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Thursday, 14 March 2024
(9.45 am)
    (Proceedings delayed)
(10.08 am)
THE CHAIR: Right. Good morning, Ms Bahrami, and good
    morning, Mr McConnell, and those in the room. I'm very
    sorry for the delay, which was to do with a computer
    malfunction, but I hope it's all now sorted.
MS BAHRAMI: Good morning, Lord Brailsford.
THE CHAIR: Can you hear me?
MS BAHRAMI: Yes.
THE CHAIR:Good. You heard what I said then, did you?
MS BAHRAMI: Yes, we did. Thank you, my Lord.
THE CHAIR: Right. Over to you.
            MR EDWARD MCCONNELL (called)
            Questions by MS BAHRAMI
MS BAHRAMI: Thank you. Good morning, Mr McConnell. Your
        full name is Eddie McConnell; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you're the chief executive of Down's Syndrome
    Scotland?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could you tell us a bit about the work that
    Down's Syndrome Scotland does, please?
A. Yes, I'm happy to do that. So Down's Syndrome Scotland
```
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is the only charity in Scotland that supports people with Down syndrome and their families from birth right through to their older age, at every stage. It was established as a charity 40 years ago, just over 40 years ago, and we have 1,400 members across Scotland. 800 of them are what we call family members, parent carers, and 600 of them are adults with Down's syndrome. We are supported by ten local branches of Down Syndrome Scotland, based in local communities, and they're organised by our parent volunteers.

We have -- our work is very focused on supporting families and people with Down syndrome. We believe that every individual with Down syndrome has immense potential and we also believe we have much to learn from them. So our job, our privilege, is to get right alongside families and right alongside people with Down syndrome to bring out that potential as best we can.
Q. Thank you. I want to jump forward a bit in your statement before going back again, but at paragraph 27 you say that, although you used the word "resilient" to describe the families you work with, they were only just about coping before the pandemic. To help us understand, please would you tell us a bit more about the general difficulties, pressures and responsibilities
on those families who have a family member with Down syndrome?
A. Well, thank you. So what $--I$ can speak from personal experience as well as a father of a son with Down syndrome and therefore I can really relate to what our families tell us. So many of our families face, on a daily basis, quite a lot of discrimination and barriers, and what they would say to us is that it's not because they have a child with Down syndrome, it's because of the attitude of others, which at one level might just simply be ignorance about the condition of Down syndrome, but at an extreme level is also about -and we have evidence of this -- some discrimination and prejudice that takes place in terms of attitudes towards people with Down syndrome.

So for families who have a young person with Down syndrome in the family, their daily experience is they often have to fight to secure the rights of their loved ones and it's a fairly exhausting daily experience. They have the same rights -- our citizens with Down syndrome have the same rights as every other member of society, but on a daily and weekly basis those rights are often not upheld and sometimes quite blatantly violated.

So for families it becomes a real fight to secure
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provision and support, whether that's in the early days in terms of medical support or interventions or support to access education in the place of their choice, whether that's mainstream education or whether that's special need provision. All families tell us that is always a fight, and that continues throughout their life, whether it's then leaving school and accessing social care support for families.

They would wish that society understood the potential of their loved ones and it wasn't so much of a fight to secure those rights, and the consequence of that is it becomes really exhausting for our families because it is a daily struggle to secure those rights and those provisions that of course people with Down syndrome are entitled to.
Q. Thank you. Moving back a bit -- this section starts at paragraph 18 onwards -- at the outset of the pandemic you say that social care provision was withdrawn. Was this state-provided social care or social care that parents paid for or both?
A. So it would be a combination of both, but in the main what we're reporting here is social care that was provided by social care providers that were often commissioned by local authorities to provide that care and support. So in a number of instances they are
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themselves charities but they are also social care providers and are often -- in most cases actually -commissioned by the local authority or the Health and Social Care Partnership to provide support to people, disabled people, locally.
Q. And what was the impact on individuals with Down's syndrome and on their families and unpaid carers of this support being withdrawn?
A. So the families told us that the impact was huge because it was immediately withdrawn. There was no transition; there was no discussion about how we might move to a new set of arrangements. So they received phone calls from their social care provider simply advising them that social care could not -- could no longer be provided. So initially it was a real shock for families. They were themselves, like many of us, trying to get their head round what was happening and of course their main concern was about protecting their loved ones in that, and the provision of social care support is part of protecting and supporting them. So to have that withdrawn was for many of the families a lifeline that was actually withdrawn from them. It meant they became carers $24 / 7$. It meant that they became carers overnight, in many cases, 24/7. And although I described them previously as a resilient population,
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many of them were exhausted and very quickly were on their knees in terms of trying to navigate their way through the pandemic on their own because that social care support was removed.

The impact on people with Down syndrome was really profound. It's really important for our community to have structure and to have support and to be part of wider society, and that's what social care facilitates. So to remove that so quickly means that people with Down syndrome lost their connections, they became very isolated, loneliness was identified very quickly and we know that their mental health deteriorated very quickly. And for some in our community that manifested itself as behaviours that were different. Some people describe it as "challenging". We would describe it as an expression of frustration. But that change in behaviour had then to be managed and supported by unpaid carers, families, family members on their own, without that social care support.

So it was really profound, the impact of withdrawing social care support and the uncertainty that went alongside that in terms of not knowing if this was a matter of weeks or a matter of months and when would it come back. Indeed would it come back was also quite a significant factor that many families talked to
us about.
Q. Thank you. You actually mentioned being aware of a family that was asked to continue paying for the service despite not knowing when or if it would come back so that they could keep their place. Do you know whether that family did in fact pay?
A. So it was a really difficult moment for everybody and I assume therefore it was a really difficult moment for social care providers, who were trying to understand what the future might look like, and we know that, we understand that. But it seemed really perverse to us that that social care provider would say to a family member, "We're withdrawing your support. However, we think it's best that you keep paying for that so that your space is there when things return to normal or return back". I'm pretty sure the -- I'm pretty confident that the family member challenged that view and I'm pretty confident the social care provider revisited their idea that the payment should continue.
Q. Thank you. Now, you go on to say that support to families with caring responsibilities came a lot later on during the pandemic, after much petitioning from organisations such as yours. Could you tell us about that petitioning activity? What forms did it take? Which people or entities did you have to petition and
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what resources were required for that?
A. So throughout the pandemic and in those early months of the pandemic throughout 2020, we were in constant contact with the Scottish Government's learning disability policy team. They were, before the pandemic, our go-to civil servants in terms of feedback about what was happening to our community, so they were the natural place to engage with as we started to spot concerns happening.

I think the challenge was that - - they were really receptive to our views and very supportive of our concerns, but their challenge was then to take that to the civil servants who were dealing with those concerns. So an example of that is that we were concerned that our family carers weren't getting the kind of level of support that we felt they needed. We were trying to provide that as a charity as best we can -- many charities stepped in to do that -- and we really felt that, as unpaid carers, we really needed some additional support, including financial support. And it became a very long journey through Government, I presume through different departments, probably up inside Government and down, to eventually deliver some carer support through the network of carers - - carers' charities that are based locally. But it came much
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later in the pandemic.
    We would also say -- and I think I've mentioned this
    in my statement -- that for a number of charities who
    have conditions, specific charities or charities that
    support people with Down syndrome, we would have liked
    that support directly coming to us because we have that
    established knowledge and relationship with that
    particular group, and it seemed a very long way round to
    try and get support that was very generic and not
    specific enough for our community, so ...
Q. Do you think a better approach might have been for those
    organisations that address a specific diagnosed
    condition, that they were to receive payments, and for
    those conditions where there is no specific diagnosis or
    there is no dedicated organisation, that for them it
    would go through a carer centre, so perhaps a dual
    approach would have been better and more efficient?
A. So I think one of the issues that we would reflect is
    that, when we raised a concern with Government through
    our established channels, we were not engaged in the
    conversations that took place to decide how to respond
    to that concern, and I think that's a pity. I think the
    consequence of that is that we could have influenced
    a different outcome or, as you have put it, different
    options rather than just one option coming forward. So
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it was a frustration for us that we often lost the conversation once it entered Government because Government had to speak with other departments and then the solution that popped out was often not perfect and then we had to work round and come up with additional solutions to make that more perfect. And I think there should have been greater flexibility -- there should have been greater involvement of us in those conversations about those solutions and there should have been greater choice about how that support was provided.
I do want to acknowledge that we did receive additional emergency funding from the Scottish Government, but this is -- this point that we're focused on here is particularly about support for carers, which was primarily driven through the carers' centres' network.
Q. What did the carers' centres do with the money being given to them by the Government?
A. So I think they attempted to reach most carers in their locality. I can certainly reflect that in my own experience as an unpaid carer. I was contacted by email and I was sent some online resources and I was invited to participate in some online sessions around well-being.
```
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Q. Okay.
A. But that support was very generic and, to be balanced
    about this, it was helpful for those who might have
    a broader disability, but in the context of our
    community and people with Down syndrome, who have a very
    specific set of conditions, particularly health
    conditions, associated with that, it was too blunt an
    approach and needed to be more precise. And we felt
    that there should have been choice and there should have
    been a direction of some of those resources directly
    into the relationship that we had with families and
    people with Down syndrome directly.
    Q. Thank you. Could you tell us, do individuals with
        Down's syndrome have a named disability social worker
        that could help in identifying people and people that do
        have a need for funding and additional resources?
    A. So many families who have a young person with
        Down syndrome, as they approach the end of school will
        start that transition process, and often with the help
        of Social Work, and that will sometimes lead to the
        identification of a specific social worker who might
        support the development of a transition plan and
        ultimately a budget to support that person in adulthood.
        The experience of that across Scotland is really
        extremely inconsistent --
    1 1
    Q. Right.
    A. -- so some people may have a named social worker, some
    people may be in a basket -- it's often referred to as
    "a basket" -- and placed in a basket to see who's
    available in terms of social worker to pick that case
    up.
            We know that many of our families are still not
    accessing the level of support that they're entitled to,
    in terms of self-directed support and a budget, and, as
    I said earlier, for many of our families, accessing that
    support is often a fight and a struggle. It's often
    predetermined by the available resources rather than the
    needs and the support needs of the individual, which is
    what is actually set out in legislation in terms of
    Self-directed Support Act. It's meant to be driven by
    the needs -- the identified and agreed needs -- support
    needs of the individual, and often families report to us
    their feelings that it's driven by the available
    resources rather than the explicit needs, support needs,
        of the individuals concerned.
    Q. And that was prior to the pandemic, so, presumably, the
        pandemic exacerbated that and made things much more
        difficult?
    A. Yes. So I would say that one of the experiences our
        families have reported to us was many of the
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professionals who were involved in providing a range of different support, whether they were health professionals, like allied health professionals or social workers, even in education -- many of those professionals stepped right back during the -- in the early days of the pandemic. So not only did social care get withdrawn almost overnight, but for many of our families that access to professional support stepped right back as well. So they felt enormously alone and enormously vulnerable, more vulnerable, acutely vulnerable, and that's where organisations like ourselves and other organisations needed to step in and provide, as best we could, some of that support.
Q. Thank you. And you've told us about the importance of socialising for those with Down's syndrome and you go on to say that, whereas the general population were able to interact with peers and family online, that members of the Down's syndrome community weren't accessible online. Why was that?
A. So our community is an enormously diverse community. So quite often, if you don't know our world, you'll -- if somebody mentions people with Down syndrome, you'll think of some of the celebrity people with
Down syndrome, Tommy Jessop, for example, who is a public figure, as we know, in the world of TV and
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media. Those well-known figures are really important in our community because they're really positive role models, but they probably only represent the top $5 \%$ to $10 \%$ of our community.

So our community is a really diverse community and, as you move across that community, the communication support needs of that community become more profound, significantly profound. So it's really important that people understand that the diversity of the community in Scotland is quite extensive and therefore the support needs of that community are really quite extensive. We always help people to understand that every person with Down syndrome is a unique individual and they therefore have a unique set of support needs, and it's important for people to really understand that quite clearly.
Q. Yes. Thank you. And you say in your statement that the consequence of not being able to interact, at least online, has had an effect on confidence levels and that the confidence levels aren't even back to pre-pandemic levels yet. Is your organisation's view that perhaps exceptions should be made in the case of people with Down's syndrome and certain other conditions to allow physical interaction to continue in some way and, if so, do you have any views on how that could be achieved, outdoor interactions or any other way to ensure that
this gap doesn't arise again?
A. So if you give me permission, l'd like to go back to the previous question because I think I probably can provide a fuller response to the previous question but still help answer this next question, if that's okay.

So it's really important for people with Down syndrome to have structure in their lives and to have those connections and to feel part of not just their community - - to feel part of a wider community. We believe that society benefits from having them closely involved. So the removal of that structure has
a really profound impact on them and, as I said earlier,
it does result in changing behaviours. It definitely
resulted in examples of mental health and well-being deteriorating, depression occurring and loneliness and isolation becoming very significant with that community.

It's an interesting question about whether creating face-to-face opportunities or physical spaces for people to continue to meet may have helped. I think what was uppermost in all our minds at that time was keeping our community safe, so the notion of moving to create any face-to-face meetings was not considered something that we should be doing at that stage because little was known about this virus at that point in time.
Q. Yes.
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A. We knew that people with Down syndrome, long before the pandemic came along, had significant health issues, had significant health inequalities. What the pandemic did was amplify them. So any idea of safely bringing people together was not in our consideration in the early -- in the first year of the pandemic, so we relied very significantly on connecting our community through online platforms. We brought forward our digital plans and within six weeks we rolled out a very significant online secure platform to allow our families to connect. Our motivations in those early days were about keeping our families and people with Down syndrome safe, but we also needed to keep them connected. That was really important because that sense of connection is really vital in their lives and we knew it had been withdrawn.

So we introduced -- for young teenagers with Down syndrome, we introduced our online teen-space programme, which was regarded by many families as an absolute lifeline, the option for teenagers to come online and connect with other teenagers. We did similarly for adults with Down syndrome. We created a friends-space programme online.

That felt the right thing to do, even though we were very conscious that for many in our community they simply didn't have access to digital technology to take
part, and the reason they don't have access is to do with that diversity of their - - of our community. So while some are very technically literate, others need considerable support, and others, who might be, for example, in supported accommodation, often don't have the right to have access to their own technology and communication and -- so while relying on that online world was the right thing to do to try as best we could to keep people connected, we were very mindful that for significant parts of our community that wasn't an option for them. So we placed, for that community, significant what we call "kindness calls". We got in touch with families to understand how they were doing, just to have a conversation with them online.

I think the whole access to technology is -- has been, on one level, really helpful because we were able to connect people who were not connected before, so we were able to connect a family in Orkney with a family in Dumfries, when previously, without that online provision, they were unlikely to meet because of the distance, but they connected because we had an online provision. So that's positive and we continue a lot of that today.

The negative is that for quite a large significant element of our community, they simply don't have access
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to digital technology in the way that you and I take for granted each and every day and they need considerable support with that, which might be as simple as the provision of a device, but it will almost certainly be support to access and use that device in a safe and responsible way.
Q. Thank you. You mentioned there that essentially other health conditions, comorbidities, with Down's syndrome are well known and there are some that could exacerbate COVID infections, but that those - - but you mention in your statement that those with Down's syndrome weren't initially on the shielding list. Presumably, that would have caused some anxiety and uncertainty for those with Down's syndrome and their families, and your organisation was involved in highlighting this issue. You then tell us, once that was accepted, I think following an Oxford study that showed those with Down's syndrome to be at higher risk, that there was a gap between national Government making that decision, that people with Down's syndrome should be on that list, and then the local health boards implementing that decision. Could you expand on the evident shortcomings in support and care following that decision?
A. This is a really important element of our submission and it's really important that I emphasise that the health
conditions of people with Down syndrome were well documented and well known about before the pandemic came along. We know that people with Down's syndrome are prone to respiratory difficulties, we know that one in five children born with Down syndrome have a cardiac difficulty, cardiac challenges, and we know that their immune systems are compromised. So these are well-documented, well-known, for want of a better expression, risk factors associated with people with Down syndrome. So I guess we were really frustrated at the start of the pandemic that that wasn't acknowledged and understood, and I think there's still a question to be asked why that -- there's still an answer to be given why people with Down syndrome were not properly recognised as a high-risk group.

I've said in my statement that it might be therefore inferred that people with Down syndrome were clearly left behind at the start of the pandemic and it might be that some people with Down syndrome died as a consequence of not having been on, for example, the shielding list. So we petitioned quite strongly and continuously throughout that period.

So the shielding list, if I recollect correctly, came into place in March 2020. People with Down syndrome were added to the shielding list
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eight months later, in November 2020, and it came as a consequence of research that we supported internationally with what's called the "T21 Research Society", which is a society that focuses particularly on research around people with Down syndrome and, as you rightly mentioned, the study conducted by Oxford University, which identified and confirmed that people with Down syndrome were in fact ten times more likely to be hospitalised and possibly die if they caught coronavirus.

The chief medical officers across the UK, on the back of that evidence, moved very quickly to issue a letter, a consistent letter, across all of the four home countries to say that people with Down syndrome would now be added to the shielding list. That started, I think - - if I recollect correctly, that started probably in September and started to gain some momentum in October and a letter was eventually issued at the start of November. The issuing of the letter was then the start of another period of implementation.

So our experience from families who spoke to us, who were really anxious of why their loved ones were not on the shielding list - - because they understood that being on the shielding list would provide additional support, would recognise that they had underlying health
conditions and complex issues that needed to be acknowledged and supported, and they also believed, rightly or wrongly, that they might have prioritised access to a vaccine when it came along and any additional health support that might be provided.

It was a common experience of our organisation that, once national guidance was issued, the filtering of that guidance to delivery and implementation at a local level took some time and also was implemented not consistently; not consistently sometimes within local health boards and certainly not consistently across health boards in Scotland. We often found ourselves -and this is set out within the submission -- we often found ourselves having to phone GP practices and telling them that people with Down syndrome were on the shielding list, and that came as a consequence of families contacting us and saying, "I've been in touch with my GP. He's adamant people with Down syndrome aren't on the shielding list ". We would contact and provide a copy of the Chief Medical Officer's letter.

So there was a significant gap between national guidance and local implementation, and we stepped in to try and close that gap as best we could, but it was enormously frustrating for families. It created another level of stress and it was quite clear that the
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communication channels were not well developed, and we found ourselves often being the one to tell health professionals of the changes that were happening nationally. So certainly in terms of lessons learnt, I think there's a significant gap between national direction and guidance and local implementation that has to be examined more closely in any future pandemic planning.
Q. Thank you. And your view, then, is that that gap is largely down to inadequate communication at the local government level -- is that right? -- or local health board level? Sorry.
A. Yeah. So I'm not sure we know why that gap happens.

I think you'd probably have to ask others why that gap happens. All we know is that we found ourselves in the position, six weeks after an announcement had been made, still telling people locally what the current position was and having to, as I've referenced earlier -- in the experience of families, having to fight for their rights, fight for their support. We found ourselves often sometimes in quite combative conversations with general health practitioners, with health board officials, to make them realise that in fact people with Down syndrome were now on this shielding list and you needed to acknowledge that and now provide the
additional support that came with that.
Q. Thank you. Clearly, during the pandemic, the work that your organisation had to do increased dramatically and you've explained the reasons for that. You do say that, in time, you received emergency COVID funding but before that you had to dip into the organisation's reserves.
The organisation had already been struggling to keep up with demand so that placed quite a bit of pressure on you.

While you were dealing with this, you then of course had to apply for the funding and wait for that to be granted. Could you tell us, amidst dealing with the day job essentially of the organisation, how did you find the application process and the steps required to be taken until funding was granted?
A. So maybe just a wee bit of context about how we as an organisation arrived into the pandemic, and you've referred to some of that there. So, as an organisation, we were financially very challenged before the pandemic came along. I joined in August 2019, knowing that we had to look at restructuring the organisation to live within its means. We had a significant -- it's a matter of public record -- we had a significant legacy debt. So ironically we had our own recovery plan in place before the pandemic arrived. When the pandemic arrived,
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we had to reduce the size of the organisation very quickly. Half of the staff immediately went onto furlough and subsequently we had to make redundancies - a significant number of redundancies of staff. About half of the staff group had to leave us at that point.

So we were dealing with quite challenging issues ourselves as a charity and, as a consequence of that, that manifested itself as quite a challenging cash flow position. We know we weren't alone as a charity, we know many charities faced that problem. I would say that, initially, the emergency funds that became available flowed to us quite quickly. I would say that some funders really understood the importance of getting finance to us quickly so that we could continue the work we were doing and I would say those processes were accelerated in a helpful way.

It's really interesting that funders, including Government, can really amplify their confidence in the organisation to do the work we're doing and how important that is. They can do that in the time of a pandemic, but when we recover from the pandemic, we find ourselves returning to a much more significant set of criteria and hoops that we need to jump through. So in some ways we wonder why they had that confidence in us in that crisis, but now that the acute state of that
crisis has gone, we wonder why it is so difficult now to achieve the same level of funding and support.

So I would want to commend some of the funders for the flexibility they had and the speed at which they moved to release funds to us, but today that's a very different -- we seem to have gone back to how things were before the pandemic, and yet it's really interesting that there was such a level of confidence in us as vital players to provide support to a vulnerable and marginalised community in the pandemic. They're still a vulnerable and marginalised community. That hasn't changed.

So we - - enquiries to our helpline peaked during the pandemic, they haven't come down, so they're still up at that level. We had a $20 \%$ increase in what we call "complex support enquiries". One in four of our enquiries to our helpline are what we designate as complex, enquiries needing a minimum in that initial contact of two to three hours of support, but a lot of ongoing support. It's now one in three of our enquiries are complex enquiries, so the need is still going up. So -- and yet the access to the resources that were available in that very flexible way is no longer available in that flexible speedy way.

We believe, like many charities, we stepped in and
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responded to the national emergency. We truly believe we saved lives, we genuinely believe we did that, but we don't believe that we are valued sufficiently now as part of the national response and part of the recovery going forward, and we're really disappointed that the contribution we made then has not been supported to continue as the country tries to move forward and recover and we still believe that we're in that recovery stage.
THE CHAIR: You of course raise an interesting point, Mr McConnell. I don't doubt anything you tell me. It makes common sense to me, to be perfectly frank. The problem or the issue $I$ have is that the situation you are in now is outwith my terms of remit or the terms of this Inquiry's remit. We have, as you know, I think, specific dates which terminate in the end of 2022. I understand that I would probably be entitled to make comments about recognition that you deserve for the work that you did, your organisation did, but it's difficult for me to say anything about the position you find yourself in at the moment, I'm afraid.
A. Thank you for that, Lord Brailsford. I understand that completely. Perhaps the point I was probably making was that, in the pandemic, people really valued and understood the contribution we could make and it's
disappointing that that is not -- you know, lots of innovation, different ways of working prevailed. People came together in a different way of working. Perhaps the most obvious example from our own community was actually the speed at which people who were homeless were moved off the street within a matter of weeks, and who would have thought that was possible before a pandemic came along?

So some of the innovation that came as a result and some of the developments that came as a result of responding to the crisis of - - by putting people together and working closely together and being in a sense less concerned about whether you're third sector, public sector, health sector, but that you're focused on people who needed support, I think as a lesson learned from the Inquiry, we would hope that that lesson would be amplified, that -- you know, as something very good that came out. People worked differently together. And I understand, going forward, it 's beyond the remit of the Inquiry to necessarily say what's happening today, my Lord.
THE CHAIR: Certainly the general point you make is something that can be considered and made if need be.
A. Thank you.

MS BAHRAMI: Thank you.
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Now, you mentioned your staff taking calls from the public and the number of complex calls, which you class as calls requiring more than two hours, increased. You've also said in your statement that the nature of those calls changed. Before the pandemic, the calls were really mainly focused on Down syndrome itself, but during the pandemic people called you in relation to their mental health, their concerns, lack of benefits or benefits I suppose not covering all of their needs. And then you go on to talk about a parent who became so desperate for help for her daughter that she actually harmed her daughter as she thought that was the only way to obtain help. Could you expand on that, in particular why did she think that was the only way to achieve that aim and was she then in fact able to achieve that help or to get that help?
A. So I think it's important to recognise that, for many of our families, they became very desperate, they became -because the support they had experienced had been withdrawn. They were really, really anxious and really worried. The nature of the calls, which quite quickly pre-pandemic were about Down syndrome and adjusting to having somebody with Down syndrome and what that means in your life, were replaced by conversations about stress, about worry, anxiety, mental health concerns,
about impacts with benefits, about not having sufficient funds, and all of that happening when they were 24/7 carers.
Q. Yes.
A. So looking -- understandably wanting to really look after their loved ones to the best of their ability but doing so $24 / 7--$ so they were exhausted and many of them continue to be exhausted today.

I don't -- and we would never - - pass judgment on somebody who was so desperate that she was getting no support from - - in that person's case, from Social Work and felt that the only way to get that support was to do something quite disastrous, to in a sense invoke statutory involvement in her family because her view was nobody was responding to her pleas for help -- so she took that really desperate measure, really desperate, and we absolutely do not have any judgment on that in terms of it was clear she herself had very significant mental health needs that were not being supported or recognised. It's uncertain -- and I should say for the record, you know, because there was statutory involvement in terms of the police -- it's uncertain whether she did actually did harm her daughter, so it's important for us to just acknowledge that. She alleged that she was going to harm her daughter and she saw that
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as the only way to get support because nobody was
listening. She was absolutely at the end of her tether.
Q. Do you have any thoughts on how that could be avoided in future? Is it simply an issue of resource or are there other steps that could be considered?
A. So I'm reluctant to always come back to resource. I'm sure that's a tired argument that lots of people hear. I think one of the more significant issues -- and again I mentioned this within the submission --it's the gaps in data that exist for our community. So many people with Down syndrome are not known to local authorities. They're not identified locally. They're not on any register. That became abundantly clear to us in the pandemic, when we found ourselves having to pass on information to GP practices, to local health boards, of people we knew about who had Down syndrome that were not appearing on their lists and were therefore not receiving a shielding letter or were not receiving an invitation to vaccine.

So there is this notion that's often referred to across our community and other charities of the invisibility of people with Down syndrome. So I think one of the issues is that data collection needs to be significantly improved. There are significant gaps in knowing where people with Down's syndrome, who are
a vulnerable community, who are significantly marginalised -- knowing where they are, and that has to -- we would argue that has to be prioritised going forward and, certainly as part of any new planning for any new emergency, that has to become a priority. So we were very much doing that retrospectively in the pandemic because we knew from families contacting us that they hadn't received a shielding letter or they hadn't been in any contact with the vaccination as it started to roll out. So I think this issue of gaps in data is very significant for people with Down's syndrome and more broadly for people with learning disabilities in Scotland.

We often say that we know there are 4,500 to 5,000 people with Down syndrome in Scotland, but we quickly support that with a qualification that that is almost certainly a very significant underestimate because of the gaps in data. So while resources are really important and directing those resources, I think of equal importance is addressing the invisibility of many people with Down's syndrome by improving data collection and ensuring those gaps are closed.
Q. Thank you. Now, I'd like to move on to the impact of school and day service closures, and I think it relates back to this issue as well of parents having to take
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everything on themselves. A lot of parents were having to home-school their children who didn't have health or genetic conditions. Where parents were trying to home-school their children who have Down's syndrome, particularly if they also had other children, presumably that would be more demanding, and you mention there was an abundance of general materials for home-schooling children but that those children with Down syndrome found those materials overwhelming. Am I correct in understanding that those materials were of limited benefit to those children with Down's syndrome and, if that's correct, is it your view that education authorities should have developed more specific materials?
A. We're definitely of a view - and families have told us this -- that the home-schooling support was not at all adequate, and there will be exceptions to that. We should acknowledge that. But across the board what we were hearing was that the needs - - the specific needs of our community and the wider learning disability community weren't really properly recognised in terms of resources that were being made available.

So there seemed to be this rush to just get as much resources to families as possible without at the same time thinking, "How do we need to adapt this resource
for people who have additional support needs?". So in many instances parents found themselves having to invent that themselves. It was a consistent feature at that time when young people were being home-schooled. It was a consistent feature that families were reporting just feeling completely overwhelmed. They had the 24/7 responsibility as an unpaid carer and now they were being asked to take on responsibility to home-school with resources that didn't really facilitate that in any effective way. So many of our families simply pushed that information to one side because it overwhelmed them.

That's a common feature of some public institutions, who I think are motivated to say, "We must get as much information as possible to all of our families and to all of our communities", but we would encourage them to step back and understand how that information is delivered, how it is made inclusive and how it is made relevant to the particular communities. And there was no nationally consistent effort around all of that. So we have been clear in the submission that we think, going forward, there needs to be some sort of national standards agreed about what that looks like. Our view is that people with additional support needs were not heavily considered in a prioritised way within the
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efforts made by education authorities, and certainly that's what families told us and they felt very -- with exceptions, there are exceptions to that. We know that -- but they felt very abandoned, is the word they often used when talking to us.
Q. Thank you. For the parents themselves, you say that employment gives them a moment where - - and you're hesitant to use the word -- but you say where they can be normal, and that was lost, so they were, as you've said, $24 / 7$ carers, but you also say that some of them found themselves out of a job as a result of their caring responsibilities. Did those parents decide to leave their jobs or were they terminated by their employers because of their other responsibilities ?
A. I think probably in most instances parents were trying to juggle too much and in the instances where some found themselves out of work, they probably took that decision because they weren't experiencing a flexible employer who was going to support their situation and they realised that they could not continue to work full-time while also being a $24 / 7$ carer.

So I think it would be fair to say that those families who did that, who found themselves out of work, probably initiated that as a survival mechanism. You know, that's how they thought they were going to be able
to survive. And while there will have been some employers that were really supportive, it was certainly the experience that a number of families found themselves having to give up work or certainly reduce significantly their hours of work in order to deal with the pressures they were under.
Q. Thank you. Now, there came a point, of course, where the restrictions started to ease and when children started to return to school and/or day services. You describe that return as being "horrific". Could you please tell us why you describe it in that way? In what way was it horrific for the children and for their families?
A. Many of the families advised us that they were really, really worried about the return to school because there wasn't clarity about how infection control would occur in school and they were really worried. So many of the families simply didn't let their children return to school, so they were then even more on their own, trying to do their best. But by this point, of course, they had realised that their young people were ten times more likely to die if they caught the virus, so their anxiety level was significantly heightened. So understanding that alongside a call to just get back to school when there was no clarity about how infection control would
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be managed and there was common $--I$ think it was quite common for people to hear that there was break-outs of COVID happening in the schools, either in the teaching staff or indeed with pupils -- so the consequence of that is that many of our families simply didn't return their children to school because they were just so terribly worried that, in the absence of clarity about how infection control would be managed, they would find -- they would expose their child or young person to even greater risk. So the consequence, the unfortunate consequence, is that they became even more isolated, they became even more worried and anxious and even more stressed, and that combination of things was described by a number of families as "quite horrific".
Q. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Can I ask a question at this stage, please, which really harks back to something you said a little while ago, Mr McConnell? It's simply a point of clarification . I fully understand what you've just been saying about the concern that parents of a Down's syndrome child had because of the vulnerability of their offspring when they were going back to school, but a little while ago you said that Down's syndrome sufferers were - - or those that had Down's syndrome were ten times more likely to contract COVID and the

## A. Thank you.

MS BAHRAMI: Thank you.
I'm just keeping an eye on time as well.
THE CHAIR: I'm going to obviously allow you a little
longer - - well, I'm going to allow you a full quota of time. We started late so you can finish late.
MS BAHRAMI: Thank you, my Lord.
THE CHAIR: But you are actually running towards the end on that basis.
MS BAHRAMI: Yes, thank you, my Lord.
Mr McConnell, can you tell us about the impact of the pandemic on pre- and post-natal care of those who were told while pregnant that their baby had
Down's syndrome? Was that at around the same level or was the support through the NHS reduced?
A. So when a family or a mother receives a diagnosis ante-natally or post-natally that their child may have Down syndrome or a confirmed diagnosis that their newborn child has Down's syndrome, a number of things swing into place quite quickly. So our charity will quite quickly be involved with that family and we quite often have referrals. So the physical connection with that family wasn't able to happen because of the restrictions for a number of those families where a baby was born with Down syndrome in that period. Like many families themselves, they were also very isolated themselves in that health setting, so it was particularly difficult for them at a time when support is really, really needed to help them make the adjustment and understand their maybe unexpected news for some of them - - because for some of them it is unexpected news. So I think it was particularly difficult for those newborns in the pandemic.

We certainly made sure that resources were reaching them, but one of the things that's really powerful for new families is putting parents in contact with other parents, and while we were able to do that online, it's really powerful for a parent to meet another parent who has been through the experience and we were unable to do that. So that's a significant element that was missing
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from their reasonable care at that point in their lives
Q. Thank you. I want to move on to speak about the clinical frailty scale. Now, my understanding is that that scale is designed to apply to people who are perhaps elderly or who have a condition that is terminal and they are close to the end of their life, but during the pandemic you found that it was being applied to those with Down syndrome and your organisation took action for that. When you contacted the Government, how did you find the response and how quickly did they react?
A. So I would have to say that they responded in shock initially, when we contacted them to make them aware that a number of families had reported to us that their loved one was possibly not going to be prioritised for treatment. They were in hospital but they were not going to be prioritised because somebody had inappropriately, completely inappropriately, used the clinical frailty scale just because the person had Down syndrome, and that's a wholly inappropriate use. And indeed I have to say they moved very quickly and guidance came out to say that the clinical frailty scale should not be used in determining support and treatment for people with learning disabilities and in particular people with Down syndrome.

So I have to say that happened very quickly, that
that guidance came out. Of course it was just guidance and we're always aware that, when it's guidance, it doesn't carry a statutory -- it wasn't a statutory instrument, and the consequence of that is we then redouble our efforts to make sure people know locally that this guidance has come out. But, similar to my earlier comments, the gap between that national guidance coming out and local implementation was very varied and of course there's that substantive point that it remains guidance as opposed to an instruction or a statutory instrument, if you like.
Q. You make the point in your statement that generally across primary care -- and I think implied in that also is in hospital care -- that some seem to view the lives of those with Down's syndrome as less worthy than others. And you give an example of a man in his 20 s who attended the cardiologist with his mother, and the cardiologist, during the pandemic, said, "I do not know whether it's worth operating on someone like him". It's quite a profound statement, even if they're not mistakenly using the clinical frailty scale. What happened in that case? Did the young man get the treatment that he required?
A. So my understanding is he did get the treatment he
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required but it required an intervention from us as a charity to explain why that was a wholly inappropriate response. This is an issue that our community sadly live with day in, day out. There are many great health practitioners, many great medical professionals, who understand the value of people with Down's syndrome and who understand that Down's syndrome is a genetic condition -- it is not a disease, it is not an illness, it is a genetic condition -- and that what you need to focus on is the health conditions that might be associated with that, but never ever use Down syndrome as a reason not to treat people or not to prioritise them for treatment.

We know that, despite the efforts of the last 40 years, where we have extended life expectancy of people with Down syndrome -- when the charity started, life expectancy was just 20 years. Today life expectancy is 60 -plus $/ 70$-plus - - but it remains the case that, for people with Down's syndrome, they continue to die on average 28 years younger than the general population and, in the majority of those cases, those deaths are preventable and certainly premature. And we know from research conducted by the University of Glasgow that there is often ignorance and prejudice about the condition that results in people having wholly
inappropriate views about the individual who just happens to have Down syndrome. So the person was supported but it required a very heavy intervention by our charity to bring about a different change in circumstances.
Q. And so these views exist generally but, during times of stress on the NHS or during pandemics, it just becomes much more prevalent. And presumably if somebody isn't used to working with your organisation, then they have to either deal with this themselves or just accept the view of the clinician that their child isn't someone worth carrying out this treatment on?
A. So we're very clear that at best it's ignorance that creates that view of a clinician but actually, in some cases, it's definitely prejudice and discrimination. So we work very hard as a charity to tackle that through training. This is an issue that has existed for our community long before the pandemic came along, but it amplified -- it was amplified. We were shocked to discover how quickly it came to the surface and how prevalent it was in the pandemic. So we've always known it 's there, but we were quite shocked, and the most obvious example of that was in the conversations around do not resuscitate orders.
Q. Yes, and I actually wanted to come on to that now.
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## THE CHAIR: You have about ten minutes.

 MS BAHRAMI: Thank you, my Lord.The do not attempt cardio-pulmonary resuscitation or DNACPR, you mention in your statement that a seriously ill woman in her 80 s received a call from the GP in respect of her fit and healthy son who was in his 40 s , with the GP stating that she wanted to place a DNACPR decision on the woman's son's file, and the woman, you say, was quite surprised by that. She perhaps -- you imply that she perhaps expected a call in respect of herself, not her son. Do you think that that was an isolated incident or do you think that these conversations in respect of people with Down's syndrome were taking place very frequently?
A. So we definitely know it wasn't an isolated incident. We know that a number of families had unsolicited calls from - in this instance, that particular example, from the GP's practice. The mum in that instance was actually very confused as to why the conversation was happening because her own health was extremely compromised. Sadly she's no longer with us. She has passed away. So she was confused why the call was about her son, who is in his 40 s and a very fit, very active, healthy man, who in fact had very -- had no significant health conditions. So she moved from that position of
confusion, reached out to us, to a position of real anger because she could only -- her only rationale for that conversation taking place is because the GP that made contact had decided that, because her son had Down syndrome, that, "Maybe we should just put" - - if you forgive me for using the short term, "do not resuscitate" -- "a do not resuscitate order in place just in case", and it's completely wrong. It is completely unacceptable and it reveals terrible bias -terrible bias - - and frankly we would say prejudice against somebody who has Down syndrome.

We moved very quickly to escalate that within Scottish Government and within Public Health Scotland. I have to be honest and say that the response we had to the clinical frailty scale issue was quite rapid. I'm probably less clear what the response was on the do not resuscitate orders, but I know that guidance was eventually issued after a number of months to be clear that, while people with Down syndrome are part of society in general and we know that in society in general there will be times for conversations about the appropriateness or not of a do not resuscitate order, it can never be justified to have that conversation just because the person has Down syndrome. Down syndrome is not an illness, it's not a disease. It's a genetic
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condition.
Q. To your knowledge, did the GPs listen when people said they didn't want this? Because we know that clinicians are able to place such notices on people's files regardless of agreement. Best practice is that they discuss it. But, in these cases, did GPs proceed to just place these notices on people's files or following a conversation with the families did they agree that it wasn't appropriate?
A. I think our recollection is that, following another heavy intervention, most stepped back. We couldn't be certain, though, that these orders weren't -- and we certainly know of one family where an order was put in place, wholly inappropriately, without the knowledge of the family, so that was completely unacceptable.
Q. Yes. And you say that eventually perhaps some communications were put out that this was inappropriate. Where a notice was placed on a file, do you know whether that led to GPs revisiting previous decisions that were based solely on an individual having Down's syndrome or do those individuals still have DNACPR decisions on their file?
A. We don't know for certain, and one of our challenges is that we -- the families who reach us, we often believe there are other families who don't reach out to us, who
may be, because of other pressures they have in their lives, be very deferential to that clinician's viewpoint. So we do know that, even if there's one family that reaches us, we have to respond because we suspect there are many families who haven't reached out to us and find themselves in a similar position. So I can't say with certainty whether those orders still sit on their files or not. I think it's probably for others to answer that question.
Q. Thank you. Thank you very much for your time. We have in your statement as well lessons that you believe should be learned and we've covered some of those in the course of your evidence and we will take all of that, of course, into account, even the points that we haven't covered. Is there anything in particular that you're keen to emphasise that we haven't discussed already?
A. Well, thank you for that and thank you for the opportunity today. I do want to go on record and say that this has been a really supportive experience, meeting with all the staff at every stage. Lord Brailsford, in this process, and the staff in the Inquiry have been enormously supportive and helpful in allowing us to bring these issues out and give voice to people who very rarely are heard from in terms of people with Down's syndrome.
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I think the most important thing that we must learn and recognise is that there remains a view -- and while we've made progress, there remains a view that people with Down syndrome are not as equal as other members of society, and we really need to be vigilant in the planning -- in the new planning for any future pandemic or any future national emergency. I think our sector should be much more closely involved in the planning, much more respected as an equal partner in that planning process. For many of us, it felt things were being done to us and we were reacting all the time. So I think, going forward, a really important lesson is to recognise and value the role of charities like ours in planning for a future emergency and to really value and appreciate us in every stage of coping with a future emergency going forward.

Fundamentally we believe people with Down syndrome are people of immense potential. We believe they have an awful lot to teach us and we have a lot still to learn from them, so we must do everything in our power to protect and safeguard them in any future national emergency.
MS BAHRAMI: Thank you very much for taking the time to join us today.
A. Thank you.

```
THE CHAIR: Yes, indeed. Thank you, Mr McConnell, for your
        time. I'm sorry you were delayed this morning at the
        start.
A. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Very good. Right, we'll have about }15\mathrm{ minutes
    which means probably just before quarter to 12. Thank
    you very much indeed.
(11.22 am)
                    (A short break)
(11.42 am)
THE CHAIR: Good morning, Mr Stephen. Can you hear me all
        right?
MR STEPHEN: Good morning, my Lord. Yes, I can.
            BARONESS FRASER OF CRAIGMADIE (called)
THE CHAIR: Good morning, Ms Fraser. I'm very sorry for the
    delay in hearing your evidence this morning. We
    experienced -- I don't know if it was computer or
    internet difficulties but one or t'other. We've held
    you back and I'm sorry for that.
A. No problems.
THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Stephen, when you're ready.
MR STEPHEN: Thank you. I'm obliged, my Lord.
                    Questions by MR STEPHEN
MR STEPHEN: Good morning. Can I ask you to confirm your
        full name, please?
(A short break)
```
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    A. Yes, my name is Stephanie Mary Fraser.
Q. And your full title is "Baroness Fraser of Craigmadie",
but I think your content to be called "Stephanie" for
the purposes of today.
A. I'm completely happy with that, thank you.
Q. I'm obliged. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: My apologies, Lady Fraser. I wasn't aware.
A. That's all right, my Lord.
MR STEPHEN: Your age and contact details are known to the
Inquiry so I won't ask you about those, and you've
already helpfully provided a written statement. For the
record, the Inquiry reference number for that statement
is $\mathrm{SCl}-\mathrm{WT} 0461-000001$. Are you content for that written
statement and the oral evidence you're going to give
today to constitute your evidence to the Inquiry?
A. I am.
Q. Are you happy for that evidence to be recorded and
published?
A. I am.
Q. Thank you. And everything you said in that statement
and indeed today will be taken into account by the
Inquiry, even if there's something that we don't touch
on.
Final reminder, just on housekeeping, I suppose, is
there is a restriction order in place so please don't
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A. Yes, my name is Stephanie Mary Fraser.
Q. And your full title is "Baroness Fraser of Craigmadie"
but I think your content to be called "Stephanie" for the purposes of today.
Q. I'm obliged. Thank you.
A. That's all right, my Lord.

MR STEPHEN: Your age and contact details are known to the
mention any individual names when I'm asking you questions. If it's a staff member, please refer to them as such, rather than their name.

Now, the organisation you're representing today is Cerebral Palsy Scotland; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Formerly that organisation was known as "Bobath Scotland" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which leads me to ask you two questions: what is Bobath and why the change of name?
A. Bobath is a therapy concept that is internationally recognised as a management for cerebral palsy. It was the first therapy concept that -- I mean, cerebral palsy is caused by damage to the infant brain. The damage to the brain doesn't change throughout life but how cerebral palsy affects you and how that damage affects you can become progressively worse as you age. The Bobath concept was the first to look at actually functionally and clinically functionally how someone with cerebral palsy was able to function, that actually by combining multi-disciplinary physiotherapy, occupational therapy and speech and language therapy, you could improve the function of what somebody with cerebral palsy could do, whereas previously people had
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just sort of thought, "You can't do anything about the brain injury so there's nothing to be done".

So Bobath Scotland was established in 1995 by a group of parents, in conjunction actually with NHS partners, to bring the therapy concept to Scotland so that parents could access it. We operate from a centre in Glasgow but we cover the whole of Scotland. What we've realised is that services for people with cerebral palsy are concentrated in paediatric services, they're concentrated around child development and the development of the body, and once you reach sort of the age of 16, but, you know, adulthood, there's a feeling that there's nothing more to be done, and so there was nothing for adults. So, from 2012, our organisation has been concentrating on how do we support adults and how do we develop a specialist service for adults.

As the organisation grew, it became apparent that we needed to better represent all the activities we do because we do not just provide therapy. We provide information, we provide support, we bring the community together, we run an annual Cerebral Palsy Scotland conference, we raise awareness of cerebral palsy, we lobby for better policy and services to improve the lives of people with cerebral palsy, and so we had a long-term strategic plan to change the name to
Q. Yes, which we'll come on to. Indeed. Thank you.

Your current position is chief executive officer of Cerebral Palsy Scotland?
A. That is correct.
Q. How long have you held that position for?
A. I joined in January 2012.
Q. What does that role involve?
A. So I am responsible for -- you know, I am responsible for the organisation. I am responsible to a board of trustees, but I am responsible for the staff, for our beneficiaries, for the services that we provide, for the strategic direction, and basically the buck stops with me.
Q. I think you say in your statement, in addition to your role as CEO, you also chair the Scottish Government's National Advisory Committee for Neurological Connections.
A. I do. When that committee was formed, which I think was in 2016, I was appointed deputy chair and I became the chair in November 2019.

53
Q. And you're also a former trustee for the Neurological Alliance Scotland as well?
A. Yes, and Cerebral Palsy Scotland is a member of the Neurological Alliance.
Q. I think you say in your statement that those connections stood you in rather good stead when we of course come to the pandemic.
A. Yes, they did.
Q. You've touched there already on what cerebral palsy is, so thank you for doing that. I was going to ask you that question. How many people in Scotland are living with cerebral palsy, just for background?
A. The short answer is we have no idea. The longer answer is that cerebral palsy is the most common cause of physical disability in children. Around 1 in 500 births every year in Scotland will result in a diagnosis of cerebral palsy. But cerebral palsy is an umbrella condition and because, as I said, it's caused by damage to the infant brain, there tends to be a wait and see procedure before a diagnosis may or may not be given.

I mean, we sometimes see adults in their $30 \mathrm{~s}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$, 50s, who have never had a formal diagnosis, so, you know, something may or may not happen that is detectable and, on average, it's picked up because the development of the child is not progressing as we would expect and,
therefore, a diagnosis tends to be given most commonly around the age of two. But, as $I$ said, there is this wait and see, you know, because maybe -- the infant brain is an amazing thing and it may just rewire in some different way. You know, there are people who are born who have huge issues at birth who don't develop cerebral palsy and others where, you know, we don't actually know when the damage happened.

So that's one of the issues that -- you know, diagnosis isn't uniform. There isn't a consistent way of achieving that, and, you know, because how people are affected varies so widely, their access and need for services vary so widely. So we do not know where people live, how many people there are in Scotland and how they are consuming services. Some lead very fulfilled lives. Cerebral palsy doesn't kill you. You know, your life expectancy is as normal. But the other things that it might cause and the issues that it might cause you to develop as you age can be extremely significant. You
know, this point about -- some people need services every day, very -- you know, a huge amount of services for the rest of their lives.
Q. And I think you make that point, don't you, that everyone is different?
A. Yes.
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Q. Just because you've met one person with cerebral palsy doesn't mean you've met everybody?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you also mention that there's no drug or procedure that makes that disappear --
A. No. I mean, the thing about cerebral palsy, it's nobody's fault or tends to be nobody's fault. It's bad luck. It can happen to anybody. It doesn't matter how much money you've got, whether you took folic acid when you were pregnant or not. None of that matters. It is what it is. There's no fancy drug or something -- you know, anything to suddenly be developed and it's not going to go away.
Q. Thank you. Can I ask you what services your organisation provides to those with cerebral palsy? I think you've touched on a bit of this already, so I don't necessarily want you to repeat yourself, but is there anything you'd like to emphasise that -- you know, how you assist those that do have cerebral palsy?
A. We provide one-to-one therapy services for families, and that involves their carers and anybody, you know, involved in their life, so it could be siblings, it could be teaching assistants, it could be local community therapists. So that is multi-disciplinary therapy depending on what their goals or needs are, that
yes, and we campaign for better services for people with cerebral palsy.
Q. Thank you. Your organisation's 25 th anniversary was in 2019. You touched on this at the outset. You had an anniversary ball, I think, just under the wire, as it were, in February or March 2020.
A. In February - - in February we managed to do our last fundraising event pre-COVID, yes.
Q. And you talk in your statement, at paragraph 33, about the optimism that you had about the future. The pandemic then, of course, immediately strikes. How did you personally feel at that point and what were the immediate actions as an organisation you took in light of the pandemic?
A. Well, I remember that fundraising ball and we were all slightly nervous about whether we could shake hands or how did we greet people, so we sort of could see that something was coming our way, and one of the things that sort of concerned us was that cerebral palsy was being mentioned as a condition very early on by both UK and Scottish governments. So in the media there was a -you know, it was given as an example of, "You might be more vulnerable to this virus if you have a condition like cerebral palsy". So what we saw was a huge spike in enquiries to us as to what we could do. We also saw
a huge raising of the level of anxiety of the people that were coming to see us and were engaging with our services.

So, you know, we'd already started thinking about - you know, there was things like the hand-washing advice. Well, if you can't use your hands -- and many people with cerebral palsy find it very difficult to use their hands -- you know, how do you help someone wash their hands? There was discussion -- so we were publishing on our website sort of blogs on how to support people to follow that. And, similarly, you know, there were discussions about should we or should we not be wearing masks, and that has an implication for people with CP, not only because they often have communication difficulties , and some have cognitive and difficulty in understanding people, so, you know, what was the right thing to do on that?

So we'd had a little, you know, feeling that actually we needed to think about these things. We were fortunate that it was the end of our financial year. We'd just finished some work in Dumfries and Galloway, so, you know, the next - - if we locked down -- so the centre was locked down and formally closed from 23 March, but, in the week before that, people had started to cancel appointments and be working -- wanting
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to work from home and things like that, and actually, because of the timing, you know, we had an awful lot of report writing and administration to catch up. We didn't have huge amounts of in-person appointments. Staff had annual leave to take before the end of the financial year. So there was a bit of managing that but, when the restrictions hit, the first thing we had to do was - - you know, I had to think about the safety of our beneficiaries and the safety and well-being of our staff.

We weren't set up to suddenly go to remote working. We had some laptops, but not enough, obviously, like everybody $--I$ think like everybody else. The therapists all had their own iPads but then there were issues around, you know, how did they access the server, how did they access secure clinical data and how is it safe to allow people to work that. And communicate -you know, we were report-writing and communicating back to the families what we'd done, so what was the safe way to do that without the IT gatekeeping of our - - so we had to manage our way around that.

Very quickly I was thinking, right -- we didn't think -- I remember talking to some of the trustees -we didn't think this was going to be a few weeks and then we'd be back. We did understand pretty early on
that this was going to be a bit of a long-term haul, and so my ambition was to get through whatever it was with my staff in tact and the organisation still in existence. So, you know, I remember my chairman saying to me "Cash is king", so we did things like cancel all the organisation's direct debits. We thought, if somebody wanted our money, they could come and ask for it. You know, we needed to be in control of what we needed to do.

The early weeks were very much in respond mode. We had to -- you know, I was thinking about the well-being of the organisation and the staff. The therapists and the admin staff were bringing to me these increased enquiries, these issues that were bubbling up, you know, so we were thinking, "Right, how do we best help our beneficiaries? How do we stay in touch with this population that are clearly worrying about what the effects of the virus are on them?". So again we published through our website, which, remember, was going through a rehaul anyway -- we put up $--I$ think we were one of the very first people to put up advice on COVID and cerebral palsy, and we were able to say, you know, "The most important thing is to stay fit and well and actually your best defence against COVID ..."-which we didn't have any clinical knowledge of what
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COVID was, but we wanted to reassure and encourage our beneficiaries to stay as healthy and as well as possible.

We had to quickly, obviously, take the decision about whether we were going to go ahead with the rebrand or not. We decided that we should because we'd done all the work. It was in place to, you know, go live. The rebranding of the website was different because we needed to keep advice front and centre of any website and we needed to keep refreshing it all the time, you know, because what we did was we focused on what we were hearing from the people that were contacting us and trying to respond to that and publish it as widely as we could.

So by about early April we'd sort of identified key tasks that we need to do and communications was high up there. Funding and how we kept financially solvent and providing a core administration so that we could -- you know, we had a system from our remote working as to how did we deal with enquiries and who was the right person to respond and all that kind of stuff and how did we continue some sort of clinical input to people that needed that. So, you know, that was the initial,
"Right, how do we do that?", while we were all at home.
Q. Right. Thank you. You mentioned staff in your answer
and funding. I'd like to ask you about both. Did you rely upon the furlough scheme, for example? Did you maintain your staffing levels --
A. Oh, completely. I could never imagine something like the furlough scheme and I can only describe it as a godsend. It enabled us to -- for example, some members of staff had their own caring responsibilities and just wouldn't have been able to be at home and work at the same time, so we were able to give some staff levels of comfort that their job would still be in place but they didn't need to worry about us. It enabled us to look forward and budget without just seeing everything fall off a cliff, and we used the furlough scheme for as long as we possibly could and, you know, brought - - we were able to identify, "Okay, what's the skeleton staff we need? What are the tasks we need to do?", and we were able to fund it.

So, you know, who was and wasn't furloughed was based on need and it gave us the most immense comfort to know that actually, you know, our biggest cost is our staff salaries and it was wonderful to know that that was sort of taken care of, thank you very much.
Q. At paragraph 45 of your statement, you talk about the stark contrast of pre-pandemic, where you were welcoming people into your centre - - I think you said you were
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based in Glasgow every day and saw people every day -to suddenly not seeing anybody. Can I ask you how you attempted -- you touched a little bit on that with the website, but how you attempted to replicate, to the extent that you could, the services that you'd provided previously to the sort of online space that you were now facing?
A. Well, we had - - during 2019 we had managed, as a third sector organisation, to sign up and use the NHS -I think it was called "Attend Anywhere" in those days It's now called "NHS Near Me". And we had been able to sign up to that platform, which was - I I mean, thank goodness we had because that was a safe and secure clinical consulting online platform. I know other organisations were trying to do, you know, sessions via Zoom or whatever it was, but the Near Me platform gave us that ability to run virtual sessions. So that meant that from the beginning of lockdown we were able to offer virtual clinical sessions.

We did -- what we found was that -- what we were used to is being in a room, whether it was in our centre or whether it was in Dumfries and Galloway or anywhere else or in somebody's home -- what we were used to is working hands-on and with the team around, whether it's the child or the adult with carers or family or
whatever, but, suddenly, no, it was virtual only. But it allowed us to deal with specific issues that came up. So, you know, for example I always think of a family in the Western Isles who had a child through lockdown who was diagnosed with CP and we were really their only contact with, "How do I..." -- this wasn't -- you know, it wouldn't have been the child that they expected to have, so what did they need to know as they were looking after their child.

We had - - very often, again, we were the only people who, you know, people could bring their issues with. So as time went on, sometimes it was -- you know, at the beginning it tended to be very physical issues that people were concerned about, so, "I'm getting stiffer", "I'm in more pain", "I think I'm growing out of my equipment" or whatever it might be, but as time went on, other issues became apparent, particularly, "I don't feel confident about going outside", "I don't want to let people into my house because I'm nervous of infection". So, you know, being able to offer virtual consultations for our beneficiaries I think was hugely appreciated and thank goodness we could do it.

For our therapists it was very hard because they are all trained to, as I said, be hands-on, to work collaboratively and to -- you know, we had to go from
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having, if you like, the satisfaction of being able to have time and a number of appointments with people to unpick a number of different things and explore goals or whatever it might be and try things out and all the rest of it, which was how we'd worked before, to suddenly having to identify, "Well, what's the biggest problem that this person is facing and what can we do clinically to assist them to help it?". So it was going from unpicking lots of clinical issues to saying, "No, no, we need to identify one and concentrate on how do we help that for now". So it was a very difficult way of working and I have to pay tribute to my clinical staff, that they, you know, stepped up to the plate and were absolutely wonderful.
Q. Thank you. You talked earlier about the anxiety that people were facing, I think partly you'd said due to the messages that was coming out I think from both the UK and Scottish Government, I think you say at paragraph 48 of your statement. At that time what was your reaction to that label, that risk assessment that was given by Government to your own clinicians? Was that an assessment that you agreed with, that those with CP would be more vulnerable to COVID?
A. I don't think any of us knew. I don't think Government knew and I don't think we knew. I did -- this is where
sort of, you know, my predecessor as chair of the National Advisory Committee is —— went on to chair or whatever he is of the Association of British Neurologists, and so I was able to speak to people like that and to people in Government.

I mean, Scottish Government had in post an absolutely wonderful person who was the head of neurological services in the clinical priorities team and -- you know, so people like that, we were able to have a discussion and everybody was feeling their way. I think what we all instinctively understood was that, the healthier you could remain and the better you could be, then, you know, the more likely you were to have a better defence against the virus.

I think the other thing that was understood, particularly by us, was that, because cerebral palsy is such an umbrella, that some people were clearly going to be far more vulnerable than others, but just by labelling everybody with CP, that wasn't terribly helpful.

The other thing that we ve mentioned is, because there is no register, there is no marker on your GP record that you have a diagnosis of CP , adult social care services don't have a clue who, under their great banner of people that are consuming adult disability

## 67

services, actually have CP versus any other condition, so therefore, you know, just highlighting a condition wasn't helpful either to them, it wasn't really helpful to us and nobody was really thinking about, "Well, is this right?".

As time went on, the Scottish Government produced specific guidance for people with neurological conditions and we were able to work with them on the cerebral palsy part of that, and a lot of that was written by, for example, the Association of British Neurologists, so we were able to sort of pull together the sort of clinical thinking as it was being developed.
Q. You touched on the blanket approach which you didn't necessarily think was entirely helpful. Is that perhaps a lesson learned, would you say, that a more tailored or nuanced approach would have been appropriate as opposed to perhaps putting everybody with CP into one bracket?
A. I think the problem is, if you don't know where anybody is and you don't know what condition they have, even a tailored approach isn't going to work because -- you know, my real issue was that there was no thought given to people with long-term conditions, so therefore there was no consultation about, "Well, what would keep you well?". Now, I'm not sure how any of that would change if you don't know where the people with long-term
conditions are and you don't know what those long-term conditions are, and there is very limited specialist knowledge in Scotland of aging with cerebral palsy apart from actually in our organisation. So until that changes, you know, it just won't be possible to tailor anything.
Q. You say "until that changes" and in your statement in a couple of places you mention about the lack of a register, if you like. Is that something - - again, we're looking at lessons learned as an Inquiry. Is that something you -- an omission, a gap, you think needs to be addressed?
A. Yes, and what I find really frustrating is that it is actually better for children. So Scotland have something called the "CPIPS", which is children with cerebral palsy -- it's actually a hip surveillance survey. So it's not a register, it's not everything, but almost every child with a diagnosis of cerebral palsy is on the CPIPS register in paediatric NHS services, and all NHS areas across Scotland use the CPIPS survey. What I find really frustrating is, the moment these children get referred into adult services, that's just forgotten about. The data just goes nowhere. So my question is always: why not? It's not the total answer, but it's a building block that
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I believe would be a wonderful thing to keep going. THE CHAIR: Can I interject at this moment? You're the second witness this morning, Lady Fraser, who has mentioned the possibility, the desirability, of a register, in your case cerebral palsy, the gentleman that gave evidence earlier on, Down's syndrome -A. Yes.

THE CHAIR: -- where likewise there is no register kept. I quite understand the persuasive arguments you've just been advancing, it would be certainly advantageous. But, obviously, that is something which might fall within the remit of this Inquiry in relation to recommendations, but registers of persons in a category have, as I'm sure you'll appreciate, potential pitfalls, both legalistic and practical and in relation to persons as well. Do you have views? I mean, you obviously have a view that it would be a good idea, but have you considered the potential pitfalls in instituting such a policy?
A. Yes, and I' m not sure a register as such is necessarily the right answer, but what I would say is that there is nowhere -- not even on somebody's clinical record that they have cerebral palsy. Now, the reason for that is because clinical records are all based on ICD coding and the coding records what causes -- you know, the cause of
something. So in the case of cerebral palsy, it might be that, you know, somebody has had an infant stroke, for example, in which case the stroke will be recorded, or a brain haemorrhage at birth, in which case that will be recorded. What isn't recorded is the consequences of that, and that's where the CPIPS survey that I was mentioning actually does a better job because it records the sort of functioning abilities of the child. And I suppose my frustration is -- you know, I agree with you, I'm not necessarily sure that registers are the answer, but I cannot understand why, in today's age of digital records and the data and information that we gather, that we can't do a better job.

And there's some interesting work actually that the Neurological Advisory Committee is currently doing on an epilepsy register, which is looking at -- it's cross-referencing pharmacy data with people that turn up to consultant appointments with primary care data and others. And I think that's the kind of thing I would like to see advanced for a condition like cerebral palsy. The problem is that we don't have specialist consultants that people go to once a year, as people with epilepsy or MS or Parkinson's or other neurological conditions do. But what we do have is this CPIPS register, which is an asset that the
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Scottish Government have invested in and we seem to be doing nothing with it in the adult space.

So I think there's huge potential for improvement of identification, and to come back to your point about, you know, that can sometimes be problematic, I completely agree, but people with cerebral palsy feel that they are not counted at the moment; they are invisible. They feel at the bottom of the pile for sort of -- you know, we don't have specialist consultants, we don't have clinical nurse specialists, they don't get called for annual reviews. There is this feeling that, you know, "Well, it's a physical developmental thing, the brain damage isn't going to change, so tough, you're just going to have to deal with it". And that is not right and that's not correct. And that's why these people, you know -- it was so frustrating during this time that cerebral palsy was being mentioned as a condition -- which I'm always thrilled it's mentioned as a condition - - because it's so common, I'm always delighted when people realise that -- but the knowledge of what the impact of cerebral palsy is for people is not well enough understood and that's the thing that I think we could change.
THE CHAIR: Thank you. That's very helpful.
You mentioned in the course of that answer some work different stages of it, and, you know, if you look at the Scottish Government's --I mean, all the work of the National Advisory Committee is published on the Scottish Government's website.
THE CHAIR: If you had an easy access to that information --
A. I think there's a link. There is a link --

THE CHAIR: If you could pass that on to my team, I would be very grateful and we can follow it up.
A. Yes.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate that.
MR STEPHEN: I'm obliged, my Lord.
Just to finish the thought before I move on to ask about something else, is it your view, then, that perhaps making the tweaks or changes that you've suggested where there is a gap at the moment would have made a tangible difference or perhaps made those with $C P$ more visible --
A. Yes.
Q. - - when the response to the pandemic was made?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. I want to ask you next about schools.

I don't think you pull any punches on this, so that's
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why I want to ask you about it. You certainly express the view that you hope that we never again close schools. This is at paragraph 60 of your statement. At paragraph 127 I think you go on to say that it was a disaster for the CP community. So I think the obvious question for me to ask you is why you hold that view.
A. I think -- the point is that schools for this population are more than about just education. So many therapy appointments happen within schools. So, you know, community physios, OTs, SLTs, work with children within a school setting. It means that things like equipment is seen and adjusted and all of that. Schools provide often, you know, the main social interaction for these children, that is where -- that's their only opportunity to be out and meet peers and interact with peers, let alone the fact that school provides quite significant respite for parents.

So I found it quite extraordinary that all these things stopped, that parents were left at home to -- you know, some of them might be trying to work from home, some of them might be trying to help siblings as well. At school some children with CP have one-to-one support to engage in learning throughout the day and all that stopped. It was just left to parents. For all those reasons, it left families unbelievably isolated, dealing
with problems that, you know, were just ignored, things like growing out of equipment, or it disengaged these children from the curriculum, you know, because, if you have a support worker to help you engage in learning and suddenly you're at home with your parents and your siblings and all the rest of it, that's pretty tough, putting it mildly and it exacerbated the isolation that these families felt.
Q. What would you suggest, then, might have been a different course to take, a middle ground or alternative to what was actually done then in relation to schools?
A. Well, I mean, I'm sad that home visits -- in-person visits didn't happen. I think people that required one-to-one support at school, it was extraordinary that they didn't have home visits at home. Families reported to us about -- you know, people would phone them up, "Are you all right?", you know, and in our very British way we'd say, "Yes, we're fine", kind of thing, but actually there was no real interaction there that we could see.

I think the other thing layering on top of that is always the anxiety. You know, families were already unbelievably anxious about their vulnerable child and so therefore there was an anxiety about, well, "Even if
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there was a ..." -- because I think technically these children could have attended schools, but, you know, put on top of that that your child is more liable to be vulnerable because of their cerebral palsy -- so families, you know, were absolutely -- so many I can think of that just stayed at home and stayed at home far, far longer than any of the rest of us, even after schools opened and restrictions lifted. You know, there was a real nervousness about going back into that environment, and I think that was caused partly because, as I say, cerebral palsy was being pointed to, but also there was no dialogue really with families about how -what would have made it better for them, what would have -- what could have kept them engaged or, you know, what did they need. It's back to the nobody asked these families what did they need to continue, you know, educating their children, in terms of development and all of that. There was just no thought given. So that's why I feel quite strongly about it.
Q. I'm glad I asked. Yes, you said no one asked. You yourself as an organisation carried out a number of surveys, as I understand, and we see that referenced at paragraph 65 of your statement. What did the results of those surveys reveal to you in general terms and also I think about mental health - - because we've talked
a little bit about physical health. You've talked about things like physiotherapy, speech and language perhaps not being offered when schools were closed. What were you seeing in terms of the results of those surveys on the mental health side?
A. We did three surveys during this period, so May and September 2020 and then again in February 2021. What we found in the May survey was that the biggest issues tended to be physical, so they were stiffness, they were pain, they were, you know, things like growing out of equipment or splints or whatever. What we found as time went on, that the reported issues of decline in mental health sort of -- you know, rose significantly. And what was important was that this decline in well-being wasn't restricted to the person with CP. It was felt - - I mean, I think I've got a figure here of $44 \%$ felt it had also impacted on other people in their family. You know, people reported that, if they had someone with CP, a child or adult, at home, then the whole family stayed at home and were restricted in what they did.

We looked at care arrangements. You know, care arrangements obviously were totally scaled back at the beginning, but, by February 2021, 63\% were reporting that the care arrangements they'd had pre-COVID still
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had not been reinstated. Very common was this feeling of isolation. Whether it was a choice or whether it was that's how they felt, I don't know. But the feelings of being isolated because of their condition increased and what also concerned us was access to healthcare. So, you know, $17 \%$ reported they hadn't even been able to speak to their GP or other healthcare professional. Appointments were cancelled and not rearranged, sometimes at very short notice. So this lack of access to what I would consider essential health services wasn't there and that was very concerning to us.
Q. And so therefore would you -- is your evidence, then, would you suggest that a reconsideration or a different approach should have been taken to what was deemed essential ?
A. Completely. I think -- you know, it astounds me that we all decided that it was clearly essential that we all had access to a supermarket and could go and buy our food and milk and toilet paper and all the rest of it, but, for our population, access to physiotherapy, occupational therapy, and actually, you know, being able to access that through venues like schools rather than just in healthcare settings, that is essential.
Q. Thank you. To complete that, were you ever asked for input into what should be deemed essential? Did your
organisation ever provide an input to the
Scottish Government about what that should be or not?
A. You know, when asked, we provided an opinion whenever we could, but the feeling we got is that the different teams we were talking to at Scottish Government -- so my main is interaction was through the clinical priorities team, who were as helpful as they possibly could be, but, you know, we also had interaction with, for example, the shielding team, who seemed to have been, I suppose unsurprisingly, but assembled at the very last minute to look at this, had no prior knowledge of this area and, you know, it was -- any input we had, it seemed to be well received but it didn't necessarily go anywhere. So this lack of co-ordination about who did what and who was listening to whom was -- it was difficult to understand whether anything we said was landing with any impact.
Q. So your thoughts were given but not necessarily actioned, I think is what you're saying; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. You've mentioned that word "shielding".

I was going to come on to that anyway so let's do that.
When shielding was first announced, was it clear, in
your view at least, how that applied to those with CP?
A. No. I think the thing with shielding is that there was
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perhaps a lack of understanding both for the people who were being asked to shield and from the people who were asking them to shield what it actually entailed. As I say, we did have meetings with the Scottish Government shielding team and we did raise the issues around cerebral palsy being an umbrella condition, that some people would be very badly affected and therefore possibly need to shield and others wouldn't. But the lack of being able to identify who any of these people were and where they were was going to be an issue.

What we found when shielding was announced was that, again, people who felt they were vulnerable -- because, remember, we'd been telling them since March that this population was vulnerable -- again, the anxiety rose. So the enquiries we got were from people who -- I think the other thing, if I remember correctly, the letters went out to ask people to shield not all at the same time, so, therefore, some people got letters and some people didn't. But for people with $C P$, they were being asked by very different professionals to shield or not, as the case may be. So the enquiries we got were, "Should I be shielding?" or "Who should I talk to about shielding?".

Now, we, as an organisation, were absolutely not in a place, nor did we want to be, to make that decision,
so we would refer people to their healthcare
professionals. But then there was an issue about
getting hold of their healthcare professionals. So not
everybody with CP has a consultant neurologist, not everybody with CP has a community AHP that they can talk
to. Many spoke to their GPs, but GPs do not have a specialist knowledge of CP. I mean, I don't want to denigrate any GP in this.

So what we found was many professionals, if they
were contacted by someone, would err on the side of caution and therefore people were being advised to shield. I just want to read something from one of our surveys that somebody -- a parent -- wrote in, you know:
"We were fortunate that my child's consultant still scheduled my child's routine appointment, which allowed us a very sensible and pragmatic discussion on practically interpreting shielding policy. I feel that all parents would have benefitted from such a discussion [as read]."

I think, now, that was a child who was clearly talking to a consultant paediatrician and children do have access to paediatricians. Adults do not. There isn't an equivalent, so -- you know, so therefore, who they should be talking to, it tended to be really ad hoc, really ad hoc. So we had people that were sent
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letters that were asked to shield, people that contacted us and/or their healthcare professionals to ask if they should be and, if they did that, our experience is that people tended to err on the side of caution, and then there was another group of people who felt so anxious about the whole thing they chose to shield themselves. Yes, whether that was right or wrong, I think there were lots of unintended consequences of shielding.
Q. Thank you. I used those words "ad hoc". Do you think therefore - - perhaps is there room for improvement -would there have been room for improvement there?
A. Well, I come back to my data. My point on data is that, if we understood where these people were, where they lived and what their level of function was, then we could have had a far more systemic approach to, you know, what could have been done and how they were communicated with because, if they were very mildly affected by CP, we could have communicated -- you know, healthcare professionals, local councils, could have communicated with them to reassure them. So on both ends of the spectrum, data would have been brilliant.
Q. Are those with CP who were asked to shield or, as you say, some people who perhaps chose to do so because they felt they needed to for anxiety reasons -- was there any particular consequences of having to do that that you
would highlight, adverse or not?
A. Well, mental health issues were significant. You know, feelings of isolation, feelings of anxiety. Access to any support and help and interaction about their condition was sort of non-existent. I mean, again, if I go back to our surveys, people were saying, "If I hadn't been able to talk to Cerebral Palsy Scotland, I don't know who else I could have spoken to about my condition". And so I think the mental health impact of shielding was enormous and, again, I come back to the fact that, if one person in the household had cerebral palsy and was either shielding or chose to shield, then we know of many instances where the whole family felt like that.

We know of families who then -- you know, shielding was over the summer, schools opened in August to an extent, but those that were shielding were not about to send their children back into the school environment nor were they advised to, and, you know, as a result of that we know of families who took a very long time to even leave their houses. I mean, we had one particular family we worked with, a good -- you know, I'm talking summer 2021, not 2020, and it was about, "Let's leave the house and go for a walk in the local park". You know, that was the level of anxiety that we were dealing
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with.
So I think the other thing is that in the adult population we saw adults who had chosen to move back in with elderly parents and so there was that combined effect of, you know, the older you were, the more susceptible you were being told you were. Ditto with cerebral palsy. So the isolation of those families and the stress that elderly parents felt caring for their adult child with CP, it just compounded because it went on and on and on and on.
Q. You mentioned the mental health impact or consequences there. On the physical side, is there any consequences you noticed also, people having to shield?
A. I think it's back to this access to what I've already said we would consider essential services. So, you know, the physical side, it's things like increased pain, increased stiffness, decline in function. The great thing with muscles and your body, if you don't use it, you lose it, and that is the same for people with CP. So if they're not able to, you know, be out and about, have access to physio or whatever it is that keeps them well -- I mean, some people, you know, accessed hydrotherapy, local swimming pools, whatever it is, and all those were shut too. So not being able to keep active had a physical issue, that once lost it's

.
Q. Yes. Were you able to help families, individuals,
with CP that were suffering these things at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that something you could assist with ?
A. So we work with clinical psychologists and we were able
to offer virtual - - and we still do -- we offer - - then
it was all through Near Me, and we were able to offer
appointments. Regarding the CP, I mean, where we're
clear is that we are not a general mental health
service. We are about, if your mental health is in
decline because of something to do with your cerebral
palsy, then we can assist and help with that, and we
have a clinical psychologist who was able to do that.
Q. Let me ask you this final question then on shielding: in
your view, was the balance struck correctly then on the
shielding guidance that was given -- given the
consequences that you've outlined, mental health,
physical, was the approach taken to shielding, in your
view, the correct one?

$$
85
$$

A. Well, if I speak completely personally, I am not convinced that we ever needed to shield so I'm not convinced the shielding policy was the right one. But that is a personal view and I think we are still dealing with the tail end of the issues that have arisen from that.
Q. Right, thank you.

THE CHAIR: You've got about 15 or so minutes left. MR STEPHEN: My Lord, a very timely intervention because I don't have any further questions for the witness.
THE CHAIR: You must be a mind reader.
MR STEPHEN: So I'm very grateful for your evidence today, both in writing and orally. This is your opportunity, I suppose, if there's anything you would like to add that we haven't covered or you would just like to emphasise before we conclude.
A. Well, first of all, I'm always grateful for the opportunity to speak about people with cerebral palsy because it is such a significant population and it is -you know, I call it the "Cinderella condition" because it is just forgotten about. My reflection on all of this is that it seemed that people -- throughout anything to do with COVID at all, people with long-term pre-existing health conditions were very, very low down the priority list for healthcare services and others,
and for many, with even these basic support services not continuing, that was what caused the biggest issues, not the COVID. And what depresses me is that they are still down - - low down on the priority today, so nothing has changed. So my hope is that it just might.
MR STEPHEN: Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I'm very grateful, Lady Fraser, for your most
helpful contribution. Thank you.
A. My pleasure.

THE CHAIR: Right. We shall come back --I think we're
scheduled to come back at 1.30 and I think that's
probably possible. Do you know that, Mr Stephen?
MR STEPHEN: I believe so, my Lord, yes.
THE CHAIR: Jolly good. Excellent. Thank you. 1.30 then.
(12.42 pm)
(The short adjournment)
( 1.30 pm )
THE CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Good afternoon,
Mr Dunlop.
MR DUNLOP: I'm just checking this mike is on. Yes, it is.
THE CHAIR: Can you hear me, Mr Dunlop?
MR DUNLOP: Yes, I can, thank you.
THE CHAIR: Good afternoon.
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DR CAREY LUNAN and DR CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS (called)
MR DUNLOP: Good afternoon. This afternoon, we have two witnesses speaking to one statement. We have
a Dr Williams and a Dr Lunan. Dr Lunan is joining us
remotely. My Lord, if it helps, the reference for the statement is SCI-WT0428-000001. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Now, good afternoon, Dr Lunan and Dr Williams.
DR LUNAN: Good afternoon.
THE CHAIR: Excellent. I can see you both. If you're
ready, Mr Dunlop, you can start, please.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. Questions by MR DUNLOP
MR DUNLOP: I wonder if you can provide the Inquiry with both your full names, please.
DR LUNAN: My name is Dr Carey Lunan.
DR WILLIAMS: And I'm Dr Christopher Morgan Williams.
MR DUNLOP: It might be helpful to explain for the benefit of the Inquiry that you both held the same position but during the pandemic. I understand we see in the statement in the table that's in paragraph 3 that, Dr Lunan, you held the post of chair during the period from - - well, the whole of 2020 and thereafter it was taken over by Dr Williams for the remainder of the period which we're interested in, which is 2021 and 2022 ; is that correct?

DR LUNAN: That's correct. 1
MR DUNLOP: To avoid -- I think we've spoken - - to avoid people speaking over each other, what I'll do is a sort of default, if you like. Given that you were involved in the earlier period, Dr Lunan, l'll maybe ask you to answer the questions and if Dr Williams has anything which he thinks he can usefully add, I' Il turn to Dr Williams. Obviously if the question is particularly geared towards 2021 or 2022, then l'll direct it in the first instance to Dr Williams.

Now, in the statement, it's explained that the Royal College represents 5,000 general practitioners in Scotland. Are all the general practitioners in Scotland a member of the Royal College?
DR LUNAN: No, they are not. It's a reasonable majority in Scotland but it's not all GPs in Scotland that are members of the college.
MR DUNLOP: Can you give us an approximate number of GPs that practise in Scotland?
DR LUNAN: There are just over 900 practices in Scotland. I think the percentage, certainly when I was chair, was between $60 \%$ and $70 \%$ of GPs were members, but I'm not sure what the current percentage is. It changes a bit from year to year.
MR DUNLOP: I maybe misheard you there. Did you say 9,000?
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DR LUNAN: No, 900 practices.
MR DUNLOP: 900 practices, sorry. And do you know how many GPs there are -- full-time equivalent GP posts?
DR LUNAN: I don't know that, no. I'm sorry.
MR DUNLOP: I'll direct this to you, Dr Lunan. At paragraphs 5 to 6 of the statement, you tell us that GP practices remained open throughout the pandemic and that face-to-face appointments were available where it was both "safe and appropriate". Could you tell us what, firstly, is meant by "safe" and what's meant, secondly, by "appropriate"?
DR LUNAN: So this was a very key part of the way that we had to change the way that we worked during the pandemic, subject to the advice we were getting from Health Protection Scotland around maintaining safe clinical conditions to see patients and safe working conditions for staff.

So at the start of the pandemic, the advice was that we spoke to everybody first on the telephone to try and assess what their needs were. If it was straightforward and safe to assess it purely over the telephone and deal with the medical needs without having to bring somebody into the practice or visit them at home, then we would do that to minimise footfall into the practice. And that was just to reduce the risk of transmission of

COVID-19. Particularly in the early stages when the virus was more virulent, it was stronger, there wasn't vaccination, we were trying to do what we could to minimise risk across the whole system.

But when we did speak to people on the phone and we realised that we needed extra information that a face-to-face appointment would bring, like, for example, examining somebody or if they were very worried about something and needed to see us face to face, then we would accommodate that and either see someone in the practice or see them at home, in their own homes.

It wasn't straightforward to do that. If we suspected that -- if somebody had symptoms of COVID, for example, in the very early stages, we developed places in the practice that we could see them, often separated out from other patients in the waiting room, in different areas of the practice. So people might be asked to wait at a different point and come into something called a "red room" or a "hot room", where they could be seen separately and the room could be cleaned more thoroughly in between patients. And those patients would generally be seen by a doctor who themselves had a lower risk of COVID if they were to contract it. But, in general, what we did was we always offered face-to-face appointments, although the
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proportion of face-to-face appointments as a whole was lower than it would have been pre-pandemic, and that was purely for safety reasons.

The appropriateness part of it, again, was related to whether or not bringing somebody into the practice or seeing them at home would add useful additional information that we couldn't reasonably collect by speaking to someone on the telephone. So, for example, if somebody was phoning up with significant abdominal pain, which is quite difficult to assess without examining somebody, then we would be more likely to bring them into the practice to see them and examine them or visit them at home, if they weren't able to come in, than, say, if someone phoned requesting a sick line for work, which is something that is more straightforward and could be managed over the phone. So it varied from consultation to consultation and we had to use our judgment and knowledge of what the infection control guidelines were at the time to make a decision about whether we could reasonably deal with it over the phone or bring somebody in.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. You mentioned Public Health Scotland there. In terms of "safe and appropriate", were they definitions contained within any guidance that was issued to medical staff that you're aware of?

DR LUNAN: I think so, but I'd have to go back and read the original guidance. That feels like very familiar wording from the start, that that was how clinicians and practices were being asked to consider how they make that difficult risk/benefit decision about bringing somebody in or seeing them at home or being able to manage someone over the telephone.

I think we all realised as clinicians that doing things over the telephone is far from ideal. It's not the way in many circumstances that we would prefer to be doing things. It can work really well for straightforward, more transactional healthcare issues, but it is a way of consulting that is more complex because you have to be very careful about making sure that you've fully understood what someone is telling you, that they've fully understood what you're advising on, that you've got a plan in place if someone is to become more sick so that they know when to contact you back and that you were confident that, without seeing them, you're able to reasonably manage the risk associated with that. So it's not a faster or easier way to consult. It was purely being done on the basis of what we needed to do at the time to try and minimise infection risk.
MR DUNLOP: Just one last question on this point. But if it
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was -- it's a two-stage test, the safe and appropriate, or appears to be a two-stage test -- if one of those tests wasn't satisfied or both weren't satisfied and it wasn't going to be possible to go, what would you do in circumstances where that individual wasn't able to have an appointment remotely? So take, for example, an individual who doesn't have access to IT or maybe has learning difficulties or something but it can't be done remotely, yet the test can't be satisfied, what would have been done in those circumstances in your experience?
DR LUNAN: So in those circumstances we would want to see someone. So if we were not convinced that either the safety or the appropriateness argument could be met, then we would have a much lower threshold of either, if someone was able to come into the surgery, inviting them to come into the surgery and obviously asking them to wear a mask and to follow the social distancing guidelines in the waiting room and that we would see them wearing PPE -- so we would explain all that to them on the phone. And if they weren't able to come into the practice because they were too unwell or for any other reason, then we could arrange to see them in their own home, which wasn't without risk as well.

So we were very aware of the fact that remote
consulting was more problematic for a number of different groups of patients, such as the ones that you have mentioned, maybe people with learning disability, cognitive impairment, lack of access to equipment, lack of access to a private space to have a conversation, and that was very much in the forefront of our minds and fed into the decision about whether or not someone could be safely and appropriately managed over the telephone. MR DUNLOP: Thank you.

Dr Williams, as you identify within the statement, there was this public perception that the GP surgeries weren't open for business or not certainly to the same extent as they were following the pandemic. As we move into 2021 and 2022 - we've heard from Dr Lunan - - is there anything $--I$ mean, did things get better in terms of face-to-face consultations? Can you speak to 2021 and 2022?
DR WILLIAMS: So the changes -- the organisational changes that we went through in terms of how each practice was operating were seismic. We had a large number of systems in the background pre-COVID that staff were familiar with, comfortable with, that helped support patient safety, that worked together, and we needed to -- these systems were disrupted by needing to bring in remote consulting, and remote consulting for a large
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number of things, things that we historically would have taken in our stride in a face-to-face manner.

So I suppose, as we reached the period that you're talking about, we had had a lot more time to test the video consulting, for example. We were able to sense-check whether the purported benefits were there, whether these were technologies that were embraced by our patients or which parts of our patient population, you know, liked or were comfortable with some of these different technologies. And I suppose ultimately we found that using the phone was in many ways, you know, something that we could flex, that we could get the most out of, in terms of rapid transferring of information or trying to understand what somebody needs at any one point in time.

I suppose to say general practice, doing things face to face, trying to understand what our patients' needs and wants are, trying to get a sense of which tests are appropriate or which - - you know, which -- from a number of different routes might be best for someone or helping them understand different options open to people, so it was a difficult time to leave behind so many of our comfortable working practices to try and -- to sense-check which changes were working, which were not, and again which practices we could go back to. In some
ways, some of the things we did pre-pandemic we found we wouldn't go back to. Times had moved on. How people were using the Health Service has changed.
MR DUNLOP: I'll come on to matters about people coming in during COVID, but one of the things that I know -- and it 's at the early stage -- in paragraphs 5 and 6 of your statement you identify that a number of GP practices weren't suitable essentially for the pandemic.

My interpretation of what the statement says is that seems to be largely to do with an issue of space, and I'm just wondering, with the benefit of hindsight, do you think there's other things that could have been done to deliver services face to face where -- obviously the GPs are capable of doing it, but when the buildings -- if it's the infrastructure, do you think, with the benefit of hindsight, in the lessons to be learned, which the Inquiry will be looking at, there's something that could be done differently?
DR WILLIAMS: I might highlight, in terms of vaccination, when vaccination was carried out by general practice staff, there was a flexing, the use of church halls, of school buildings. Now, in some respects, some of that was very problematic about who was carrying out risk assessments or whether permission was given, whether it coincided with term time or whether there were other
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events booked. As I say, there's a surprising amount of barriers for some of these, you know, buildings that were owned by local authorities and should have been converted for different purposes.

One limitation we have in general practice is we do a lot that relies on electronic communication between a variety of systems, so there is an infrastructure in terms of the SWAN network across health and social care and other, you know, local authority premises. So it's conceivable that there were other buildings that could have been brought into use, but, as I say, if there had been that foresight or, you know, if there was an emergency plan switch that could have been flicked -but what we in practice encountered was that there's lots of different ways of working between local authority and NHS, for example, in terms of how, you know, a building might be deployed or used.
MR DUNLOP: Okay. You mentioned obviously the planning of it. In terms of - - and we'll hear perhaps this year, perhaps next year -- we'll hear about various pre-pandemic exercises that were carried out, such as Silver Swan. Is that something that's familiar to you? Do you know that --
DR WILLIAMS: So I'm familiar with Exercise Silver Swan, but I suppose only because midway through 2020 there was
a publication of this -- of papers from 2015 and 2016.
I have done work, but with BASICS Scotland in terms of being an emergency responder. There are many GPs in rural areas that are -- that try and make themselves available to be part of an emergency response. I think even amongst this community you would find a limited number that are -- you know, that were aware of planning round about pandemics.
MR DUNLOP: My question is in relatively sharp focus and I' II ask Dr Lunan the same question, but I wonder whether you have a view on whether pre-pandemic planning in respect of the delivery of GP services was adequate and, if it wasn't adequate, is there anything that could have been done differently.
DR WILLIAMS: So I can recall going to major incident planning meetings in Highland in 2015 and a lot of the sort of incidents that they were planning round weren't pandemic, weren't infectious-disease-related. They were related to power disruption, to vehicle crashes, to incidents that might appear across the patch. So, yeah, I do wonder - - Exercise Silver Swan should have sent a message that should have been more widely received.
MR DUNLOP: Dr Lunan, I hope you heard the question that I put to your colleague, Dr Williams. If I was to ask you the same question, whether the pre-pandemic planning
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was adequate in terms of the delivery of GP services during the pandemic, I don't know whether you have a view.
DR LUNAN: So I guess my reflection would be that the vast majority of GPs working on the front line would not have any awareness of Silver Swan. I didn't, as a GP working on the frontline. I think that there were GPs who had specific roles, such as Dr Williams mentioned, being involved in pre-hospital care because there was a GP working in a remote or rural setting or other GPs with specific roles within local board areas, but the vast majority of front-line GPs would not be aware, I think, of strategies like Silver Swan. So I think there probably is a case for a more general awareness certainly of maybe a key member within teams or practice managers, but also I think there are some other things that would be useful to learn about.

So you mentioned space. Thinking about, you know, looking to the future, if we needed to have social distancing again and that was the main rate-limiting factor to being able to see people, then I think we would want to see faster mobilisation of use of other spaces. We probably didn't have the IT infrastructure that we ideally could have had as a modern NHS pre-pandemic, but that was rapidly accelerated in the
first few months at enormous speed and I think something
that we should be really proud of. So, you know, within
a few months we all had cameras, microphones. We were
able to use the Near Me consulting platform and
Microsoft Teams and that was unheard of before the pandemic. So, you know, there were some silver linings, in a way, if there can be any, during something that was so difficult for so many people.

And PPE 1 guess is the other thing, in terms of ensuring do we know how we order it, do we know what we need, have we got adequate supplies to keep us going for, you know, the initial period. I think all of these things would be very forefront in our minds if there were thoughts of planning for a future pandemic.

If you don't mind, just going back to your previous question, just really briefly, around space, I think that space is important to consider, as Dr Williams has said, as is having the adequate IT, but there are other issues as well that make it less straightforward than that, such as the ability to clean spaces, such as the ability to have air circulating. But the main limiting factor to being able to see lots of people face to face and longer appointments with the need to clean in between and change PPE is workforce, so that would be a rate-limiting factor no matter where the premises was.
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We could open up bigger buildings and have more space and bring more people in, but we'd still need to have the staff there to see them. So we may come on to workforce later. Thanks.
MR DUNLOP: Can I ask, just dealing with that, if I can call that, "infection control", in terms of -- this might be a better question to put to you, Dr Lunan, given you were dealing with -- or you were more involved at the earlier stages of the pandemic. What impact did infection control have on the number of patients that GPs could see? Maybe you can tell us relatively briefly in the time that we have. Was there a cleaning regime between every patient, every second patient and what was the impact on the number of patient appointments in the day?
A. So in the briefest terms there was a cleaning regime that had to happen between every patient because we didn't know who was asymptomatic and had COVID, so we had to clean down all services between each patient coming into our consulting rooms and we had to change PPE between patients as well. We also had to -- many practices, if they had space to, would run this second room that I mentioned earlier on, a hot room or a red room, to see people who had symptoms of what we assumed might be COVID, so continuous cough or fever or loss of

DR LUNAN: I would say it would at least half them.
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MR DUNLOP: At least half. You mentioned PPE there and I wonder if I can maybe ask a couple of questions about PPE. Immediately before the pandemic, what were the procurement arrangements for GP practices obtaining PPE? By "PPE", I have in mind masks, gloves, aprons, the kind of -- what I might call the conventional PPE that medical staff might wear. How would GP practices obtain that?
DR LUNAN: So they would normally be ordered through the board, the health board, and there's a national distribution centre. So it would be usually the practice manager of a practice that would be involved in ordering in stocks, and that's how it began or that's how it was done at the beginning of the pandemic.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. I think l'll maybe put that question to Dr Williams as well. I wonder if he's got an insight into --
DR WILLIAMS: So there's a system called PECOS that can be used for ordering items of equipment, but although it brings some computerisation to the process, it doesn't -- it's not then linked into any stock control or inventory systems within the practice, so there very much is a process, I suppose, of manual counting or trying to know when a practice -- by practice, but each practice would have its own system of what it's keeping
track of or how much it thinks it's got of one item.
So pre-pandemic you're not using very much PPE unless somebody is coming in, you know, sort of coughing and sneezing and you want to avoid droplets or you're doing some minor surgery, you want to avoid body fluids, and suddenly, when you go into the pandemic, you've got dynamic risk assessments around everything that you're doing. I suppose, in telephone terms, you didn't need PPE to use the telephone so you could keep up a pace, but there was different PPE that would appear in our surgery and at different points and some of it was manufactured to different standards.

I'm not clear how that related to the ordering. In most practices, you would find that the ordering is then given to someone who can do it consistently and who can go round and check what items are in the stock cupboard and within the rooms and would top up. So often that might be a healthcare assistant, for example, or, you know, somebody whose governance is either through the practice manager or the nursing team.
MR DUNLOP: Was there any guidance in relation to $--I$ don't mean stockpiling as such, but having a minimum quantity of PPE? Was there any guidance either issued nationally or by the Royal College or any other body?
A. There was a checking process that occurred, I think, on
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a weekly basis, I think, to occur -- for boards to be reassured that practices had adequate PPE, and I think they then reached a "Yes"/"No" - - you know, on a practice-by-practice basis. But I don't know what -you know, whether that was a value judgment rather than numbers because there were times when we were going through large amounts of PPE, especially when we got -when we were able to open things back up and go back to a bit more of a familiar turnover of people in the surgery for face-to-face - - you know, for a sequence of face-to-face appointments.
MR DUNLOP: I mean, I should have asked that at the outset. During the pandemic $--\operatorname{Dr}$ Williams, were you
a practising GP during the pandemic period?
DR WILLIAMS: Throughout the pandemic.
MR DUNLOP: And, Dr Lunan, the same?
DR LUNAN: Yes.
MR DUNLOP: You've told us about the systems. The pandemic occurred at the end of March. There's not much in the PPE shelves in the GP practices. What were GPs doing then to obtain PPE? How would you go about obtaining it?
DR WILLIAMS: So GP practices have always been able to source bits of equipment, either healthcare equipment or computer equipment or things that they thought were
necessary that went above minimum standard, so even where a health board is responsible for providing items, and I suppose PPE was no exception. We would have patients come and drop off scrubs that they had made -you know, that they had fashioned from curtains or bedspreads or all sorts of things. People were trying to do their bit to help. We had protective bodysuits, you know, that painters and decorators might use, that people had dropped in.

It was, I suppose, less easy in terms of the face mask side of things, that we were given guidance and, as I say, I think across general practice there were people that were wondering about whether, if FFP3 masks were available -- you know, whether there was a higher - - a step-up level of protection, especially for people that might be involved, as I say, as emergency responders or who have more of an extended role than what you might view as, you know, some of the -- yeah, the more general practice.
MR DUNLOP: Can I ask, did either of you or any of your members that you're aware of run out of PPE -- that you're aware of?
DR WILLIAMS: We heard lots of expressions of anxiety and nervousness about PPE, and I think that stretched across people thinking that either they - - I mean, I had
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experience of aprons that weren't -- that were repurposed bin bags, you know, that weren't easy to put on and take off without -- you know, without them having then shed any droplets or particles that might have got on them. Some of these things -- some of these items were not the level we had hoped for. There were masks that had new expiry dates that went on them. I remember that particularly vividly. It wasn't in my practice. But, again, these were masks that were deemed to have a longer shelf life than initially thought.
MR DUNLOP: Sorry, it seems to me that there's two issues arising out of that from what you're saying, from your evidence. It's whether there was enough in terms of supply and then whether the supply that was available was adequate. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think what you're saying -- or you didn't -- when I asked if members had said had they run out, you didn't come back to me and say, "Yes, they did". So am I correct in assuming that GPs weren't running out of PPE but there were anxieties about the suitability of the PPE?
DR WILLIAMS: I think there will be -- I'll just finish and hand over to my colleague. But I think there were many instances where people didn't have a full set of PPE that they felt met the risk assessments that they were making or that -- we could see that there were some
environments where a higher level of PPE was required in some of the hospital secondary care settings and I think general practice in particular, but I would extend this to other contractors in primary care, so dentists, optometrists, pharmacy. I would say that these groups felt as if - - either that the guidance that we were given round about what PPE was suitable was tailored to what was available or that $--I$ don't think there was confidence from the profession that they had, you know, the right armour on, that they had the right tools for the job.
MR DUNLOP: I'll maybe put this question to you, Dr Lunan. If a GP didn't have the right tools for the job, the right PPE, if it was a more basic mask than was required, what could a GP do about that, if anything? Perhaps the answer is "nothing" but ...
DR LUNAN: No, I think it's a good question. There was variation in the guidance that I guess GPs were reading, depending on whether it was maybe WHO guidance or national guidance around what level of protection was necessary, working in a general practice setting. So the PPE that we were distributed at the beginning was to protect us against droplet spread, which is how we understood that COVID was transmitted at the very beginning. So that was the fluid-resistant surgical
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masks, the ones that you can buy in a chemist, a pair of gloves, a thin apron but no sleeves, and goggles or visors. And, as time went on, I think there was a lot of concern within members that, "Is this the right level of PPE for the work that we are doing, particularly if you're examining people who are coughing on you? Is that adequate protection - - if we're seeing people who don't want to wear a mask and are coming into your consulting room, does that mean that we have to change who those people are able to see and maybe see doctors that are themselves at lower risk of contracting COVID?".

So there was concerns about the quality, there was concerns about the quantity and there was concerns about the reliability of supply, and there were lots of work-arounds that came about because of that. So Dr Williams mentioned that often the community would kind of rise to the challenge and drop in things like scrubs, they would often drop in things like home-made masks as well, which we would often wear and sometimes hand out to patients in the practice as well, if people didn't have masks themselves, but many GPs actually chose to purchase their own. They chose to purchase their own FFP3 masks online, like many members of the public did, because they didn't feel adequately
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reassured that the fluid-resistant surgical masks were going to give them adequate cover.
MR DUNLOP: And were they able to $-I$ take it there were sufficient supplies in the marketplace for GPs to obtain those FFP3 masks?
DR LUNAN: They were subject to the same supply issues as everyone else because they were going through public routes, so I guess there would not have always been a reliable supply of FFP3 masks. It would just depend on what they were able to order. But they weren't available through NHS pathways because our PPE was this other level, this other standard.
MR DUNLOP: So - - excuse my ignorance - - so a member of the public might go on to $--I$ suppose l'd better not mention any names -- but on to the internet and use -find the product on the internet. Is that what GPs were doing or could GPs go through some specialised, you know, procurement consortium-type ...
DR LUNAN: No, I think people just bought it online in the same way that the public would. There wasn't a special access pathway for GPs who wanted to buy a higher level of PPE that was considered, you know, acceptable as deemed by our local infection control guidelines.
I think a lot of people were content with the level of PPE but some people were really concerned and the
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evidence was sometimes a bit conflicting at the start around how well protected you would be wearing the fluid-resistant surgical masks. They really only protect the person that is being seen by the person with the mask on. They don't protect the person wearing the mask. It's about protecting other people, so, for that situation to work, you need both the doctor to be wearing a mask and the person that you're consulting with to be wearing a mask as well, and of course that didn't always happen.
MR DUNLOP: Moving on to a different topic, from paragraph 39 on, you talk about pharmacies and prescriptions in the statement. I wonder if I could just ask you some questions. It's not dealt with in the statement, but was there a trend towards people going to see pharmacists where they previously would have gone to see a GP? And I'll put that to Dr Lunan. Was that a general trend that you're aware of?
DR LUNAN: It's difficult to know for sure. I know that pharmacy was really busy. Our community pharmacy colleagues were amazing during the pandemic because they -- you know, they're also front line, open door, and they were seeing lots of people who were concerned about their health. They had a lot of footfall into practices for people collecting prescriptions. We tried 112
to help minimise that by taking batches of paper prescriptions over to them so that they wouldn't have multiple people coming in with one, they would have maybe one person from a practice coming in with 20 or 100 , depending on how many we'd signed. We don't have end-to-end paperless prescribing in Scotland so we still rely on signed bits of paper that need to go from building $A$ to building $B$ and be collected by person $C$, so it's quite contact-intensive.

I don't have the figures to hand about whether there were people seeing pharmacists who would ordinarily have seen GPs. Some of -- if that was the case, some of that may have been appropriate because there is a kind of longstanding background campaign to try and encourage people to see wider members of the primary care team, which basically are any clinician working out in the community who has different sets of skills and expertise, depending on what the problem is. So we know that community pharmacists are extremely skilled, for example, in dealing with minor illness and dealing with minor skin conditions and giving advice about lots of different healthcare issues, and it may have been that people were starting to make more use of that than they had before the pandemic. So seeing community pharmacists wasn't necessarily an inappropriate thing,
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but it may have driven that change quicker than it ordinarily would have happened.

I think that one of the, again, silver linings, if you can use that word, from the pandemic was that our relationships with our community pharmacy colleagues were really strengthened during the pandemic because we had to work really closely with them to make sure that they were safe, that we were minimising footfall into their buildings, that we were thinking of all the ways that we could to make sure that pathways were streamlined, safe for patients, safe for staff.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you, Dr Lunan. Could I maybe pick you up on just a couple of points that you dealt with there? I suppose the first point, the quicker point, is that -simply speaking from my experience, is that the local pharmacy -- there was a queue to go into the local pharmacy, certainly at the beginning of the pandemic. Now, I wonder, would that exclude then certain people visiting the pharmacy, people that may be shielding or people with mobility problems? Would that perhaps exclude certain people using pharmacies?
DR LUNAN: I mean, I think that the queues were very apparent and the queues were more pronounced in more socio-economically deprived areas because that is the trend across the use of healthcare across the system,
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I' II maybe put to Dr Williams because it's something I'm sure you're both qualified to answer.

Thankfully I'm not particularly familiar with prescriptions, but, if I understand Dr Lunan's evidence, it's that a prescription is still a signed bit of paper essentially?
DR WILLIAMS: In Scotland we have the infrastructure for a message to be sent from the GP practice to the community pharmacy so that it can be seen what item has been prescribed, but legally, for that prescription to be dispensed, there needs to be a bit of paper with a signature on and for the community pharmacy to get reimbursement for their work in prescribing -- in dispensing and supplying that medication.
MR DUNLOP: I'm sure we could spend a whole afternoon on this topic, but in many walks of life electronic signatures have now become the norm following the pandemic. Is there any reason why -- and I appreciate I don't want to open a can of worms - - but is there any reason why those prescriptions couldn't be signed electronically, that they have to be still a hard bit of paper with a wet signature?
DR WILLIAMS: So there's two elements and there is an ongoing programme of work that the digital prescribing and dispensing pathway or DPDP - - but essentially you

## the scope.

In terms of -- I wonder if I can move forward to paragraphs 57 of your statement and principally 58 as well. You talk about the changes to clinical work and you tell us that routine screening was paused. When you say "routine screening", what type of screening?
DR WILLIAMS: So I suppose we should clarify the definition of "screening". So screening is an evidence-based process where you test a certain section of the population knowing that you are going to do more good than harm in terms of the results that you -- that are returned. So there are some specific conditions that you can look for in sections of the population that you can then treat -- you can detect at an earlier stage and there can be more treatment options available at the point of detection.

So the bowel screening, for example, people will be sent out a kit to their home that they can test themselves. Once they're over the age of 50, that process kicks in. There's a national breast cancer screening and I suppose the screening that general practice has been most involved with is the cervical
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screening, and I might defer to my colleague,
Carey Lunan, to -- if that's okay, Carey.
MR DUNLOP: Of course. Dr Lunan?
DR LUNAN: Yes. No, absolutely. So fairly early on we were advised that routine screening would pause. As Dr Williams was saying, that includes the breast, bowel and cervical cancer screening programmes. Also screening for abdominal aneurysms and for diabetic eye disease. A couple of months into the pandemic, there was a keenness to try and reintroduce screening because I think we were all acutely aware that it would be generating a backlog and potentially delaying diagnosis of early cancers or pre-cancer conditions for the cancer programmes anyway, which is what they are designed to pick up. Also some people are on non-routine screening, which means that they have a more regular invitation to come in and get tests done than someone who is on a routine screening programme where their tests have been normal previously.

So I think it was May/June time in 2020 that there were plans to re-open screening programmes within general practice, which is the cervical screening programme, the smear test, which is done by practice nurses in the vast majority of cases, and an agreement that we would focus, to start with, on the people who
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were at higher risk. So people who had previously had an abnormal smear would be invited in first for their follow-up smear and, once we'd caught up with the backlog of people who were waiting for their follow-up from a previously abnormal result, we would resume the normal routine screening for people who were on the normal recall pathway, which was a smear every three years.
MR DUNLOP: How long did that backlog take to catch up? DR LUNAN: It probably took a good few months. Certainly over the first couple of months, I think, routine -sorry, non-routine screening, so the higher risk group, was due to start I think at the end of June, from memory -- I'd need to double-check the dates now - - but it was recognised that those smear tests were going to take longer than normal because they needed to be done in person, wearing PPE, cleaning between appointments, all the things that we've talked about already. They weren't the usual 15-minute appointments back to back. We had to accommodate a probably $50 \%$ reduction in the amount of cases that we could get through in a normal working day. But our practice nurses worked incredibly hard to get through that backlog and then I think we were able to resume normal routine screening --I think certainly by the end of 2020.
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There were discussions that we were involved in, where we were talking about resuming screening, about whether or not that workload could be shared out beyond just general practice because of course smear tests don't need to be done in general practice. That's just where they've traditionally been done. And we had wondered about whether we could have a whole system approach, where we've got colleagues trained in smear-taking across the wider system within hospital settings or clinic settings that could maybe help with the backlog. I think at the end of the day it was felt that general practice was where the screening should be done and that's where it was done. And, from memory, we managed to get through the kind of non-routine backlog within two to three months, which is pretty phenomenal, and then managed to get back to more routine screening by the end of the year.
MR DUNLOP: This might not be a question that you can answer, but in terms of screening and tests that would have been done by the GP practice, if that was delayed -- and we've heard that there was delay -- would that have led to progression of diseases which would create more of a pressure on the secondary care, the hospitals, in the future? I'm just wondering if that contributes to the backlog that we hear in the press
every day.
DR LUNAN: Yes. I mean, I think we can't know that for sure but we have to assume that that is the case because people - - there's a reason that, for example, cervical screening at that time was every three years, because the evidence tells us that that is the most effective way to do it. Doing it every three years means that you pick up enough to make it a cost-effective programme. So if you're going to delay doing smears, then you are going to pick up pre-cancers or early cancers at a later stage, and that was why there was a keenness to try and get the routine screening up and running as quickly as possible, with a focus on the people who were highest risk getting screened first.

So I don't know the exact figures in terms of people who were picked up with a new cancer diagnosis or a pre-cancer diagnosis when things opened up again across the whole of the screening pathway, and of course we were only doing cervical screening in general practice -- there's also the breast and bowel screening pathways which had to open up outside general practice -- but I think we have to assume that there will be some of those new diagnoses that may have been caught earlier if screening hadn't been paused.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. Dr Williams, as a very general
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question -- I'm kind of jumping completely on to
a different topic --but in terms of the impacts felt by
GP practices, are you aware of any difference between impacts felt within different geographical locations?
I have in mind maybe a city GP practice that's perhaps
in a poorer area, an urban practice that's perhaps in
a relatively affluent area, a rural practice, perhaps an
island practice, where there was varied restrictions.
Are you aware of any kind of differences in terms of impacts felt by the surgeries, depending on where they're located?
DR WILLIAMS: Yes, I can certainly speak to the impact in rural, remote and island areas. General practice in those settings, the GPs - - the practice is very much a part of the community, so even simple things like removing the waiting room as an area where people might meet and speak is -- you know, is disruptive to the local population. I think the populations are sympathetic to the clinicians that are living and working there, but, as we described at the start, there was such profound changes to some of the ways that things were done -- and again I come back to the emergency medical responder side of things. There were changes in terms of what -- you know, whether people were allowed to go and do CPR without full protective
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bodysuits and masks, and these were things that we didn't have generally.

So I think some of the ethical dilemmas that were there, services that we'd previously provided $--I$ think you've picked up on, you know, the difficulties round about home visiting and the things that we wanted to do as general practice but that our risk assessment told us that this might take -- you know, this might expose us to disease that might then go round the team, and some very difficult decision-making round about how do you keep a service going, how do you ensure that the service keeps going. And these are often, as I say, small teams, where you don't -- in terms of resilience, where you don't have lots of layers. If one person goes missing from that team or has to self-isolate or has to work remotely because they've got symptoms and you assume that to be COVID or someone develops long-term problems following an infection, in remote and rural areas I think it's very pronounced, and it's felt not only within the team, but, as I say, across the community. There's -- you know, there's a strong bond in these areas.
MR DUNLOP: I take it you work in a rural practice, do you, Dr Williams?
DR WILLIAMS: I work in a rural practice in Highland
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currently and I've worked in many other rural practices earlier on in my career, so, yes, I've seen, as I say, some of the differences between some of the urban practices.
MR DUNLOP: Dr Lunan, again -- sorry, do you wish to follow up on that?
DR LUNAN: Yes, just on the same question, if that's okay -MR DUNLOP: Of course.
DR LUNAN: -- because Dr Williams and I work in quite different practices, which is probably quite useful for being able to reflect on that.

So I worked during the pandemic in an urban deprived area practice and I think that we're all very aware of the impact that COVID-19 had on highlighting the existing health inequalities that we have in Scotland and the fact that it also worsened them. So I think what we noticed was, during the pandemic, there was always a triple whammy of COVID. Our patients were more likely to get COVID because they were more likely to be working in front-line jobs -- they didn't have the choice of being able to work from home. They were often front-line jobs where the prevalence was high, so they were more at risk and more exposed; poorer underlying health to start with; more likely to die from COVID if they caught COVID -- four times more likely to die;
higher levels of ethnic minority populations in more
deprived areas, which also gave an additional risk. And then, when vaccine was rolled out, the vaccination rates had lower uptake in more deprived areas, which is
a historical finding. It's been seen with every
vaccination programme that we've ever had for lots of complex reasons.

So I think that we were acutely aware that health inequalities -- COVID was following the same social gradients that we see with many other diseases, but it felt particularly stark during the pandemic and it was worsened by things like having to consult remotely when people were digitally excluded. So if people didn't have access to data on their phone or reliable broadband or a private space in their home or they had cognitive impairment or English as a second language or if they struggled to, you know, describe the things that they were worried about, these were all things that made remote consulting much more difficult in a more deprived area and I think brought in the issues that we talked around clinical judgment, in just bringing someone in to see them face to face and get that sense-check. We also saw a rise in things like drug-related deaths, in mental health problems, in safeguarding issues around vulnerable families and domestic violence rates. All of

## 125

those things rose during the pandemic.
In the more kind of affluent urban areas, the main challenges would be that the main risk factor for COVID was age, and if you live in a more affluent area, you're more likely to live into old age, so we know from speaking to colleagues across the country, working in the suburbs with older, frailer populations, that again that was incredibly difficult . Different challenges, having to have very complicated and often very sensitive discussions with people about their existing health, what they would want to happen - - if they became sick with COVID, would they want cared for at home, would they want admitted to hospital, what was realistic to expect; if they did get COVID, what social supports did they have. Lots of issues around social isolation for older people. So there were lots of challenges that were core to all of us as GPs working across Scotland and then there were some particularly unique challenges depending on the demographic of the population that we were looking after.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. You said a lot of things there that I wonder if I could pick up on a few of them. I' II list them and then I'll go through them one by one. You talked about substance abuse, you talked about safeguarding, you talked about mental health and you
talked about digital exclusion.
I suppose, just doing them in reverse order, digital exclusion -- when we talk about digital exclusion, we talk about people who obviously may not have either the equipment or the capacity to use the equipment to consult remotely. Is that focused on particular groups? Does that tend to be people that are elderly, that are frail? Was there a particular people that might have been more digitally excluded than others?
DR LUNAN: I guess the people that we knew were more likely to be digitally excluded were people who were older and less confident in using technology, people who had sensory impairment, so had difficulty with vision or hearing, people who couldn't necessarily afford the equipment or the data or the reliable broadband to be able to access things like Near Me. But we also know that there were other groups, so people with learning disability, people with cognitive impairment, so folk who had previously had a stroke, for example, or who had other neurological conditions. People who had English as a second language were also more likely to experience difficulty around digital consultations.

But other things -- for example, just being able to access a private space within your house to have a sensitive conversation about something that's worrying
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you is more difficult if you're living in an overcrowded home and, particularly if there are issues around domestic security at home, that felt, you know, particularly worrying. So there were lots and lots of things that we needed to be actively considering when we were speaking to people on the phone or with Near Me to make sure that this was an appropriate and a safe way to be assessing someone and consulting with someone. And the RCGP was involved in writing guidance for GPs to just help -- to sort of sense-check with people, "Does this feel okay for you?", "Are you able to speak just now?", "Have you got somewhere private to go?", "Do you know how to use the technology?", "What would your preference be?", and we would try to accommodate that as far as possible, given what was going on around prevalence in the local area at the time.

But I think digital exclusion was a big concern during the pandemic and remains one because we need to make sure that, as we recover the NHS and we develop more hybrid ways of working and more telephone appointments or video consultations, that they don't worsen health inequalities because there are many, many consultations that are more complicated, that need that face-to-face element, not just to assess somebody but also to build trust and connection and relationships
with people, which is a big part of what we do as GPs.
MR DUNLOP: Okay. Thank you. One of the other points you mentioned was mental health, and we see at paragraph 66 of your statement that there was an Audit Scotland report referred to, which said that accessing mental health issues [sic] became worse as a result of the pandemic. I suppose again we could talk about this all afternoon, but relatively briefly could you explain to us, if you can, what mental health services weren't available as a consequence of the pandemic and what people could do to obtain mental health services, if anything, during the period March to December 2020 when you were the chair of the Royal College?
DR LUNAN: So we know that a lot of the third sector organisations were struggling to be able to see people face to face, so third sector voluntary charity organisations that a lot of people got mental health support from either were not financially viable during the pandemic or weren't able to staff the service or weren't able to stay in the premises, so a lot of those services became unavailable.

In terms of specialist mental health services, a lot of those went online, so became remote by default, and a lot of patients with mental health issues often struggled with that. Not all of them. Some people like
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a telephone appointment or a video consultation. But access to mental health services felt more difficult.

In general practice, it's a big part of our normal workload, so we see lots and lots of mental health in normal times. Probably about a third of our consultations have got a mental health component to them. But during the pandemic it's estimated that rose to probably about half of our consultations would have some mental health element to them, whether it was low mood or anxiety or insomnia or other issues or more significant mental health issues, so --
MR DUNLOP: Can I ask, those issues, were they caused by effects from the pandemic, whether it be lockdown restrictions or -- Dr Williams looks as if he might be willing to offer an answer to that one.
DR WILLIAMS: So aside from the health and social care and third sector support, people's lives and routines were disrupted. People experienced financial pressures that they had never experienced before or uncertainties about their future work or about their relations or about their relatives who lived in another place or whether they could visit their elderly parents or what would happen if somebody got ill. Some of the things that in ordinary times might cause you stress or upset or worry might all come at the same time and might be magnified.

So, as I say, people who had mental health issues that were coping on a day-to-day basis before, I think were very much then feeling pronounced effects or I think there were lots of people who -- where their functioning became worse or how they felt became worse, I think when it also appears more difficult to access help that they would have previously felt able to access, you know, if there are.

So even if there aren't actual barriers, if there are perceived barriers or if they aren't confident in speaking to -- in saying to a receptionist, "I have depression, it's got worse" - - if people can't navigate these few simple steps into -- you know, to speaking to a GP or to another clinician in general practice, which would ordinarily be most people's sort of first steps towards help and assistance, then you're looking at problems out there.
MR DUNLOP: I suppose this takes me on to the substance and I' II come back to the safeguarding point, but in terms of substance - - I'll maybe just put this to Dr Williams because, as a practising GP, I think you can speak to this. You don't need to be the chair of the Royal College -- but was there an increase in alcohol and drug use that you're aware of during the pandemic?
A. Yeah, there was -- and it was a change in pattern and
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a change in where people would consume alcohol in terms of drinking at home rather than going to pubs and bars, especially when people aren't able to congregate and they've got a real change in how people are ordering food and drink and having deliveries. But, yeah, there are a range of organisations that could document, you know, the changes in pattern and the harm that's occurred.
MR DUNLOP: That's the question. A changing pattern in itself isn't necessarily a bad thing, but when use goes to abuse that presumably is a bad thing. Did you see use go from use to abuse, if that's the term?
DR WILLIAMS: So I suppose the fear is the things that you're not seeing or the people who aren't consulting, but at the same time you know that sales are going in a direction that are bound to be causing harm, or by the time that you see people, they've already experienced harm.
MR DUNLOP: Dr Lunan, just to pick up the last of the four points I think you identified. It was safeguarding. I don't want to spend too much time on this, we have limited time this afternoon, but you deal with safeguarding in your statement at paragraph 73 and identify that GPs play an important role in safeguarding and deal with family and child and social workers and so
forth. My question is in fairly sharp focus: in your opinion, do you know if the absence of that during the pandemic -- is it likely to have led to preventable harm to children and domestic violence or --
DR LUNAN: The absence of the usual organisations that wrap around, like education, social work, health visiting, general practice? Is that the question?
MR DUNLOP: Yes. Essentially the role that the GPs play, if that's taken out the equation, does that increase the risk that there's harm to children or domestic violence?
DR LUNAN: I think, yeah, the collective responsibility of all the organisations that are placed to support vulnerable families, whether it's schools, whether it's social work, whether it's health visiting, whether it's midwives, whether it's general practice -- if all of those organisations are less available for whatever reason because they're having to operate in a different way during the pandemic, then, yes, that will have increased harm to families that we were not seeing or hearing from because they were missing in the system under very stressful circumstances.

We know that the rates of domestic abuse went up, for example, and we know that children's mental health deteriorated during the pandemic and that it was pretty stark, when schools reopened, that teachers were
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reporting concerns about the fact that their vulnerable children had deteriorated in the time that they hadn't seen them.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. Dr Williams, I wonder if I can put this question to you, and I'm moving on to shielding now. You deal with shielding under paragraph 81 of your statement. Maybe just for brevity I can read it out myself:
"The regulations that GPs worked under were not straightforward. [The Royal College] felt there was not good correlation between the list of conditions that had been drawn up, and those who were vulnerable of becoming very ill. We objected to the terminology of 'extremely clinically vulnerable'."

Did the lack of clarity in the guidance cause GPs difficulties and, if so, what were those difficulties? DR WILLIAMS: So I should explain, to help inform things, that clinical record that GPs keep can be a lifetime clinical record. It can be very detailed, it is carefully coded, it's curated, and even when patients move around between practices, we can still have a very granular idea of procedures that people have gone through or illnesses that they have had, diagnoses that they've had.

In terms of the process around about shielding,

I think that started with what model you've got, do we know who is going to be affected most -- who is going to be at most risk of COVID and most at risk of complications and serious outcomes, and of course we didn't know that at the start. So you have a model which you then need to deploy very rapidly and then you need to check whether that -- whether the right people were on the list. So along the way, there was all there was various groups that were found that were known about in hospital systems but weren't particularly apparent from looking at the codes on GP systems. I think my colleague, Dr Lunan, might be able to add some more useful information about shielding. I think she dealt with the start of it.
DR LUNAN: Thanks. Yes, I think that at the beginning the list that was drawn up of the people who were being recommended to shield were largely people who fell into what we call single disease categories, but actually, as we began to see the data coming out of who was dying from COVID, it just wasn't as straightforward as that and it seemed to be that people with particular combinations of different diseases would be more at risk. So, for example, if you had obesity and you also had diabetes and you also happened to be from a certain ethnic minority background and your age was higher, you
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were very high risk, and that wouldn't necessarily have been picked up in the initial shielding categories that were announced.

So I think it created confusion in two ways. One was that there wasn't always a common understanding between specialist services looking after people with one illness, one disease, one condition, and generalist services, ie, GPs who were looking after people with lots of different conditions, with other stuff thrown in that makes it more complicated, for example, ethnicity, for example, poverty or health-harming behaviours like smoking or obesity -- things that make it more complicated than that. So people would often be receiving two different shielding conversations, one from the hospital and one from their GP which created confusion for patients sometimes. But we did have the opportunity to add people on to the shielding list if we felt, in our clinical judgment, that they were more vulnerable and that they would benefit from the extra protections that shielding would bring, and that often just required a discussion with the patient to see how they would feel about that based on their own risk.
MR DUNLOP: Can I ask a follow-up question? You explain in your evidence there that you began to see the people that were passing away from COVID. It wasn't simply
people that were on the shielding list. There was
a range of factors. Obviously we're looking at this with the benefit of hindsight but what I'm interested in: as those other factors developed and people said, "Oh, this is a critical issue", was the shielding guidance changing to reflect that or was it not changing sufficiently quickly to reflect that?

I think Dr Williams look as if he's -- I'll let Dr Williams - - and then perhaps I'll pass it briefly over to you, Dr Lunan, if I may.
DR WILLIAMS: I think the Scottish Government team that were working on that might be better able to inform you with numbers, but I think that eventually they recognised that - - by being told to shield and by people being told that they were on a list, it then started off, I guess, a mindset or behaviours or what people thought -- how much people thought they needed to limit their interaction with wider society, and of course a lot of the background circumstances changed.

So I think over time it became apparent that the way that shield -- the group that had been told that they were extremely clinically vulnerable, actually some of the behaviours that it was then influencing wasn't influencing them in the right way and, as Dr Lunan has said, actually there were other - - it was other groups
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with combinations that were far more at risk, and that was being borne out by the death certification process.
MR DUNLOP: I appreciate you said you should put the question perhaps to those that drafted it, but as somebody at the front line, I just wondered if you had a view of whether or not the shielding guidance was being amended sufficiently swiftly to capture what was - - these new factors that were important.
DR WILLIAMS: So I don't think there was the technology in place to be able -- so there was the ability to put a marker on a large group of people's - - into people's clinical notes, but this was something that hadn't been done before, so it hadn't been realised that you can then easily take that off --
MR DUNLOP: Just to jump in there -- and I apologise for jumping in - - but just for lessons to be learned, is that a lesson to be learned, then, that in a pandemic there should be a facility for GPs to be able to do that?
DR WILLIAMS: So I think if you're going to give an instruction to a subset of the population to be doing something specific, and that is to be, you know, especially distanced from normal parts of society, then you need to understand the implications over time, so how that person will adapt psychologically. So if you
said

DR LUNAN: Just a couple of quick points. One, I would echo what Dr Williams has said, is that shielding was a really big deal. To tell someone that they were shielding was quite a frightening thing for a lot of people and required them to significantly change and limit their life, so there's -- a huge risk/benefit decision needs to be made about whether or not someone needs to be in the shielding group. And I think, as time went on, we realised that some of the conditions that were felt to be at high risk of COVID probably weren't as high risk as we'd originally thought, but it 's far harder to remove someone or remove a group of people from the shielding list than it is to add them in the first place because people are anxious then about coming out of it. So I think that was one of the
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## challenges.

I think there was recognition of the fact that we needed to not think in single disease pathways and we needed to think across something called "multiple morbidity", so if you've got two or more long-term conditions running together, you were more likely to get sick with COVID if you caught it. And I think that probably two or three months in we began to have much more awareness of the impact of ethnicity and that began to get a lot more traction in terms of how we would risk-assess people.

I think the impact of poverty took longer and I think that what we need to recognise is that age isn't a straightforward binary thing. Someone who is 65 , living in poverty, is nearer the age of a 85 -year-old person living in a much more affluent situation. So there's something about weighting age according to deprivation so that we think about biological age and not chronological age when it comes to shielding, and exactly the same could be said about rolling out vaccines because many people living in poorer circumstances never reach old age. So there's something about adjusting age thresholds, although I appreciate that's not straightforward to do, but I think that is learning for next time.

THE CHAIR: Mr Dunlop, you've actually used your allotted time for these witnesses. If you need more time, we'll have to have a break for the stenographers.
MR DUNLOP: I will be another five/ten minutes, my Lord. I promise to be finished before 2.55. However, I think a break -- I don't think there's a witness on after.

```
THE CHAIR: No, there isn't.
```

MR DUNLOP: So l'm entirely in your Lordship's hands. I apologise. I've just got a few more questions.
THE CHAIR: If you're only going to be five or ten minutes, I'm sure we could run that through without interrupting.
MR DUNLOP: I only have two topics I just want to deal with and thankfully Dr Lunan has helpfully basically identified, the health inequalities. So, Dr Lunan, you were mentioning there that obviously the people that are living in social deprivation, a younger person will be the same as an older person in a more affluent area.

In terms of you deal with health inequalities, were there particular groups of people that were affected by COVID more? I don't need to go into detail -- if you could list the groups rather than -- I don't think we need to go into a huge narrative unless you think it would be of particular benefit.
DR LUNAN: People working in front-line jobs who weren't able to work from home; people who had poor underlying
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health, and we know people living in more
socio-economically deprived situations develop diseases that older people would develop ten to 15 years older; people who are less likely to be vaccinated, they were the people that were more likely to get sick and to die from COVID. That's in a very brief snapshot of who was more likely to, but obviously I could talk about this in much more detail.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. No, no, no, I'm sure we could. What I would say is we have your statement and your statement is evidence.

Just finally, Dr Williams, if I can just take you to paragraph 172 of the statement. You identify that there's been an increase in private healthcare since the pandemic which is attributable to kind of long waiting lists and backlogs. Does the increase in people taking out or going privately -- does that remove the pressure from the NHS? Does that enable them to --

## DR WILLIAMS: No.

MR DUNLOP: And why does it not?
DR WILLIAMS: So private healthcare is by and large providing a more limited set of investigations and procedures, often making use of staff, be they surgeons, be they nurses, who also have NHS jobs. So I can understand -- when people are faced with a long waiting
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list or, you know, a potentially very long waiting list, if they're seeking a diagnosis and here is a test that they could get done without needing that wait, I can understand the decision. My hope would be for an NHS that wouldn't have these waits involved, that wouldn't have these delays that people face. But I wouldn't want others to think that private healthcare is the solution to the problems that we currently face.

I think there's certainly -- people look for quick fixes often, and in some ways, if you get a hip replacement that, you know, revolutionises what mobility you have, then that is a fantastic change in circumstance that you wouldn't want somebody waiting a couple of years' delay. But it's difficult for me to speak more widely about. I think the increase in private healthcare is a consequence of the system pressures and those who are affluent or have access to insurance or who are making the choices that something is necessary are often making sacrifices that I don't think they should need to make.
MR DUNLOP: Am I correct -- I don't wish to lead you in your last question -- but am I correct that what you're saying, then, essentially is that a part of it is that it's the same medical practitioners who are providing that care, so if we were to go into another pandemic,
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there wouldn't be an answer by looking simply to the private sector to essentially fill the gap that wasn't being provided by the NHS in 2020?
DR WILLIAMS: So I think you need to go one step backwards and look at why some of these waiting lists got longer. So, for example, for large joint replacements, for hip replacements, knee replacements, if surgical space was being repurposed or wasn't able to be used, if these operations weren't able to go ahead, if the need for intensive care support round about an operation meant that it became a completely different risk, as I say, there are multiple reasons why any pandemic, I think, would increase certain waiting lists. And the change in how people have accessed healthcare, in some respects the sacrifices that people have made when there's been periods of limited healthcare resource, you know, the decision-making round about that, you know, is difficult for doctors and patients alike. I think having a health system that has capacity, that has reserve, that has resilience is important.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you. Before I thank you both for your time, Dr Lunan, was there something --I saw you had your pen up but maybe it was just --1 hold my pen as well. I don't know if there was something you wanted to add?

```
DR LUNAN: No, it was just the private healthcare -- well, 1
    can I briefly -- 30 seconds about private healthcare.
    I think that there are lots of people who can and can't
    afford to pay for private healthcare that are choosing
    private healthcare because they feel they have no
    option. But, as Dr Williams said, it's often the same
    workforce and often the work will come back to the NHS
    for follow-up, where tests are done in private
    healthcare systems that wouldn't necessarily have been
    done in the NHS because they wouldn't have met the
    thresholds for needing tests to be done.
        But I think more importantly than that, in the
    long-term, if you have these two-tier systems of
    healthcare, it removes the collective incentive of the
    whole of society to argue for or vote for a public
    healthcare system that works well for everyone because
    some people are getting their needs met elsewhere and
    so, ultimately, that undermines the social function of
    the NHS.
MR DUNLOP: Thank you.
            Is there anything else that you would like to add
    that you think would assist the Inquiry in its
    deliberations before I thank you for your time?
DR LUNAN: I think I would just like to say thank you for
    the opportunity to give evidence today; that I think
```
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    general practice as a profession was remarkably
    adaptable and flexible. I was really proud to be a GP
    during the pandemic, during really difficult times, and
    in many ways it brought us closer to our patients.
    I think recovery has been really difficult -- a lot of
    the media coverage around general practice has been
    really difficult in terms of the impact on morale and
    we're still working to try and address that, but I think
    that the way that we were able to support not just the
    medically vulnerable but the socially vulnerable feels
    really important and \(I\) felt really proud to work during
    the pandemic as a GP in the NHS.
    MR DUNLOP: May I extend my thanks to both of you and the
Royal College for giving your time freely and going to
the extent of preparing such a comprehensive statement.
We can't essentially do the Inquiry without parties like
yourselves, so l'll extend my thanks to you.
I have no further questions. I don't know whether
my Lord has anything that he wishes to add.
THE CHAIR: No. Just my thanks to both the doctors. I'm
very grateful. That concludes proceedings for today.
Thank you all.
MR DUNLOP. Thank you my Lord -
. Thank you, my Lord
( 2.54 pm ) 21
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(The hearing adjourned until Friday, 15 March 2024 at 9.45 am)
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| A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acutely (4) 13:10 } 115: 15 \\ & 118: 11125: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| abandoned (1) 34:4 | ad (3) 81:25,25 82 |
| abdominal (2) 92:9 118:8 | adamant (1) 21:18 |
| abilities (1) $71: 8$ | adapt (2) 32:25 138:25 |
| ability (5) 29:6 64:17 | adaptable (1) 146 :2 |
| 101:20,21 138:10 | add (10) 86:14 89:7 92:6 |
| able (72) 13:16 14:17 | 135:12 136:17 139:9,23 |
| 17:16,18 28:15 34:25 | 144:25 145: |
| 39:8,22 46:4 51:21 61:22 | added (2) 19:25 20:15 |
| 63:8,9,15,17 64:11,18 | addition (2) 53:19 139:9 |
| 65:20 66:1 67:4,9 68:8,11 | additional (11) : 1919 10:5,13 |
| 78:6,21 80:9 83:7 84:20,24 | 11:16 20:24 21:5 23:1 |
| 85:3,7,11,13,19 92:13 | 33:1,24 92:6 125:2 |
| 93:6,20 94:5,16,21 96:5 | address (2) 9:12 146:8 |
| 100:21 101:4,22 | addressed (1) 69:12 |
| 103:3,20,21,24 106:8,23 | addressing (1) 31:20 |
| 110:10 111:3,10 119:24 | adequate (10) 32:17 |
| 124:11,21 127:16,23 | 99:12,13 100:1 101:11,18 |
| 128:11 129:15,19,20 131:7 | 106:2 108:15 110:7 111:2 |
| 132:3 135:12 137:12 | adequately (1) 110:25 |
| 10,18 141:25 144:8,9 | adjourned (1) 147:1 |
| 146 | adjournment (1) 87:17 |
| abnormal (2) 119:2,5 | adjusted (1) 74:12 |
| above (1) 107:1 | adjusting (2) 28:22 140:23 |
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| (1) $26: 1$ | using (7) 41:22 45:696:11 | 67:10 75:19 90:12,13 | withdrawing (2) 6:207:13 | 143:14 | 30 (1) 145:2 |
| trust (1) 128:25 | 97:3 105:2 114:21 127:12 | 3:10,13,22 101:7 111:20 | withdrawn (8) $4: 18$ | sno (1) 106:3 | 30s (1) 54:21 |
| trustee (1) 54:1 | usual (2) 119:19 133:5 | 115:11 121:7 128:7 133:18 | 5:8,10,21,22 13:7 16:15 | yet (5) 14:20 25:7,22 73:2 | 33 (1) 58 |
| trustees (2) 53:15 60:23 | usually (1) 1 | 135:8 137:20,24 146:9 |  | 94:9 | 39 (1) 112:12 |

40 (3) 2:4,5 42:15 40s (3) 44:6,23 54:21
44 (1) $77: 17$
45 (1) $63: 23$
4500 (1) $31: 14$
48 (1) $66: 18$
49 (2) 148:3,3

5 (3) 14:3 90:6 97:6 50 (2) 117:22 119:20 500 (1) $54: 15$ 5000 (2) 31:14 89:12 50s (1) $54: 22$ 57 (1) 117:6 58 (1) 117:6

6 (2) 90:6 97:6 60 (2) 74:3 89:22 600 (1) $2: 7$ 60plus70plus (1) 42:18 63 (1) 77:24 65 (2) $76: 23$ 140:14 66 (1) 129:3

70 (1) $89: 22$ 73 (1) 132:23

800 (1) $2: 6$
80s (1) $44: 5$
81 (1) 134:6
85 yearold (1) 140:15 88 (2) $148: 4,5$

900 (3) $89: 2090: 1,2$
9000 (1) $89: 25$
945 (2) $1: 2$ 147:2

