

Clearly, stockpiling needs to be done with care, to ensure that equipment does not pass its expiry date;

- The Government should support the development of new facilities for the testing of surgical gowns to BS EN 13795, specifically the ISO 22610 and 22612 wet and dry microbial penetration tests. State Aid rules would allow this (under section 3.7 – “Investment aid for testing and upscaling infrastructures” of the “EU Commission’s Temporary Framework for State Aid”, put in place to support EU economies during the period of disruption caused by the coronavirus epidemic). Note that State Aid rules will cease to apply at the end of the transition period on 31/12/2020.
- The Government should consider supporting the expansion of capacity to test FFP3 respirators to BS EN 149 (see above comments on State Aid);
- The Government should support laundry facilities for pre-treatment of reusable isolation gowns prior to testing;
- HSE should develop clear standards for testing isolation gowns after the end of the PPE Regulatory Easement;
- DHSC should ensure that information on products that fail testing is fed back promptly to procurement teams (both national and regional) to reduce the chances of purchasing faulty equipment.

Commented [NR]:

Commented [NR]: In collaboration with BSI?

Commented [NR]: HSE is already aware of this. I would say in collaboration with test house and standard experts.

### Long Term Future

As pointed out above, our work has identified a number of issues that if addressed could significantly improve any future responses to similar crises, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, in the long term. This section points towards these issues, which are discussed in greater detail within the respective topical papers provided alongside this document.

#### UK competitiveness

Price levels have been elevated during the Covid-19 pandemic which has assisted UK manufacturers to compete with overseas suppliers, particularly as short timeframes have necessitated PPE from overseas to be transported by air (for example aprons from China were costing about 7p per apron with air freight making up 5p of that cost). We recommend that DHSC include a full cost to serve analysis from the procurement team in their work to build a resilience model to determine to which extent UK manufacturers should continue to be encouraged to enter the market.

There are a number of financial options that could be deployed to support companies manufacturing PPE in the UK, such as tax incentives, business rates reduction, energy subsidies, and loans if UK manufacturing becomes part of the overall resilience model. Our advice is that were such a policy to be pursued grants are the most effective tool as they are an injection of cash direct to the company and don’t have the associated costs and administrative burden (for companies and public authorities) of the other approaches.

The Regional Growth Fund and the Exceptional Regional Growth Fund are two mechanisms through which such grants could be administered if DHSC concludes that financial support is necessary to support UK manufacturing of PPE in the medium-long term.<sup>9</sup>

Commented [NR]: Need to link this to the point above about the procurement criteria. Once they have done the full cost to serve analysis it may well show imports are cheaper. The question is then do they want to have break the procurement up into cells and include one with criteria which point to UK manufacture eg must be able to supply by road within 2 hours.

Commented [NR]: This section will inevitably repeat what's in the response to the strategy, however in this case I think that's ok. The key points are that the strat needs to set the context for uk manufacturing and that we need to be able to ask for it. We can repeat the point here about grants from above. [NR] let's speak.

Commented [NR]: ok

Commented [NR]: Do you want to add any more things from the DHSC strat?