

# Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Wednesday 22 July 2020**

Time: **10am**

Venue: **Virtual Meeting**

**Pursuant to The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, the 22 July 2020 meeting of Norfolk County Council will be held using video conferencing.**

**The Scrutiny meeting will be broadcast live via this link:**

[https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCdyUrFjYNPfPq5psa-LFIJA/featured?disable\\_polymer=1](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCdyUrFjYNPfPq5psa-LFIJA/featured?disable_polymer=1)

**Scrutiny Members and other attendees: DO NOT follow this link, you will be sent a separate link to join the meeting.**

## Membership:

Cllr Steve Morpew (Chair)  
Cllr Alison Thomas (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Roy Brame  
Cllr Emma Corlett  
Cllr Phillip Duigan  
Cllr Ron Hanton  
Cllr Chris Jones

Cllr Joe Mooney  
Cllr Judy Oliver  
Cllr Richard Price  
Cllr Dan Roper  
Cllr Stefan Aquarone  
Cllr Hayden Thirtle

## Parent Governor Representatives

Mr Giles Hankinson  
Vacancy

## Church Representatives

Ms Helen Bates  
Mr Paul Dunning

# A g e n d a

## 1 To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending

## 2. Minutes

(Page 5 )

To confirm the minutes from the Meetings held on 29 June 2020

## 3. Members to Declare any Interests

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is on your Register of Interests you must not speak or vote on the matter.

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is not on your Register of Interests you must declare that interest at the meeting and not speak or vote on the matter

In either case you may remain in the room where the meeting is taking place. If you consider that it would be inappropriate in the circumstances to remain in the room, you may leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

If you do not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest you may nevertheless have an **Other Interest** in a matter to be discussed if it affects, to a greater extent than others in your division

- Your wellbeing or financial position, or
- that of your family or close friends
- Any body -
  - Exercising functions of a public nature.
  - Directed to charitable purposes; or
  - One of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union);

Of which you are in a position of general control or management.

If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

## 4 To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency

## 5 Public Question Time

Fifteen minutes for questions from members of the public of which due notice has been given. Please note that all questions must be received by the Committee Team ([committees@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:committees@norfolk.gov.uk)) by **5pm on Friday 17 July 2020**. For guidance on submitting a public question, please visit <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we->

**6 Local Member Issues/Questions**

Fifteen minutes for local member to raise issues of concern of which due notice has been given. Please note that all questions must be received by the Committee Team ([committees@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:committees@norfolk.gov.uk)) by **5pm on Friday 17 July 2020**

**7 The deadline for calling-in matters for consideration at this meeting of the Scrutiny Committee from the Cabinet meeting held on Monday 6 July 2020 was 4pm on Monday 13 July 2020**

**8 COVID 19 - Support for shielded and vulnerable people in our communities. (Page 12 )**

Report by Executive Director of Strategy and Governance

**10.15 am – 11.40am (Page 16 )**

**8a) Covid-19 Response: Supporting Vulnerable Adults in Norfolk**

Report and presentation from Executive Director of Adult Social Services

**11.40 am -12.10pm (Page 23 )**

**8b) Personal protective equipment for the Covid-19 pandemic**

Report from Director of Procurement

**12.10pm -12.40pm (Page 27 )**

**8c) Local Outbreak Control Plan**

Report and presentation from Director of Public Health

**12.40pm -1.15 pm Break for Lunch**

**9 1.15pm – 1.45pm (Page 31 )**

**Briefing on COVID-19 and Strategic and Financial Planning**

Report by Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services

## **Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme**

Report by Executive Director of Strategy and Governance

**Tom McCabe**  
**Head of Paid Service**  
County Hall  
Martineau Lane  
Norwich  
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 14 July 2020



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or (textphone) 18001 0344 800 8020 and we will do our best to help.



## Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 29 June 2020  
at 10:00 as a virtual teams meeting

### Present:

Cllr Steve Morpew (Chair)  
Cllr Alison Thomas (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Stefan Aquarone  
Cllr Roy Brame  
Cllr Emma Corlett  
Cllr Phillip Duigan  
Cllr Ron Hanton

Cllr Joe Mooney  
Cllr Judy Oliver  
Cllr Dan Roper  
Cllr Hayden Thirtle

### Substitute Members present:

Cllr Rhodri Oliver for Cllr Richard Price  
Cllr Mike Smith-Clare for Cllr Chris Jones

### Parent Governor Representative

Mr Giles Hankinson

### Also present (who took a part in the meeting):

John Fisher	Cabinet member for Children's Services
Fiona McDiarmid	Executive Director Strategy and Governance
Sara Tough	Executive Director of Children's Services
Phil Watson	Director of Children's Social Care
Chris Snudden	Director of Learning and Inclusion, Children's Services
Tim Eyres	Assistant Director Commissioning and Partnership
Sarah Jones	Director of Commissioning, Partnerships and Resources, Children's Services
James Wilson	Director of Quality and Transformation, Children's Services
Lauren Downes	Head of Youth, Children's Services
Andrew Stewart	Director Insight and Analytics
Dr Louise Smith	Director of Public Health
Helen Edwards	Director of Governance
Martin Hinchliffe	Digital Skills Consultant Strategy and Governance Department
Karen Haywood	Democratic Support and Scrutiny Manager
Tim Shaw	Committee Officer

### 1. Chair's Opening Remarks

- 1.1 In his introductory remarks the Chair said that this meeting was adjourned from 23 June 2020 due to technical difficulties with the public broadcasting of the meeting and would start with the first item on the agenda.

**1.2 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies were received Cllr Chris Jones (Cllr Mike Smith-Clare substituting), Cllr Richard Price (Cllr Rhodri Oliver substituting), Ms Helen Bates (Church Representative) and Mr Paul Dunning (Church Representative).

**2 Minutes**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meetings held on 27 May 2020 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair subject to the following words being added at the end of the fifth bullet point on page 7 “and particularly given the difference between a flu pandemic and a Covid-19 virus.”

**3. Declarations of Interest**

- 3.1 Cllr Emma Corlett declared an “Other Interest” for item 8 because she was a care provider for a looked after child.

**4 Urgent Business**

- 4.1 No urgent business was discussed

**5. Public Question Time**

- 5.1 There was one public question with a supplementary question from Family Lives. The public question(s) together with the answer provided by the Executive Director of Children’s Services can be found on the committee pages website.

**6. Local Member Issues/Questions**

- 6.1 No local Member questions were received.

**7. Call In**

- 7.1 The Committee noted that there were no call-in items.

**8. Children’s Services Covid-19 Response**

- 8.1 In his introductory remarks the Chair introduced the Executive Director of Children’s Services and those members of the Children’s Services Senior Management Team who would be introducing the report and providing detailed presentations to the Committee about the Children’s Services response to Covid-19.

- 8.2 The PowerPoint presentations (which can be found on the committee pages website) explained the key challenges faced by Children’s Services which included ensuring immediate safety, maintaining critical service provision, system leadership in particular in relation to education, safeguarding and community support, keeping eyes and ears on children, managing a complex market, supporting staff teams, communication at an unprecedented scale and planning for the less obvious and longer term impacts on children and families.

- 8.3 The presentations covered the following areas of Children's Services activity:
- Education, Schools, Settings and Colleges
  - Special Educational Needs and Children with Disabilities
  - Children's Social Care
  - Community / Tier 2 Support
  - Commissioning, Resources and Funding (note: there was insufficient time in the meeting to consider this in any detail)
- 8.4 The issues that were discussed included the following:
- The Executive Director said that in response to the pandemic the existing safeguarding and strategic partnership arrangements for Children's Services were joined together to provide a new system wide partnership approach for core areas of business activity which focused on immediate child protection and workstream issues.
  - From the start of the pandemic, 90% of Children's Services staff were available to keep key public services open and two thirds of the staff who provided face to face visits for vulnerable children were available to continue to do this line of work. From the second week of July Children's Services are aiming to return to a normal service in relation to visits for vulnerable children.
  - The approach to the pandemic that was taken by Children's Services compared favourably with the approach taken elsewhere in the country. In many ways Norfolk had taken a national lead in the way that it had responded to the pandemic. Norfolk's forward-thinking approach was reflected in many aspects of the guidance issued by the Government. Norfolk had not had to apply many of the Government regulations aimed at introducing a reduced service during the pandemic.
  - In reply to questions, it was pointed out that Children's Services had continued to undertake home visits throughout the pandemic for children deemed to be the most vulnerable and at the greatest risk. Children's Services had updated its risk assessments and had increased the use of its extended family network contacts and kept social care cases open longer than would normally be necessary. Case numbers were now at an acceptable level and staff were able to take on extra work as it came in.
  - Alongside new publicity campaigns aimed at providing Covid-19 specific guidance and advice, and an extended front door offer, Children's Services had introduced a new seven days a week text messaging service and had increased the hours of its out of hours duty team.
  - The senior management response had provided staff with more opportunities for flexible 24/7 working. By making increased use of extended family and neighbour contacts Children's Services had increased service resilience and had been better able to deal with any child care crises that emerge outside of office hours.
  - The Committee heard that the pandemic had resulted in a reduction in the number of referrals. This had given staff an opportunity to reduce case load levels to a level planned before the start of the pandemic. It had also provided an opportunity to undertake the improvements in the quality of referral work that had been planned before the pandemic. The completion of social worker assessments was now above regional and national averages. There was also a reduction in the number of children in care who went missing.

- It was, however, pointed out that the work coming into the social care team was below 50% of normal levels as the department had reported leading up to the Easter bank holiday on BBC radio Norfolk.
- In reply to other questions, it was pointed out that with the registration of births being suspended Children's Services had received information on this issue from NHS colleagues and shared data with its partner organisations.
- Councillor Dan Roper asked for information to be made available (at a future meeting and to him at the end of this meeting) that defined the highest category of risk cases, gave numbers of such cases and explained the steps that were being taken to prevent the second highest category of social work cases from becoming the most important cases as a result of the pandemic.
- Councillors raised concerns about whether the case load of social workers was being distorted by cases being kept in the social care system longer than was necessary and if, as a direct consequence of the pandemic, less resources were being put into quality assurance than was entirely necessary at this time. In reply, officers said that senior management had taken a decision as part of the response to ensure resources were maintained in quality assurance and to undertake more into quality assurance work. This work has continued.
- Officers explained the new counter measures and joint working arrangements that had been put in place to prevent child exploitation including the appointment of the specialist missing persons teams and the appointment of a national expert in this field.
- Councillors raised concerns about the impact of court delays on vulnerable children. This was an issue for a future meeting.
- In reply officers said that in some ways it was now easier to present evidence at virtual meetings and to get people to give evidence, however, the courts continued to struggle with the high number of cases. A detached youth work team were working on issues to do with criminal exploitation and was involved in work on communication campaigns and work about the risk of on-line exploitation.
- In adding to earlier comments, it was pointed out that Children's Services planned to build on support provided by the voluntary sector.
- Councillors said that while they were pleased to hear that the relationship with the DFE on emergency planning issues had improved they remained concerned that work to identify any potential gaps in emergency plans should continue as a matter of urgency. Officers said that Children's Services had acted as a critical conduit for education leaders to DFE to problem solve and where possible influence policy.
- In reply to further questions it was pointed out that while it had not been possible to compel children who had a social worker to attend school, systems to track these children had been improved. Children's Services had surveyed schools on their approach to support for children who were not at school. There was an expectation that all children would return to school from September and the logistics were still to be worked out including the use of fines for non school attendance.
- Children's Services had taken steps to ensure a consistent response from schools, checking staffing capacity needs, helping with risk assessments, talking to unions, arranging supply of PPE, making sure transport arrangements were in place, providing support for definitions of critical workers.
- Children's Services had put in place a daily Inclusion helpline, provided



STEPS (behaviour support) to parents and continued to process EHCP referrals.

- Councillors queried if there was a continued weekly improvement in school attendance. Officers said that of the previous week, 42% of eligible children in the reception year had attended school. Approximately 37% of Year 1 children and approximately 65 % of Year 10 pupils had attended school. Detailed figures on attendances would be made available at a future meeting.
- In reply to further questions it was pointed out that schools were to be surveyed very shortly on their approach to remote learning. Key players in Norfolk had been involved in the development of the Oak Academy which allowed schools to make use of on-line lessons.
- Children's Services had supported schools with the roll out of the national food voucher scheme. Approximately 75% of schools had taken up the national scheme and 25% of schools had made use of their own scheme.
- It was pointed out that in Thetford there were strong local arrangements between the local primary school and the local Academy. Children's Services supported the transition arrangements that they had put in place.
- Councillors questioned what success looked like in relation to the roll out of laptops. In reply, officers said that it was not possible to broaden the national definition of who laptops could be made available.
- Many of our LAC children had access to a laptop through pupil premium funding. Some children on plans had received one from their school. 2,300 were originally identified in need of a laptop by social workers. We received 1800 from the DFE. However only 60-70 % of this 2,300 need a laptop of which we have distributed 700 at this stage.
- In response Councillors suggested that an analysis was required of how much difference the provision of a laptop made to the education of children. The analysis should identify who needed the laptops most (including any connection problems) and that this information should be made available at a future meeting. This Friday would be the first request to schools for details regarding this matter.
- In answer to further questions, officers said that It was not the role of Children's Services to coordinate the setting up summer school catch up provision over the summer holidays.
- Children's Services had continued with post 16 work to ensure there was not an increase in NEET and to ensure that post 16 pathways remained in place during these difficult times. The key concerns for this age group were around jobs and about work experience and apprenticeship opportunities.
- Councillors were particularly concerned about those families with a disabled child who had not had a break during the pandemic and urgently needed additional support. In reply, officers said that where families were in crisis, Children's Services had put in place additional outreach work which included additional in house respite care and the restarting of face to face community support (similar to that provided in normal times) , however, at a time of a pandemic this level of support was very difficult to put in place. The response of Children's Services and of schools had focused on the creative use of personal budgets. All the SEN schools in the county but for one had remained open throughout the pandemic.
- In reply to detailed questions about which cohorts of pupils were most impacted by the pandemic, officers said they were most concerned about those in key stage 3, and those with SEN needs, where any loss of

education had a significant impact and where pupils had lost skills that could not be easily regained. There was also concern about the cohort of young carers and those children who needed support from an emotional care prospective.

- There were no known noticeable differences in school attendances in different parts of the county.
- In answer to a further question officers said that if there was just one thing that could be done differently it would be for the Government to give Children's Services more local discretion.

## 8.5 **RESOLVED**

**That the Committee:**

- **Note the report and place on record thanks to the officers from Children's Services on their helpful presentations and to all Childrens Services staff on their hard work in providing the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic.**
- **Forward the minutes of today's meeting for consideration at the first meeting of the Sub-Group of this Committee tasked with considering Childrens Services matters.**
- **Ask the Sub-Group to consider those aspects of the PowerPoint presentations that there was insufficient time to consider in any detail at today's meeting.**

## 9 **COVID 19 – Update on emerging issues**

9.1 The Committee received an update from the Director of Public Health and the Director, Insight and Analytics about emerging issues from COVID 19. The details contained in the update could be viewed on line by following the link that was provided on the front of the agenda.

9.2 During discussion it was pointed out that there were less than five cases a day of Covid-19 in Norfolk, excess deaths in King' s Lynn and West Norfolk were largely due to the age profile of the population and social deprivation in that area, and that it was difficult to provide information on numbers of those discharged from hospital to care homes.

## 9.3 **RESOLVED**

**That the Committee place on record thanks to the Director of Public Health and the Director, Insight and Analytics for the update about emerging issues from COVID 19.**

## 10 **The Children's Services agenda for Scrutiny**

### 10.1 **RESOLVED**

**That the Committee:**

- **Agree the framework for Scrutiny of the Children's agenda by the Children's Services Scrutiny Sub Committee is organised under five**

**strategic themes of the Children's Transformation programme, namely:**

- **Inclusion**
- **Prevention and early intervention**
- **Effective Practice**
- **Edge of Care and Alternatives to Care**
- **Re-shaping the Care Market and creating the capacity we need.**

**11 Children's Services Scrutiny Sub Committee**

**11.1 RESOLVED**

**That the Committee:**

- **Note the establishment of a sub group of this Committee to consider Children's Services matters.**
- **Ask the Chair and Vice Chair to agree terms of reference for the sub group and agree wider membership.**
- **Ask the Chair and Vice Chair to consider developing a draft work programme for the sub group based on outcomes from the earlier Children's Services scrutiny and reports considered elsewhere on this agenda.**

**12. Covid-19 - Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme**

12.1 The Committee received a draft of the forward work programme.

**12.2 RESOLVED**

**That the Committee agree its forward work programme as set out in a report by the Executive Director of Strategy and Governance.**

The meeting concluded at 13:30

**Chair**

## Report to Scrutiny Committee

<b>Report title:</b>	<b>COVID 19 – Support for shielded and vulnerable people in communities</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Bill Borrett – Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Executive Director of Strategy and Governance</b>
<b>Is this a key decision?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<p><b>Actions required</b></p> <p>The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the attached reports and presentations in the meeting.</li> <li>whether there are any issues for further scrutiny at future meeting, focusing on lessons learnt that could be fed into any current emergency planning and issues for longer term recovery planning.</li> </ul>	

### 1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. At the Scrutiny Committee held on 27 May 2020 Members considered a forward programme of scrutiny regarding the County Council's response to COVID 19. Members were asked to highlight areas for consideration focusing on lessons learnt that could be fed into any current emergency planning and issues for longer term recovery planning. Following the meeting the Chair and Vice Chair, in consultation with the Liberal Democrat Group Spokesperson, met to consider the issues raised in the meeting and agree a programme of scrutiny.
- 1.2. Scrutiny Committee have acknowledged that we are still in the middle of the COVID 19 crisis and therefore scrutiny for the next few meetings will be prioritised on emergency planning within the Council in response to the crisis focusing on:
  - Supporting children, young people and families during the crisis (Meeting on 23 June 2020)
  - Support for shielded and vulnerable people in our communities (Meeting on 22 July 2020)
  - Norfolk County Council internal processes – support for Members, democratic processes, communications, ICT (Meeting on 19 August 2020)

### 2. Proposals

- 2.1. The focus for Scrutiny Committee today will be on support for those shielded and vulnerable people in our communities. Considering the wide-ranging areas that fall within the remit of this scrutiny the Chair and Vice Chair have agreed to focus on the following areas:
- Shielded and vulnerable – including Care homes
  - PPE
  - Norfolk's Local Outbreak Control Plan
- 2.2. The attached reports provide further detail for the Committee on each of these areas. As the current situation is still constantly changing Officers will also provide presentations outlining the most up to date information.
- 2.3. It is suggested that the Committee considers the attached reports and presentations and focuses on the following areas of questioning:
- What are the current issues being faced?
  - What are the lessons that have been learnt so far?
  - How robust were our emergency plans and internal business continuity?
  - How can we use these lessons to support and contribute to future planning?

### **3. Resource Implications**

#### **3.1. Staff:**

The County Council is still in the middle of this crisis and the main focus for Officers will be in dealing with the crisis. Some Officers may be redeployed from their current roles elsewhere to support ongoing work during the pandemic and the Committee may need to be mindful of focusing requests on essential information at this time.

#### **3.2. Property:**

None

#### **3.3. IT:**

None

### **4. Other Implications**

#### **4.1. Legal Implications:**

The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 ("the Regulations") sets out the framework for Councils to hold Council meetings remotely.

#### **4.2. Human Rights implications**

None

#### **4.3. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included)**

None

#### **4.4. Health and Safety implications (where appropriate)**

None

#### **4.5. Sustainability implications (where appropriate)**

None

#### **4.6. Any other implications**

None

### **5. Risk Implications/Assessment**

5.1. None

## **6. Select Committee comments**

6.1. Select Committees will meet again in the week beginning 13 July 2020 and will be receiving updates on COVID 19, addressing the response from their own service areas. The Scrutiny Committee should take into consideration any work being undertaken by the Select Committees in deciding any areas for future scrutiny.

## **7. Recommendation**

7.1. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider:

- the attached reports and presentations in the meeting.
- whether there are any issues for further scrutiny at future meeting, focusing on lessons learnt that could be fed into any current emergency planning and issues for longer term recovery planning.

## **8. Background Papers**

8.1. [Scrutiny Committee meeting : 27 May 2020](#)

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Karen Haywood

**Tel No:** 01603 228913

**Email address:** [Karen.haywood@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:Karen.haywood@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



## Scrutiny Committee Item 8a

<b>Decision making report title:</b>	<b>Covid-19 Response: Supporting Vulnerable Adults in Norfolk</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>James Bullion, Executive Director for Adult Social Services</b>
<p><b>Executive Summary</b></p> <p>Since the start of the Covid-19 emergency in March 2020, health, social care and community partners have been working together to minimise the spread of the virus, to effectively support people affected by the pandemic and to maintain essential services. The report provides a summary of the response to the pandemic which has sought to protect people, protect the NHS and support care homes.</p> <p>A presentation will be delivered to Committee giving an overview of the activity against these headings in response to the pandemic.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To have oversight of and comment on the response to support vulnerable adults in Norfolk during the Covid-19 pandemic.</li> </ol>	

### 1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. Since the start of the Covid-19 emergency in March 2020, health, social care and community partners have been working together to minimise the spread of the virus, to effectively support people affected by the pandemic and maintain essential services.
- 1.2. The information in this report has predominantly been led by Adult Social Care (with some exceptions) and activity can be summarised under three key headings:
  - a) **Protect people** – mitigating the impact of the pandemic on service users, the vulnerable and shielded.
  - b) **Protect the NHS** – creating capacity in the NHS to enable them to respond to increasing demand resulting from the pandemic.
  - c) **Support Care Homes** – keeping care homes safe during the pandemic.



- 1.3. The report below provides a high-level overview of the key themes and approaches, but a presentation will be given at Committee providing greater detail and the opportunity for a dialogue.

## **2. Protect People**

### **Social Care**

- 2.1. Activity has focused on reaching all those who are supported to risk assess their situations and ensure they are coping. This has included:
- a) Risk assessing around 8000 people to ensure contingency plans were in place
  - b) Calling all individuals with learning disabilities whose usual activities had been stopped because of social distancing to offer support and check on welfare. (This support continues)
  - c) Commissioning urgent respite to prevent carer breakdown for people with learning disabilities
  - d) Moving to 7-day a week working to ensure continuity
  - e) Calling around 2100 people with direct payments

### **Safeguarding**

- 2.2. Social distancing measures have resulted in fewer face-to-face contacts, and during the pandemic a 25% reduction in safeguarding concerns and 18% reduction in safeguarding enquires has been seen in comparison with March and April 2019. This is coupled with a national concern around the increase of domestic violence and scamming.
- 2.3. Early in the pandemic arrangements were established to mitigate the impact, with activity including:
- a) Working with the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board (NSAB) to share key messages with partner agencies asking for increased vigilance and for staff to raise concerns
  - b) Working with NSAB to launch a publicity campaign to draw public attention to signs of abuse and encourage reporting. NSAB collated information on known scams and shared with partners
  - c) £200k emergency spend for domestic violence services
  - d) Use of video-conferencing, telephone, creative solutions such as speaking through windows at a distance, 'virtual unannounced visits'
  - e) Close liaison with Quality Assurance team who continued to carry out some visits to care providers
  - f) Guidance document developed to address issue of people not social distancing, with partner agencies and NSAB

## **Accommodation and support for those with complex needs**

- 2.4. Responding to the Government directive to house everybody living on the streets, a Norfolk wide approach to provision of temporary housing and supported accommodation has been established with emergency or temporary accommodation provided to 465 homeless individuals.
- 2.5. Joint working between the districts, Registered Provider sector, Adult Social Care and Public Health has ensured more effective approaches to providing accommodation and support to those with complex needs, so improving their outcomes, and reducing costs to the wider system.

## **Delivering essential support and supplies to those most in need**

- 2.6. Over 41,000 shielded individuals have been proactively contacted and of those who needed support, deliveries have been arranged to ensure shielded and vulnerable people can access the food, medicines and support that they need. This has been delivered through the Local Resilience Forum, working with a joined-up network from a range of partners, including the district councils, the voluntary and community sector and the volunteer network.
- 2.7. The scheme will formally come to an end at the end of July with associated state funded support packages finishing.
- 2.8. Whilst the risk to extremely vulnerable individuals is considered to have reduced, many people will still be anxious and concerned about their personal circumstances and clinical conditions. Work continues with partners to ensure best use of the infrastructure and mechanisms put in place through the emergency phase and to leverage the potential for ongoing support for residents. This support will be important during the transition “normalise” phase to help people regain their independence but will also be critical through the Test and Trace process and any second wave activity.

## **3. Protect the NHS**

### **Redesigning hospital discharge**

- 3.1. Social work and occupational health teams, with health partners, fundamentally redesigned hospital discharge processes. Based on the [Home First principle](#), this has helped to ensure there is capacity in all three hospitals and that people do not stay longer than is absolutely necessary.

### **Securing additional capacity**

- 3.2. In response to modelling information, and to help support flow of people out of acute hospitals, commissioners have secured:
  - a) Additional capacity in care homes and in the community – 95 block beds and an additional 550 hours a week enhanced home care
  - b) A new step-down facility established at Cawston Lodge - a former care home (requiring buildings and facilities management, the sourcing of

equipment, recruitment and re-deployment of staff and appropriate social work leadership and oversight)

c) A community response team established 7-days a week

3.3. The effectiveness of the capacity secured in response to Covid-19 is under continuous review to ensure it represents good value for money.

3.4. Work is now underway to support the modelling work in response to any second wave and usual winter pressures. Commissioning will continue to work with the market to secure capacity needed, whether this is bed or community based.

## **4. Support Care Homes**

### **Care Home Support Plan**

4.1. Substantial multi-agency support has been wrapped around care homes, with an immediate response to the Covid-19 pandemic seeing a new joint service between Norfolk County Council and Norfolk and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group developed to support care homes and control and prevent outbreaks.

4.2. On the 14 May the Government asked all local authorities to review or put in place a care home support plan, drawing on local resilience and business continuity plan.

4.3. The Government identified a number of key action areas to be covered through the Plan:

- a) Governance and oversight
- b) Infection control
- c) Testing
- d) Personal protection and clinical equipment
- e) Workforce support
- f) Clinical support
- g) Financial support

4.4. The Norfolk plan (which is available on the NCC website [here](#)) provides a clear and purposeful programme of actions, bringing together both the extensive response already in place, alongside further action to strengthen the response for the future.

4.5. The support plan is part of the £600m national fund committed to supporting care homes. In Norfolk, the allocation of this funding is £12.39m based on 9650 beds covering all specialisms and respite beds<sup>1</sup>. Due to be paid within two instalments, 75% of the first instalment reached Care Homes within 10 days of us receiving the funding.

4.6. Activity to support care homes in Norfolk has included:

---

<sup>1</sup> This included an area cost adjustment that reflected differing wages and prices and each local authority area.

- a) Multi-disciplinary outbreak team established with quality monitoring officer, infection control nurses and public health consultants to respond to outbreaks, and prevent further outbreaks
- b) 2 million+ pieces of PPE delivered to providers and guidance given on how to use them
- c) Working with the care market to make sure that providers<sup>2</sup> have continuity of income. For those continuing to deliver care a premium payment of 6% over the first 12 weeks of the pandemic was paid upfront on the 21<sup>st</sup> April to help sustain providers with the additional costs of continuing to operate at this time. On the 1st July, a further 6% payment was made to cover the next 4 weeks. The total for all payments made amounted to £3.3m
- d) In addition to our 6% payment, where providers have needed more financial support, we have encouraged them to complete a financial support template so we can assess the additional level of support required
- e) Currently undertaking a proactive approach to identify challenges within the care market, including provider stability and issues
- f) Advised care homes on making admissions from acute hospitals by thinking safely about how to accommodate people who needed to be isolated
- g) Conducted virtual Quality Monitoring Reviews of care services Action Plans and Quality Monitoring Officers supporting providers with regular conversations
- h) Established early on a dedicated and single point of contact 'Provider Hub' for providers to raise questions, issues and concerns
- i) Made regular and proactive phone calls with residential and domiciliary care providers to pick up and anticipate issues and challenges
- j) Joint (NCC & CCG) regular communications to residential, nursing and domiciliary providers keeping them updated of the steps Norfolk are taking to support them

## **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1. Adult Social Services has incurred significant financial implications from the pandemic. These were set out in the papers to Cabinet in May, June and July, predominately as part of the Covid-19 Financial Implications for Norfolk County Council reports. As reported to Cabinet in July, the service is expected to incur additional cost pressures of £36m against an adult's Covid-19 grant share of £26m, which is leading to a projected overspend for the service in 2020-21 of £9.983m.

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note our financial support offer extended to the wider ASC care market but these quoted amounts relate specifically to care homes.

In addition, due to the pace of the response required, some of the specific Cabinet decisions were taken as Cabinet member decisions and reported subsequently. The following summarises financial decisions related to the Covid-19 response that have been taken since the start of the pandemic:

- a) Covid-19 Impact on MIG and PIP charging increases – Cabinet Member decision and reported to May Cabinet
- b) Covid-19 Additional financial support for Adult Social Care providers – Cabinet Member decision and reported to May Cabinet
- c) Approval of the Phase 2 package of financial support to Adult Social Care providers – June Cabinet decision
- d) Covid-19 impact on MIG and PIP charging increases – Cabinet Member decision and reported to July Cabinet
- e) Care Home support plan – Cabinet Member decision and reported to July Cabinet

- 5.2. The use of the infection control fund has been agreed as a Cabinet Member decision but will be reported to August Cabinet.

New funding arrangements have also been in place as part of the Hospital Discharge Service Requirements, which were introduced in March. This has meant that care packages arising from hospital discharge and admission avoidance, including contracts that would have previously been health related or privately self-funded, are incurred by the County Council but recoverable from the NHS. The reclaim up to the end of May totalled £2.141m as reported to July Cabinet.

## **6. Resource Implications**

- 6.1. **Staff:** There are no current direct implications arising from this report. Across the Council, new working practices and policies have been adopted. Significant numbers of staff have been fully or partially redeployed to other or new activities to meet the needs across NCC.

- 6.2. **Property:** None

- 6.3. **IT:** None

## **7. Other Implications**

- 7.1. **Legal Implications:** None

- 7.2. **Human Rights implications:** None

- 7.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included):** Covid-19 has impacted on every individual and family across Norfolk, particularly on people with protected characteristics. New evidence is emerging daily about the nature and extent of this impact. In view of this, the Council is maintaining a [dynamic equality impact assessment](#).

- 7.4. This impact assessment is being used to inform decision-making during the Covid-19 crisis. It is being continually updated to inform business continuity planning. Mitigating actions are being developed wherever necessary and these are summarised in the assessment.
- 7.5. **Health and Safety implications:** We continue to put in place full and up to date advice and risk mitigation responses for all our staff in light of the pandemic. A robust process is in place to assess and consider the risks of all face to face activities before they are introduced.
- 7.6. **Any other implications:** None identified.

## **8. Risk Implications/Assessment**

8.1. **N/A**

## **9. Select Committee comments**

9.1. **N/A**

## **10. Recommendations**

- 10.1. 1. To have oversight of and comment on the response from Adult Social Services to the Covid 19 pandemic.

## **11. Background Papers**

11.1. Reports considered by Cabinet 11 May 2020 – titled [‘NCC Response to COVID-19’](#) and [‘COVID-19 financial implications for Norfolk County Council’](#)

Reports considered by Cabinet 8 June 2020 – titled [‘COVID-19 financial implications for Norfolk County Council’](#)

Reports considered by Cabinet 8 June 2020 – titled [‘COVID-19 financial implications for Norfolk County Council’](#)

## **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Hannah Shah

**Tel No.:** 01603 223165

**Email address:** [Hannah.shah@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:Hannah.shah@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help

## Scrutiny Committee    Item 8b

<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Personal protective equipment for the Covid-19 pandemic</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance)</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Al Collier (Director of Procurement)</b>
<p><b>Executive Summary</b></p> <p>The council has been successful in procuring personal protective equipment (PPE) for use by its staff and education, health and care providers, on its own behalf and on behalf of the Norfolk Resilience Forum, of which it is a member. PPE is now commercially available, but the council will make it available on a chargeable basis to any education, health and care provider that requires it in the coming months. The council will maintain a stockpile of PPE that it can make available in the autumn/winter if necessary, and will take a view in the New Year as to whether a longer-term stockpile is required.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>1. To note the information provided in this report on the provision of Personal Protective Equipment</b></p>	

### **1. Background and Purpose**

- 1.1. It is essential that PPE be available to council staff and to education, health and care providers to protect staff and to minimise transmission of Covid-19.
- 1.2. The council has procured PPE – notably eye protection, masks, gloves, aprons and hand sanitiser - on a large scale. The PPE has been used, amongst other purposes:
  - for council staff, including in particular the staff of Norfolk First Support and the Fire and Rescue Service;
  - to supplement the PPE issued by HM government to the Norfolk Resilience Forum for emergency distribution to health and care providers;
  - to support the opening of schools to additional year groups; and
  - to support early years providers.
- 1.3. There has been no real difficulty in obtaining aprons and gloves, which are used in large quantities for day-to-day purposes, but in the early stages masks, eye protection and hand sanitiser were in short supply and masks in particular became extremely expensive. User organisations have also had difficulty in confirming that masks genuinely meet the required standards.

## **2. Timelines**

- 2.1. The first confirmed UK death from coronavirus occurred on 5 March 2020. The government advised people to work from home on 16 March, and instituted 'lockdown' on 23 March.
- 2.2. Adult social services ordered a 'buffer' stock of PPE for its own purposes around 15 February. A further corporate stock was ordered on 3 March.
- 2.3. Initial difficulties were experienced with the availability of hand sanitiser in mid-March. Whilst for most purposes soap and water was (and remains) the best option for hand cleansing, hand sanitiser is important for staff who are visiting people in their own homes. The UEA was asked on 18 March to produce sanitiser in accordance with the WHO formulation, and other local sources (such as distilleries) were also asked to go into production. This largely alleviated the sanitiser problem by the early April.
- 2.4. Similarly, local suppliers were quickly able to provide visors.
- 2.5. On 20 March, the council agreed to join an ESPO joint procurement for face masks, ordering 50,000 masks.
- 2.6. In response to continuing supply chain uncertainty, the council commenced discussions (in collaboration with Essex County Council) to source masks directly from China. Following negotiations and due diligence, the first order for one million masks was placed on 10 April.
- 2.7. The council developed relationships with a number of UK-based importers to provide parallel sources of masks. As a result, substantial quantities of masks were received from around 20 April and these, combined with the import of two million masks directly from China and with sporadic supplies from the government, has enabled masks to be provided to both the council and the NRF since that date.
- 2.8. A local apron supply chain was developed which has resulted in our being able to build up a suitable stockpile.

## **3. Lessons learned**

- 3.1. There will need to be a review of whether the council should retain a longer-term stockpile of PPE once the current pandemic is over. This will depend in large part on whether government puts in place robust national arrangements.
- 3.2. Our relative success in PPE sourcing has been achieved through the establishment at a relatively early stage of a dedicated procurement team, led at a senior level and with considerable delegated authority. The ability to move quickly to do deals was particularly important at the earlier stages, when PPE was in high demand and authorities unable to make quick decisions lost out.
- 3.3. For the Chinese sourcing, the following were of particular importance
  - teaming up with Essex County Council, combining their knowledge of trading in China and in-country presence with our procurement expertise;
  - identifying and building an early relationship with an experienced and helpful freight forwarder;



- the willingness of the relevant chief officers and cabinet members to take calculated commercial and financial and risks, including payments in advance;
- delegated authority to the Director of Procurement to take commercial decisions quickly;
- rapid development of expertise in specifications and in reviewing certificates of conformity.

3.4. Preparedness for emergency Far East procurement in future might include:

- training a number of staff in import-export procedures and increasing the pool of staff with knowledge of Incoterms;
- having a pre-prepared short-form standard contract tailored to the Chinese market;
- having a pre-prepared freight-forwarding contract.

3.5. For sourcing from UK middlemen, the following were of particular importance:

- cultivating individual relations with salespeople in a small number of companies and gaining preferred customer status through a reputation for fast decision making and the ability to pay promptly (including through Faster Payments).

3.6. Local sourcing was of particular importance for fairly generic products – in particular sanitiser (which can be made from commonplace ingredients according to a standard WHO recipe) and aprons (which can be made by repurposing production lines making other plastic film products). For sanitiser in particular, pro-active approaches were effective – in particular in the early days the approach to the UEA. Expertise from colleagues with regulatory experience was of particular value in dealing with product certification and (for distilleries making ethanol to go into hand sanitiser) achieving exemption from excise duty.

3.7. For all forms of sourcing, good knowledge of specifications and relevant European standards had to be developed. This is something that could be incorporated into resilience plans for ease of reference. We have also learned that, for products that staff already use in their day to day work (such as aprons) it is valuable to understand the current specification. That specification may not be essential, or obtainable, but it is helpful to understand the baseline that staff are used to.

3.8. Demand for information about PPE was relentless. It would be worthwhile establishing a pre-prepared IT system to enable orders and stocks to be tracked more easily.

## **4. Preparedness for a further outbreak**

4.1. The PPE warehousing operation and supply chain remain extant and we hold substantial stocks. If necessary, additional supplies will be bought over the summer to maintain stock levels.

## **5. Recommendations**

5.1. **1. To note the information provided in this report on the provision of Personal Protective Equipment**

## **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Al Collier

**Tel No.:** 01603 223372

**Email address:** [al.collier@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:al.collier@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

<b>Decision making report title:</b>	<b>Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Cllr Andrew Proctor (Leader of the Council)</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Dr Louise Smith (Director of Public Health) Tom McCabe (Head of Paid Service, NCC and Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)</b>
<p><b>Executive Summary</b></p> <p>The Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk sets out our how we are preparing for people, businesses and communities to go about their normal daily lives as safely as possible whilst the Covid-19 pandemic remains.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>1. To receive information on the Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk</b></p>	

## **1. Background and Purpose**

- 1.1. The Government has instructed all councils to have a Local Outbreak Control Plan for their area to support the national NHS Test and Trace programme.

## **2. An Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk**

- 2.1. The Local Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk sets out our how we are preparing for people, businesses and communities to go about their normal daily lives as safely as possible whilst the COVID-19 pandemic remains.
- 2.2. It will set out how we will work with partners to prevent local outbreaks and how we will use real-time data from NHS Test and Trace with local intelligence to identify any emerging outbreaks in specific work places, settings, and communities and manage them to limit further transmission.
- 2.3. An outbreak is generally defined as two or more cases connected in time to a specific place (not a household) for example, in a care home, school or factory.

- 2.4. It also reinforces the actions everyone can take to stay safe, including handwashing, social distancing, and self-isolating, and how we will support people in the event of them testing positive.
- 2.5. The three key phases are: prevent, engage, contain.
- 2.6. The plan brings together Norfolk County Council, all the seven district Councils, the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group, emergency services and Public Health England. Our strong partnerships in Norfolk will be vital to the plan's success.
- 2.7. Six key delivery groups will focus on specific areas. The delivery groups are:
- a) care providers
  - b) education settings
  - c) health settings and emergency services
  - d) high risk public sector
  - e) business and public venues
  - f) vulnerable people isolating.
- 2.8. The Local Outbreak Plan is available on the Norfolk County Council website ([www.norfolk.gov.uk/controlplan](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/controlplan)).

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1. Norfolk County Council have been allocated £3.7 million of the £300 million Local Authority Test and Trace Service Support Grant available nationally for local authorities to support the additional public health capacity required to develop and implement our plans and run the scheme in Norfolk.

### **4. Resource Implications**

- 4.1. **Staff:** The implementation of the plan requires the setting up of an outbreak control centre in two phases. The initial phase will deploy existing roles within the organisation to key tasks, the second phase will recruit to new positions.
- 4.2. **Property:** None
- 4.3. **IT:** Information and activity will be recorded securely on an IM system to be commissioned which will provide a full audit trail and will align with agencies' GDPR responsibilities.

### **5. Other Implications**

#### **5.1. Legal Implications**

The legal context for managing outbreaks of communicable disease which present a risk to the health of the public requiring urgent investigation and management sits:

- With Public Health England and Directors of Public Health under the Health and Social Care Act 2012

- With Chief Environmental Health Officers under the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984
- With NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups to collaborate with Directors of Public Health and Public Health England to take local action (e.g. testing and tracing) to assist with the management of outbreaks under the Health and Social Care Act 2012
- With other responders' specific responsibilities to respond to major incidents as part of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004
- In the context of COVID-19, the Coronavirus Act 2020 extends enforcement powers, allowing named designated Public Health Officers within Public Health England to take enforcement action against individuals as a last resort in protecting public safety.

This underpinning context gives Local Authorities (Public Health and Environmental Health) and Public Health England the primary responsibility for the delivery and management of public health actions to be taken in relation to outbreaks of communicable disease.

The Director of Public Health has, and retains, primary responsibility for the co-ordination of the Health Protection System at local level in England. These arrangements are detailed in the 2013 guidance *Health Protection in Local Government*.

The new lockdown order in Leicester has been implemented with new legislation in the form of a new Statutory Instrument: The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions Leicester) Regulations 2020.

## 5.2. **Human Rights implications**

None identified.

## 5.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included)**

The Equality Impact Assessment is to be completed and subject to further work with review by the Health Protection Board.

## 5.4. **Any other implications**

# 6. **Risk Implications/Assessment**

## 6.1. In developing the plan, locally and nationally, the following risks have been identified:

- a) Significant uncertainties about future disease activity with the potential for an overwhelming increase in the autumn/winter period
- b) Risk to the delivery of aspects of the plan for outbreak control management due to lack of clarity on legislative powers and updated guidance for local authorities
- c) Risk that outbreak information, participation in NHS Test and Trace and testing data may not be provided in a timely manner to implement an effective local response

- d) There is a group who cannot self-test for whom access to testing is difficult
- e) A risk that not all people in Norfolk may be able to access testing if demand rises in the autumn or any other time
- f) Local systems cannot at this stage direct national testing mobile units to focus on areas of concern or response to a local outbreak
- g) Public Health England capacity to deliver the current level of their role to identify all outbreaks and do all the initial assessments, especially if the number of outbreaks rise
- h) Ambiguity with shared and joint responsibilities especially for outbreak response and contact tracing with NHS Test and Trace and Public Health England
- i) Lack of the required skills and capacity in the local system, to undertake the complex/specialist contact tracing and surveillance work required, leading to a less effective local outbreak control operation.

## **7. Recommendations**

- 7.1. **1. To receive information on the Outbreak Control Plan for Norfolk**

## **8. Background Papers**

- 8.1. **N/A**

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Hannah Shah

**Tel No.:** 01603 223165

**Email address:** [Hannah.shah@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:Hannah.shah@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Scrutiny Committee Item 9

<b>Decision making report title:</b>	<b>Briefing on COVID-19 and Strategic and Financial Planning</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance)</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Simon George, Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services</b>
<p><b>Executive Summary</b></p> <p>The Chair has invited the Cabinet Member for Finance, and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to this meeting to provide Scrutiny Committee with a briefing on the Council's current and future financial position. This will ensure that the Committee better understands the Council's strategic financial planning process and can undertake a more effective role in its scrutiny.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>1. To consider the County Council's current and future strategic and financial planning and to consider the next steps for future scrutiny.</b></p>	

### 1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee has proposed that the Committee should seek to understand the Council's current and future financial position, budget process, and has asked the Cabinet Member for Finance, and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to the meeting to brief the Committee.

### 2. Proposals

- 2.1. Copies of the following reports, taken to Cabinet on 8 June 2020 and 6 July 2020, are attached as background information for the Committee to consider:

[Strategic and Financial Planning 2021-22](#)

[COVID-19 financial implications for Norfolk County Council](#)

2.2. In considering the briefing by the Cabinet Member for Finance and the Executive Director for Finance and Commercial Services the Committee may wish to consider the:

- Budget Timetable
- Proposed allocation of savings targets
- Recent Government Funding Announcement

2.3. Budget Timetable from 8 June Cabinet Strategic and Financial Planning 2021-22 report

**Table 1: Budget setting timetable 2021-22**

Activity	Date
June Cabinet (to consider 2021-22 budget process and timetable, agree allocation of savings required and framework for service planning).	08/06/2020
Scrutiny Committee	23/06/2020
<i>FFR exemplifications to be published by Government / Treasury Fundamental Business Rates Review</i>	<i>Originally Spring / Summer, now delayed</i>
NCC Financial Regulations update	Summer / Autumn 2020
Budget Challenge (Corporate Board and portfolio leads to consider proposals at extended Corporate Board / Budget Challenge session)	<i>August-September*</i>
September Cabinet (to review MTFS assumptions, proposed areas for savings, and agree any revisions to 2021-22 budget gap targets)	07/09/2020
Select Committees to consider proposed areas for savings	September 2020
Scrutiny Committee	23/09/2020
October Cabinet (to consider final 2021-22 savings proposals for consultation, and overall budget position. Key decision – agree 2021-22 budget proposals for consultation)	05/10/2020
Scrutiny Committee	21/10/2020
Public consultation on 2021-22 Budget proposals	<i>22/10/2020 to December / January*</i>
Autumn Budget 2020 and Provisional Settlement (5 December Government's target date for provisional Local Government Finance Settlement)	<i>November-December*</i>
Final Settlement	<i>January 2021*</i>
February Cabinet (to recommend 2021-22 Budget and council tax to County Council).	01/02/2021
Scrutiny Committee (scrutiny of 2021-22 budget proposals, consultation and EQIA)	17/02/2021
County Council Budget Setting (to agree final 2021-22 Budget and level of council tax)	22/02/2021

*\*Dates or activities to be confirmed*



## 2.4. Proposed allocation of savings from 8 June Cabinet Strategic and Financial Planning 2021-22 report

**Table 2: Proposed allocation of savings targets 2021-22 to 2024-25**

Department	2021-22 £m	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2021-25 £m	%
Adult Social Services	<b>-17.723</b>	-4.597	-4.628	-4.628	<b>-31.576</b>	46%
Children's Services	<b>-8.782</b>	-2.223	-2.213	-2.213	<b>-15.431</b>	22%
Community and Environmental Services	<b>-8.771</b>	-2.232	-2.207	-2.207	<b>-15.417</b>	22%
Strategy and Governance Department	<b>-0.844</b>	-0.215	-0.213	-0.213	<b>-1.484</b>	2%
Finance and Commercial Services	<b>-1.753</b>	-0.439	-0.430	-0.430	<b>-3.052</b>	4%
Finance General	<b>-1.120</b>	-0.294	-0.309	-0.309	<b>-2.032</b>	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>-38.992</b>	<b>-10.000</b>	<b>-10.000</b>	<b>-10.000</b>	<b>-68.992</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 2.5. Recent Government Funding Announcement

On 2 July 2020, the Government made further announcements of a “comprehensive new funding package” for local government<sup>1</sup>, which includes the following elements:

- **Tranche 3 of the COVID grant** allocation, which will total £500m, bringing the total direct support to local government to £3.7bn (excluding separate allocations such as “track and trace” and the Infection Control Fund etc). As with the first two tranches, this grant will be un-ringfenced. The individual allocations remain to be confirmed, but the letter from the Minister for Regional Growth and Local Government, Simon Clarke MP, sets out that the Government has “created a new formula for the additional £500 million. This formula will reflect the factors which the returns have told us correlate most closely with your expenditure, and will take account of population, deprivation and the way that service costs vary across the country.” As a result, the allocations may look significantly different from those provided in the first two tranches.
- A new **scheme to help reimburse lost income**: Councils will be expected to bear the first 5% of losses compared to their budgeted income – reflecting the fact these income sources are volatile from year to year – but the Government will support those worst affected by covering 75p in every pound of losses beyond this. The Minister’s letter highlights the expectation that this new scheme of further financial support will “mean that your previous allocations can go further in meeting the expenditure pressures posed by the pandemic.” The Government will set out further details of the scope of this scheme, including the principles under which it intends to cover losses, ahead of the first process of

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/comprehensive-new-funding-package-for-councils-to-help-address-coronavirus-pressure-and-cover-lost-income-during-the-pandemic>

collecting, calculating, and compensating for relevant losses. It remains to be seen what criteria the Government specifies, and any compensation will be highly dependent on the terms of the scheme, and the level / methodology applied to assessing the 5% threshold. The Secretary of State has stated that the scheme will “flex up and down depending on the true cost to local councils that we will only learn over the course of the year.” He has acknowledged that the scheme may cost “potentially many billions of pounds.”<sup>2</sup>

- The Government has outlined **measures to address the impact on Council Tax and Business Rates**, which it considers cannot be predicted with certainty at this stage. The proposed approach is to:
  - Enable any deficits are to be repayable over a three year period rather than one.
  - To agree at the Spending Review, a “fair apportionment” of irrecoverable council tax and business rates losses, between central and local government, for 2020 to 2021.

At the time of writing this report, further details of the new package are awaited from the Government and will be needed in order to fully quantify the likely impact on the Council’s currently identified shortfall related to COVID-19’. However, clearly the new package has the potential to both mitigate the 2020-21 impact and support the 2021-22 budget setting process.

### **3. Impact of the Proposal**

3.1. Highlighted in background papers.

### **4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

4.1. Highlighted in background papers.

### **5. Financial Implications**

5.1. Highlighted in background papers.

### **6. Resource Implications**

#### **6.1. Staff:**

There are no direct implications arising from this report although there is a potential that staffing implications may arise linked to specific saving proposals developed. These will be identified as they arise later in the budget planning process.

#### **6.2. Property:**

There are no direct property implications arising from this report although existing saving plans include activities linked to property budgets and assumptions around capital receipts to be achieved. In addition, activities planned within Business Transformation will include further work to deliver property related savings.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/local-government-association-annual-conference-2020>

### 6.3. IT:

There are no direct IT implications arising from this report although existing saving plans include activities linked to IMT budgets. In addition, activities planned within Business Transformation will include further work to deliver savings through activity related to digital and IT initiatives.

## 7. Other Implications

### 7.1. Legal Implications

Highlighted in background papers.

### 7.2. Human Rights implications

No specific human rights implications have been identified.

### 7.3. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included)

Highlighted in background papers.

## 8. Risk Implications/Assessment

8.1. Highlighted in background papers.

## 9. Select Committee comments

9.1. None.

## 10. Recommendations

- 10.1 1. **To consider the County Council's current and future strategic and financial planning and to consider the next steps for future scrutiny.**

## 11. Background Papers

11.1 Cabinet agenda papers for 8 June 2020 and 6 July 2020:

[Strategic and Financial Planning 2021-22](#)

[COVID-19 financial implications for Norfolk County Council](#)

### Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Harvey Bullen

**Tel No.:** 01603 223330

**Email address:** harvey.bullen@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Report to Scrutiny Committee

<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Forward Work Plan</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Executive Director of Strategy and Governance</b>
<b>Is this a key decision?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Actions required</b>  The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and agree the draft forward work plan and any future items for scrutiny	

### 1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. At the Scrutiny Committee held on 27 May 2020 Members considered a forward programme of scrutiny regarding the County Council's response to COVID 19. Members were asked to highlight areas for consideration focusing on lessons learnt that could be fed into any current emergency planning and issues for longer term recovery planning.
- 1.2. Attached at Appendix A is the proposed programme of work for the remainder of the year.

### 2. Proposals

- 2.1. The Scrutiny Committee has been mindful that the County Council is still in the middle of the COVID 19 crisis and any programme of scrutiny work needs to be able to adapt to constantly changing situations. Proposed longer term areas of work for later in the year may therefore need to be adapted and changed as the crisis evolves.
- 2.2. In considering any work programme the Committee should consider the following:
  - Is this something that the County Council has the power to change or influence
  - How this work could engage with the activity of the Cabinet and other decision makers, including partners such as the Norfolk Resilience Forum
  - What the benefits are that scrutiny could bring to this issue?
  - How the committee can best carry out work on this subject?
  - What the best outcomes of this work would be?
- 2.3. The Committee may wish to hold additional meetings in the coming months considering any issues highlighted for the work programme.

### **3. Resource Implications**

#### **3.1. Staff:**

The County Council is still in the middle of this crisis and the main focus for Officers will be in dealing with the crisis. Some Officers may be redeployed from their current roles elsewhere to support ongoing work during the pandemic and the Committee may need to be mindful of focusing requests on essential information at this time.

#### **3.2. Property:**

None

#### **3.3. IT:**

None

### **4. Other Implications**

#### **4.1. Legal Implications:**

The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 ("the Regulations") sets out the framework for Councils to hold Council meetings remotely.

#### **4.2. Human Rights implications**

None

#### **4.3. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included)**

None

#### **4.4. Health and Safety implications (where appropriate)**

None

#### **4.5. Sustainability implications (where appropriate)**

None

#### **4.6. Any other implications**

None

### **5. Risk Implications/Assessment**

#### **5.1. None**

### **6. Select Committee comments**

#### **6.1. Select Committees will be meeting in the week beginning 13 July 2020 and will be receiving updates on COVID 19, addressing the response from their own service areas. The Scrutiny Committee should take into consideration any future comments raised by the Select Committees regarding their own forward work plans to avoid duplication.**

### **7. Recommendation**

#### **7.1. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and agree the draft forward work plan and any future items for scrutiny**

### **8. Background Papers**

#### **8.1. [Scrutiny Committee meeting : 27 May 2020](#)**

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Karen Haywood

**Tel No:** 01603 228913

**Email address:** [Karen.haywood@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:Karen.haywood@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme

Date	Report	Issues for consideration	Cabinet Member	Exec Director
22 July	<b>COVID 19 - Support for shielded and vulnerable people in our communities</b>	<b>Emergency Planning issues:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the current issues being faced</li> <li>- What lessons have we learnt so far – what worked well, what didn't</li> <li>- how robust were our emergency plans and internal business continuity</li> <li>- How can we use these lessons to support and contribute to future planning</li> <li>- Safeguarding</li> <li>- Care homes, food supplies, PPE</li> <li>- Community response – what lessons can we learn from this, how can we harness this support and ensure a positive legacy.</li> <li>- Track and Trace</li> </ul>	Bill Borrett	James Bullion Dr Louise Smith Fiona McDiarmid
	<b>Budget 2020/21</b>	Consideration of cycle for budget scrutiny for 2020/21	Andrew Jamieson	Simon George
19 August	<b>COVID 19 – Internal processes</b>	Consideration of any issues regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Democratic processes</li> <li>- Support for Members</li> <li>- Communications – both internally and to the public</li> <li>- ICT</li> </ul>		
23 Sept	<b>COVID 19</b>	<b>Normalisation and Recovery Planning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview including Public Health, Communities, health protection, any further spikes?</li> </ul>		Dr Louise Smith
	<b>Budget 2020/21</b>		Andrew Jamieson	Simon George



<b>21 October</b>	<b>COVID 19</b>	<b>Normalisation and Recovery Planning</b> - Childrens and Young People - Support for vulnerable people in our communities - How does the 'new normal' feel for service users	John Fisher Bill Borrett	Sara Tough James Bullion
	<b>Budget 2020/21</b>			
<b>18 Nov</b>	<b>COVID 19</b>	<b>Normalisation and Recovery Planning</b> Norfolk Economy and support for businesses (link in with scrutiny of the LEP)  Digital	Graham Plant Tom FitzPatrick	Tom McCabe
<b>23 Dec</b>				

**Items also to be scheduled:**

- **Regional Schools Commissioner**

Report postponed from 17 March 2020 meeting