

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES  
BY DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER  
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 12th MAY 2020**

**Question**

“Further to his response to Oral Question 101/2020, in which he advised that, from 2009, the stock of personal protective equipment (P.P.E.) for a flu-like pandemic was integrated with the business-as-usual (B.A.U.) stock and that this had been increased by 10%, will the Minister state what that 10% increase was in real terms; and will he explain how the adoption of ‘Health England’ guidelines to manage P.P.E. provision ensures the safety of patients and frontline staff?”

**Answer**

The Government of Jersey Public Health Department PPE guidelines build on those issued by Public Health England. They provide an evidence-based approach to ensuring the safety of staff and patients with respect to the type of PPE needed and the use of PPE in specific circumstances described in the Government of Jersey guidelines. The Government of Jersey PPE Cell provides types of PPE to all organisations within scope and in quantities required in accordance with these guidelines.

The original pandemic stock was intended to respond to a flu-like illness. It contained items of PPE *and* a wide range of other pandemic response items such as beds, bed tables, commodes, sleeping bags, disposable bed pans, urinals and so on. As items from the total pandemic stock were progressively dispersed (new beds in the pandemic stock were used to replace old beds in the hospital and so on), the value of the residual PPE stock in 2017 was £49,796. When the approach to pandemic inventory changed what was considered as PPE was different.

There are no management accounts therefore that evidence a ‘step change’ of 10% in value because there is no single point in time to calculate this. The PPE inventory was evolving as the approach to PPE pandemic inventory was also evolving. For example, what would be considered pandemic inventory in 2008 when the pandemic stock for a flu-like illness was initiated is different to the pandemic stock for COVID-19.

As best as is possible with the management accounts used in the HCS Stores, the table below shows annual expenditure classified as ‘Protective clothing’ for 2009-2019, and the first 4 months of 2020.

This is based on a combination of the value of items requisitioned from Stores and special orders directly from the ‘business’ (i.e. expensed immediately, not held as stock in Stores).

This shows expenditure in 2010, 2011 and 2012 on protective clothing was 20.64%, 25.64% and 14.46% up on the 2009 expenditure level respectively. The years 2014-2016 have lower expenditure levels than 2009.

These values are relatively low compared to the investment in PPE in response to the 2020 COVID-19 Emergency, which is approximately £4.5m

The table shows that more was spent on protective clothing in 2010-2012 than was spent in 2009. The uplift in PPE relating to my previous answer (OQ 101/2020) exceeded 10%.

	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Full Year	Expenditure to April 2020
	Expenditure 2009	Expenditure 2010	Expenditure 2011	Expenditure 2012	Expenditure 2013	Expenditure 2014	Expenditure 2015	Expenditure 2016	Expenditure 2017	Expenditure 2018	Expenditure 2019	
Expenditure (£)	100,988	121,836	126,881	115,588	94,176	89,615	86,949	85,676	101,873	211,853	252,104	284,747
Variance from 2009 expenditure level (£)		20,848	25,893	14,601	-6,812	-11,373	-14,039	-15,312	885	110,865	151,116	Part Year
Variance from 2009 expenditure level (% of 2009 expenditure)		20.64%	25.64%	14.46%	-6.75%	-11.26%	-13.90%	-15.16%	0.88%	109.78%	149.64%	Part Year

