

- Questions were raised around mutual support for ICUs in London and why places of worship were not being included in these measures.
  - On timing of any announcement, there was potential for a rush to venues as a result.
4. The CHAIR invited the Devolved Administrations to comment on the proposed measures and the following points were made in discussion:
- That this was a strengthening of existing policy to ensure social distancing and was in line with the scientific evidence.
  - Concerns were raised around legal powers to enforce these measures.
  - An announcement that evening, in light of the two to three week time frame for effects to be realised, in ICUs was preferred.
  - The economic package was highlighted as a vital component to support business during these measures.
  - The need for forward thinking and having a clear picture of upcoming decisions was also raised.
  - The FIRST MINISTER FOR NORTHERN IRELAND requested a conversation with the Attorney General to further discuss the legal powers and how they would be implemented in Northern Ireland.
5. In wider discussion the following points were made:
- The measures would require operational decisions by local forces but that more resources would be required for them to effectively police the measures.
  - That 'illegal' gatherings following the announcement of measures were possible but that compliance with the measures was expected to be high. The issue of younger people exploiting any delay in announcement was highlighted.
  - The prospect of food deliveries as a lifeline for restaurants and other food businesses. Work was underway to ensure these were possible.
  - Specific details on the circumstances for mixed premises would need to be outlined.
  - The need for any measures to be enforceable - fixed penalty fines or similar penalties for non-compliance were favoured.
  - An option to stagger the measures by industry, was deemed as not workable.
  - That trends were demonstrating that the current measures were reducing social mixing and that modelling from Her Majesty's Treasury indicated significant losses to GDP as a result of increased measures.
  - Whether the measures were proportionate considering the long-term economic implications?
  - On legality, coronavirus was evidently serious enough to warrant a response of the kind in these measures and the measures outlined are required to meet the 75 per cent reduction.
  - On ICU mutual aid, this happened normally and so far ICUs were not collectively facing unexpected pressures, though this was expected to change in the near future, as ICUs were put under greater strain.
  - That the Civil Contingencies Act (2004) could not be used as this is not an unforeseen event and the Public Health Act (1984) was recommended instead.
6. Summing up the CHAIR said that the measures were needed because there had not been full compliance with the previously announced advice. That the Government was committed to the