We have revised the recommendation from 2m to 1m based on figures from Wray Park. Additionally, this volume is securable in the UK (split supply) with 500k in 3-6 days and the remaining volume in 2 -3 weeks.
Visors	50,000	80,000 - Based on Wray Park information, there is a larger requirement	£380,000	£308,000	£104,000	The supplier we are working with is locally based (South Godstone) and has agreed to deliver in stages (10k per week) at a reduced price if we make an order for the full volume. The product has been well received and meets requirements
Total	2,715,000	1,950,000	£2,665,000	£1,655,000	£1,316,300	

Appendix 2

PPE Specification used for regulatory compliance and CE certification

PPE Equipment	EN Standard	PPE Directive	Specifications
Disposable gloves	EN 455-1, -2, -3, -4	89/686/EEC	Gloves Spec
Disposable plastic aprons		89/686/EEC	Aprons Spec (no EN number - just the minimum requirements for NHS Supply Chain)
Disposable fluid resistant gown	EN 13795:2019	2016/425	Gowns Spec
Disposable fluid resistant overall	EN 13795:2019	2016/425	Coveralls Spec
Type 1 Mask	EN 14683:2019		Mask Spec
Fluid – resistant (type IIR) surgical mask	EN 14683:2019		Mask Spec
Filtering face piece respirator (FFP 3)	EN 149:2001+A1:2009		FFP Spec
Eye / face protection	EN 166:2002		Goggles Spec
Hand sanitiser	Various - 60% Alcohol		Hand Sanitiser Spec

This page is intentionally left blank

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: providing support to Kier supply chain
Divisions Affected:	All
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

Non critical highway works were paused on 30th March, with most recommencing by 15th April. In order to support suppliers and to retain capacity to enable a rapid return to work, we have agreed to meet “stand down” costs (e.g. staff, hire of plant, overhead), and also to pay de-mobilisation and re-mobilisation costs (e.g. shutting down and securing construction sites). These costs are currently estimated at £0.4m.

In order to assist suppliers with their cashflow, payment will be made of 70% on account (i.e. earlier than normal, and prior to full verification), with the remainder paid once verification has taken place, working on an open book basis. The initial payment equates to £0.276m.

This decision relates to costs incurred up to 9th April, with a possible requirement for a further payment up to 15th April (or whenever individual schemes re-commenced).

These suppliers are “tier 2”, i.e. they are contracted to Kier, not to SCC. Payment is only proposed where specific task orders have been issued by SCC, and those works have been affected by the pause.

These are additional costs to SCC, and therefore require approval.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

1. Financial support of £0.4m be provided to highway contractors operating within the Kier partnership contract, for costs incurred while works were paused in March and April 2020.

Reasons for Decision:

To support highways contractors, and to retain their capacity so that highway works can re-commence as quickly as possible.

Decision taken by:	Katie Stewart – Executive Director ETI Matt Furniss – Cabinet Member for Highways
Decision taken on:	29 th April 2020 <i>(note this notice must be published on the council's website within three days of the decision being made)</i>
To be implemented on:	Payments backdated to 30/03/2020

Alternative options considered

The alternative is not to provide financial support, which could affect the financial viability of contractors, and would not allow highway works to be re-commenced quickly.

Summary of any financial implications

Costs in respect of this decision are expected to be c.£0.4m. Additional payments may be made where works were paused beyond 9th April 2020. In the first instance attempts will be made to contain costs within the existing budget envelope, or additional funding provided by government.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

(list any conflict of interest declared by a Cabinet Member who is consulted by the officer which relates to the decision and, in respect of any declared conflict of interest, any note of dispensation granted by the head of paid service).

Consultation/Process Followed

Decision taken in consultation with Cabinet Member for Highways.



Decision to support
Kier subcontractors.

(If delegation required consultation to take place with, for example, a Cabinet Member, include details here).

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: providing support to service providers
Divisions Affected:	Elmbridge, Runnymede (and the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames)
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

Bus route 461 is a key route to St Peter's Hospital normally running every 30min. The operator reduced it to hourly, then every two hours, due to falling fare income as a result of fewer passengers as a result of Covid-19. The council received complaints that the reduced service was not supporting key workers to access an NHS primary care facility, not supporting the hospital shift patterns, and causing problems with self-distancing due to crowding. In order to maintain an acceptable service and support the NHS, an additional payment has been negotiated on the basis that that the 461 bus service continues to run once an hour.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

1. Financial support of £450 per day (estimated at £33k) be provided to Falcon Buses to support route 461 for three months from April to June 2020.

Reasons for Decision:

To enable continuation of bus services taking key NHS workers to St Peter's Hospital.

Decision taken by:	Katie Stewart – Executive Director ETI Matt Furniss – Cabinet Member for Highways
Decision taken on:	15 th April 2020 <i>(note this notice must be published on the</i>

	<i>council's website within three days of the decision being made)</i>
To be implemented on:	Payments backdated to 01/04/2020

Alternative options considered

The alternative is not to provide financial support. The supplier had already reduced the frequency of services due to reduced patronage and fares, which gave rise to the issue.

Summary of any financial implications

Additional costs expected to be c.£33k until 30th June 2020. In the first instance attempts will be made to contain costs within the existing budget envelope, or additional funding provided by government.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

(list any conflict of interest declared by a Cabinet Member who is consulted by the officer which relates to the decision and, in respect of any declared conflict of interest, any note of dispensation granted by the head of paid service).

Consultation/Process Followed

Decision taken in consultation with Cabinet Member for Highways.



RE Decision to provide support to l

(If delegation required consultation to take place with, for example, a Cabinet Member, include details here).

Background Documents

Cabinet report 31st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.

Exempt:

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Totterdown Pre School
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

To pay Little Angels £8,085 to support their financial sustainability due to loss of private income and inefficiency of continuing to operate for 2/3 children due to a lack of alternatives in the area.

Totterdown are a strategically important provider in Deepcut where there are limited alternative providers.

They have provided a detailed cashflow including their DSG funding and Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme allocations which will leave them in a deficit position by the end of the summer term.

Working with Early Years commissioners they have identified that up to September they require £8,085 of additional support. We have agreed to pay £4,000 now, and the balance as part of a review at the end of April. The figure of £4,000 will support their project deficit for June. If further government guidance or changes have not been actioned by then the balance of £4,085 will be paid subject to a review to support the provider up to the autumn term.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

A total payment of £8,085 be made to Totterdown Pre School in two instalments of £4,000 and £4,085. The second payment at the end of July 2020 will be subject to no further government announcements of funding becoming available which will be assessed by commissioning and finance officers.

Reasons for Decision:

To ensure capacity remains in the Early Years sector when the current restrictions in place in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are lifted.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	05/05/2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Totterdown Pre School for the additional costs and leave the provider to find alternative means for funding them. This could put the long term sustainability of the provider at risk which would then impact on the available provision for children in Surrey.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £8,085.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government as this is separate to the provision of childcare which would come from Early Years DSG.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Stepping Stones for provision over Easter Holidays
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

Stepping Stones are an NMI provider who the Council use for a number of placements. As per government guidance they remained open over the Easter Holidays to provide a secure and safe environment for a number of Surrey children.

Currently there is no additional funding for NMI schools for costs incurred over the Easter holidays as they are not able to access the maintained sector additional Covid-19 funding the government has allocated.

As a result of opening over Easter they incurred a number of additional costs, after review by the panel there was agreement to reimburse them for £4,959 of direct costs relating to provision for SCC children. This included teaching assistants whose contracts would not normally include this period and a deep clean of the premises (due to a relative of a member of staff testing positive for Covid-19).

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

The costs of £4,959 would be reimbursed to Stepping Stones to reflect their costs of providing placements to SCC SEND pupils over Easter.

Reasons for Decision:

No other government funding is available for these type of costs and it is important the provision remains in place post Covid-19. Stepping Stones are also considered to be a good value provider who have a good reputation in their dealings with the Council.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	05/05/2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Stepping Stones and require them to fund these costs themselves. This may lead to Stepping Stones having to increase fees or reduce capacity in the future.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £4,959.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Step Ahead (supported accommodation)
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

To pay Step Ahead £8,400 for additional costs incurred remaining open over the last 7 weeks and projected for the next 7 week period.

Step Ahead have continued to stay open and deliver services through this period and additional costs relate largely to additional PPE and additional staffing costs as a result of a number of staff shielding and needing to be back-filled.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

A total payment of £8,400 be made to Step Ahead.

Reasons for Decision:

To recognise the additional costs incurred by Step Ahead in providing services during this period in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	18 th May 2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Step Ahead for the additional costs and leave the provider to find alternative means for funding them. This could put the long term sustainability of the provider at risk which would then impact on the available provision for children in Surrey.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £8,400.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Stables Nursery
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

To pay Stables Nursery £10,200 to support their financial sustainability due to loss of private income and inefficiency of continuing to operate for 2/3 children due to a lack of alternatives in the area.

Stables are a strategically important provider in an area where there are limited alternative providers.

They have provided a detailed cashflow including their DSG funding and Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme allocations which will leave them in a deficit position by the end of the summer term.

Working with Early Years commissioners their original request of £24,000 was revised to £10,200 with further interrogation of their financial assumptions.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

A total payment of £10,200 be made to Stables Nursery

Reasons for Decision:

To ensure capacity remains in the Early Years sector when the current restrictions in place in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are lifted.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	18 th May 2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Stables Nursery for the additional costs and leave the provider to find alternative means for funding them. This could put the long term sustainability of the provider at risk which would then impact on the available provision for children in Surrey.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £10,200.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government as this is separate to the provision of childcare which would come from Early Years DSG.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Moving on Care
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

Moving on Care are a supported accomodation provider. The Council currently has 40 young people placed with them in a range of areas including Guildford, Woking, Epsom, Croydon, Coulsdon, Crawley, Horley, Camberley, Stratford, Orpington.

They are therefore a strategically important provider for the Council in relation to our vulnerable children.

They have incurred £942 of additional Covid-19 related costs which the Council intends to fund for them.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

The amount of £942 was to be paid to Moving on Care to fund additional costs incurred as a result of their response to Covid-19.

Reasons for Decision:

To support a provider who works with the Council's vulnerable children. Without additional funding they may not be able to maintain the same level of provision which would have a significant impact. The cost of finding alternative providers could be substantially more than this claim.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	05/05/2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Moving on Care, in which case they would need to absorb additional Covid-19 costs themselves. This may lead to a reduction in placements if they are not able to do so.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £942.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Cabinet report 31st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.

Exempt:

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Little Angels Early Years provider
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

To pay Little Angels £5,044 to support their financial sustainability due to loss of private income.

Little Angels are an Ofsted outstanding provider of childcare who have applied for additional financial support as a result of lost private income as a result of Covid-19.

They have provided a detailed cashflow including their DSG funding and Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme allocations which will leave them in a deficit position.

Working with Early Years commissioners they have identified that up to September they require £5,044 of additional support. We have agreed to pay £2,556 now, and the balance as part of a review at the end of April. The figure of £2,556 will support a balanced position for the period up to the end of June. If further government guidance or changes have not been actioned by then the balance of £2,488 will be paid subject to a review.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

A total payment of £5,044 be made to Little Angels in two instalments of £2,556 and £2,488. The second payment in July 2020 will be subject to no further government announcements of funding becoming available which will be assessed by commissioning and finance officers.

Reasons for Decision:

To ensure capacity remains in the Early Years sector when the current restrictions in place in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are lifted.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	05/05/2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Little Angels for the additional costs and leave the provider to find alternative means for funding them. This could put the long term sustainability of the provider at risk which would then impact on the available provision for children in Surrey.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £5,044.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government as this is separate to the provision of childcare which would come from Early Years DSG.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.

Record of decision taken under delegated powers by a council officer



Title:	Surrey County Council Response to Covid: Payment to Challengers
Divisions Affected:	All divisions
Key Decision:	Yes
Reason Key:	Affects two or more Divisions
Decision taken under delegation by virtue of:	Cabinet decision 31 March 2020 Min ref: 41/20

Summary

To pay Challengers a total of £46,000 to stabilise and support their Early Years and short breaks provision in Surrey, including Tandridge Short Breaks, in the short-term. This payment acknowledges the specific challenges facing the provider at this time and their strategic importance in delivering services that support children with disabilities in Surrey.

Based on delivery hours, Challengers are contracted to provide 33% of SCC's total commissioned short breaks provision (excluding overnight respite) so are a strategically important provider in this sector.

The funding is given with the expectation that Challengers work openly and in good faith with CFLC Commissioners to develop and implement any necessary changes to their current models of delivery, whilst ensuring the needs of the children, young people and families currently accessing schemes are effectively met through future arrangements.

Decision made

Decision made:

It was AGREED that:

A total payment of £46,000 be made to Challengers.

Reasons for Decision:

To ensure capacity remains in the Short breaks and Early Years sectors when the current restrictions in place in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are lifted.

Decision taken by:	Dave Hill
Decision taken on:	18 th May 2020
To be implemented on:	Payment to be made following CLT and Cabinet Member Decision. This has now happened and payment will be processed.

Alternative options considered

The alternative is to not reimburse Challengers for the additional costs and leave the provider to find alternative means for funding them. This could put the long term sustainability of the provider at risk which would then impact on the available provision for children in Surrey. Challengers had flagged financial concerns pre-covid19 so their capacity to absorb the impact of the pandemic would be questioned.

Summary of any financial implications

The cost to SCC will be £46,000.
It is anticipated that this will be funded out of the COVID-19 funding SCC is receiving from central government as the £10,000 EY element, is considered separate to the provision of childcare which would come from Early Years DSG.

Declarations of conflicts of interest

None

Consultation/Process Followed

A panel has been created consisting of Commissioning, procurement and finance staff to consider applications from CFLC providers.

This application has been reviewed and following further engagement with the provider was approved. This has since been approved by the Executive Director of CFLC.

Background Documents

Exempt:

Cabinet report 31 st March 2020 setting out the council's response to Covid-19.	
--	--