

Message

**From:** pshelenwhately [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D0F92BD025A84F08A4A69D427EF290F7-PSHELENWHAT]  
**Sent:** 01/07/2020 18:11:13  
**To:** Roughton, Rosamond [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=83a8961439ff464aaa6228f0dece9e0d-RRoughton]; pshelenwhately [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=d0f92bd025a84f08a4a69d427ef290f7-pshelenwhat]; Surrey, Tom [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=c44db478a11a4503ba18a8cd796c4153-TSurrey]; Mark Harvey [Mark.Harvey@hertfordshire.gov.uk]  
**CC:** Pearson, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=085e87bf8b2746b8a0fc32ebd282db1b-DPearson1]; **NR** [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=1097764f1b9d42289c8705d82d7990f0-]; **NR** [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=33c978861876433ab6d859b3ce73bf0e-]; **NR** Nuttall, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=0fd76afeac2941e393fd6c4ee629346e-DNuttall]; Benjamin, Jennifer [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=90f05c36bde24faa8db74bb9507eee3c-JBenjam]; Williams, Antonia [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=57c8edb95bc14d919041049642dce0b0-Awillia]; psnadinedorries [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=eb8332f3fa0b4fd7808ef72aa0f85df5-psnadinedor]  
**Subject:** RE: Read-out & Actions from CQC Fortnightly Meeting - 01.07

Thanks Ros – I have flagged with MSC, but on the call Kate suggested a level of detail that MSC does not recognise.

Given MSC's real concern by Kate's admission we should expect cases to emerge in the coming weeks of potential neglect/abuse/poor standards of care, she has asked:

- Is there a way we can get them to expedite inspections?
- Can we get more formal information from CQC on where they are carrying out inspections (ask them to put this in writing)? Are we confident in CQC's prioritisation of high risk settings? (Have cc'd in Dave as think likely it will be LD facilities?)
- Do we internally have a sense of what the scale of the issue is that may be about to erupt?

She was also really clear that whilst she agreed with the CQC decision to stop routine inspections during the pandemic, she did not agree that this was done at the risk of neglect/abuse to residents and Kate's comments today did not assure her on this point.

Appreciate if you can advise on the above and what options we have to address this, particularly if we think this will be a significant issue in the coming weeks?

Thanks

**NR**

**From:** Roughton, Rosamond <Rosamond.Roughton@dhsc.gov.uk>

**Sent:** 01 July 2020 15:50

**To:** pshelenwhately <pshelenwhately@dhsc.gov.uk>; Surrey, Tom <Tom.Surrey@dhsc.gov.uk>; Mark Harvey <Mark.Harvey@hertfordshire.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Pearson, David <David.Pearson@dhsc.gov.uk> **NR** @dhsc.gov.uk **NR**

NR

<[REDACTED]@dhsc.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Read-out & Actions from CQC Fortnightly Meeting - 01.07

On the first point in red, about information from CQC, whilst we might not have received it formally, we certainly did receive all this feedback through the weekly national Covid-19 ASC calls which [REDACTED] NR and I chaired. All of these issues featured heavily and shaped our policy response.

So I don't quite understand MSC's concern – this seems exactly what we were hearing from providers at the time?

Ros

---

**From:** pshelenwhately <[pshelenwhately@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:pshelenwhately@dhsc.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 01 July 2020 15:16

**To:** Surrey, Tom <[Tom.Surrey@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:Tom.Surrey@dhsc.gov.uk)>; Mark Harvey <[Mark.Harvey@hertfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.Harvey@hertfordshire.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Roughton, Rosamond <[Rosamond.Roughton@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:Rosamond.Roughton@dhsc.gov.uk)>; Pearson, David <[David.Pearson@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:David.Pearson@dhsc.gov.uk)>;

pshelenwhately <[pshelenwhately@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:pshelenwhately@dhsc.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED] NR

<[REDACTED]@dhsc.gov.uk>

NR

<[REDACTED] NR <[\[REDACTED\]@dhsc.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dhsc.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Read-out & Actions from CQC Fortnightly Meeting - 01.07

Hi all,

Please see a read-out and actions from the call MSC had with CQC this afternoon. Let me know if I have missed anything.

Following this meeting, MSC has asked a number of questions. **Tom** – I would really appreciate if you're able to help answer any of these questions?

**Comms colleagues** – as you will note from below (in bold red), MSC is really concerned that CQC are expecting new cases of care home standards dropping/closures etc. to be uncovered in the next few weeks – I have asked below whether we have any early intel on this?

Attendees: MSC, Tom Surrey (TS), Mark Harvey(MH), Kate Terroni (KT), Deborah Ivanova (DI), [REDACTED] NR

- KT was content to talk MSC through the slides but also keen to leave space to discuss content of CQC letter to SofS (attached)
- On the slides MSC keen to discuss information on p.4 KT explained they prioritised contact with providers directly (mostly via skype/zoom) and then as when needed follow up conversations with LAs, CCGs, and where needed regional level discussions where trends had been observed across care homes)
- MSC asked about data and information from the provider discussions on specific issues. KT confirmed this detailed data was in each provider record but main themes were workforce, PPE, multitude of guidance, discharge, withdrawal of the health offer from community nursing, CCGs etc
- **MSC noted these insights sounded very helpful but was not confident that reports on these issues had been flagged with the department as she certainly did not see this at the time. Following the meeting, MSC has asked whether this information was received by the department, and whether we received anything other than data from the Capacity Tracker? If it didn't come into us, was there a good reason for this, any particular barrier? She is also not clear why CQC didn't share the intel they had from inspectors' contacts with care homes with us before, as we had asked for this information, and has asked if this was due to not having a mechanism for getting the info up to Kate?**
- KT stated the information would have come via the department alongside to LAs etc but conceded an aggregated report wasn't shared until the Insights report – and the main priority at least in first 12 weeks was getting the data out to the right people to ensure action was taken.
- MSC asked whether KT confident that right and timely steps were taken to take to ensure people weren't neglected.
- KT noted cautiously that whilst the right measures were taken (giving example of care home in Kettering closed due to lacking basic in safety for residents) **it is likely we will see an increase in no. of services that haven't been able to**

cope during pandemic and therefore a spike of these cases being unveiled in next few weeks. **MSC is extremely concerned about this, flagging with Comms colleagues – have copied you in, in case we have any intel of what might be uncovered in next few weeks?**

- KT stood by their decision to stop the routine inspections (MSC agreed) but still likely to uncover bad cases in next few weeks.
- MSC asked if we can we get more insight into CQC findings in terms of latest and live intelligence - especially where there are known alarming cases. KT agreed to this going forward, and alongside real time activity, CQC will share any potential actions to take.
- MH flagged that getting granular detail will lead to more information asked of LAs, therefore important we have detail around the LA response to care home issues. **Action: KT to work with MH on this point.**
- On Infection Prevention Control, KT updated on her discussion with Ros Roughton and David Pearson on role of CQC in IPC compliance. KT stated that CQC inspectors were reviewing their portfolios with a focus on IPC, looking at how providers can assure them they are following guidelines.
- Inspectors now going out to high risk services
- KT flagged they 300 additional inspections planned across range of providers, including those that don't fall into high risk – as between the three CQC Chief Inspectors, keen to pull together gold standard examples and best practice.
- KT flagged Provider Collaborative Reviews starting Monday, and again focus will be IPC to inform learning for a second wave. IPC will be a focus at least until the end of March.
- MSC reiterated importance of more timely information within and outside of the fortnightly meetings so by time we reach next CQC output report (planned for September) we are aware but more importantly taken necessary action/interventions based on live intel and insights.
- KT agreed and said they would do both - there was value in having a blueprint of best practice alongside the quick intel to allow system to act effectively, and she would be happy to provide MSC with running narrative fortnightly.

#### DECISION

- KT said they could update at next meeting the number of inspections planned but wouldn't have the analysis at that point
- DI added that fine to provide real time feedback on the inspections but more work being done on methodology of inspections starting in August. DI noted that whilst each inspection had its own report, a quick tick box element could be added to capture live information
- TS raised the need to be conscious of sensitive information of provider but balance this with receiving important and timely information
- KT agreed and committed to adding a slide on next meeting slide pack setting out clearly rules of engagement alongside the findings
- MSC asked CQC to flag to her any care home concerns immediately and CQC actions on the case before they become a media story (rather than wait for the fortnightly meeting) **Action: KT to pick up what the current routes of alerting MSC/DHSC are on this and will address if no clear information loop is in place. Policy/Comms colleagues do we know what the current process is, or whether we have one?**
- Finally, KT plugged support for the for LSRs

Thanks

NR



NR

(She/Her)

Private Secretary to Helen Whately, Minister of State for Care

9<sup>th</sup> Floor, 39 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0EU

E: NR

@dhsc.gov.uk

Irrelevant & Sensitive

Follow us on Twitter @DHSCgovuk

DHSC recipients please note: this email will not be saved by Private Office. If you need it for audit purposes, please keep a copy for your records.

*If I am emailing outside of your work hours, please do not feel the need to respond until you are back in the office – many thanks!*