Me	essa	ge
----	------	----

From:	Van Tam, Jonathan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D29C846FC8FA4678B419C6F0DC3836F3-JVANTAM]
Sent:	05/02/2020 16:31:03
То:	Whitty, Chris [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=0b3ee62e0ca04e978730b14f9b416a1e-Whitty, Chr]
Subject:	RE: Planning assumptions

Chris I very much support 2-3%, hoping it still might come down to 1.5. But huge data uncertainty.

I am keeping out of this because I think further views are unhelpful and a range of 2-3% clearly says across govt prepare for something large and potentially difficult.

Regards

JVT

From: Whitty, Chris

Sent: 05 February 2020 16:27

To: Harris, Samantha (Go Science) <Samantha.Harris@go-science.gov.uk>; Hammond, Katharine - [Flex-C] <Katharine.Hammond@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk>; Wainwright, Stuart (Go Science) <Stuart.Wainwright@Go-Science.gov.uk>; Grant, Natasha -ISRG Civil Contingencies Secretariat <Natasha.Grant@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk> Cc: Vallance, Patrick (GO-Science) <P.Vallance1@go-science.gov.uk>; Name Redacted (Go Science) Name Redacted Science.gov.uk>; Van Tam, Jonathan <Jonathan.VanTam@dhsc.gov.uk> Subject: RE: Planning assumptions

Patrick and I have discussed.

We will for now say 2-3 central estimate but wide uncertainty.

2.5% gives an impression of precision we don't have.

Chris

From: Harris, Samantha (Go Science) <<u>Samantha.Harris@go-science.gov.uk</u>>

Sent: 05 February 2020 16:12

**To:** Hammond, Katharine - [Flex-C] <<u>Katharine.Hammond@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk</u>>; Wainwright, Stuart (Go Science) <<u>Stuart.Wainwright@Go-Science.gov.uk</u>>; Grant, Natasha -ISRG Civil Contingencies Secretariat <<u>Natasha.Grant@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk</u>>

Cc: Vallance, Patrick (GO-Science) <<u>P.Vallance1@go-science.gov.uk</u>>; <u>Name Redacted</u> (Go Science) <u>Name Redacted</u> <u>Science.gov.uk</u>>; Whitty, Chris <<u>Chris.Whitty@dhsc.gov.uk</u>>; Van Tam, Jonathan <<u>Jonathan.VanTam@dhsc.gov.uk</u>> **Subject:** RE: Planning assumptions

SAGE concluded that there was insufficient evidence to deviate away from the pan flu assumptions at this stage so they proposed that the existing figures of 50% population infected, of which 2.5% mortality rate should continue to be used for now. I think these other numbers are taken from the DHSC slide in the CRIP on scenarios - which were not agreed by SAGE – and maybe should be removed to avoid confusion. Many thanks

 From: Hammond, Katharine - [Flex-C] <</td>
 Katharine.Hammond@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk>

 Sent: 05 February 2020 15:26

 To: Wainwright, Stuart (Go Science) <</td>
 Stuart.Wainwright@Go-Science.gov.uk>; Grant, Natasha -ISRG Civil Contingencies

 Secretariat 
 Natasha.Grant@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk>

 Cc: Vallance, Patrick (GO-Science) <</td>
 P.Vallance1@go-science.gov.uk>; Harris, Samantha (Go Science)

 <Samantha.Harris@go-science.gov.uk>; Name Redacted (Go Science)
 Name Redacted

 <Chris.Whitty@dhsc.gov.uk>; Van Tam, Jonathan <</td>
 Jonathan.VanTam@dhsc.gov.uk>

 Subject: RE: Planning assumptions
 Subject: RE: Planning assumptions

Thanks for following this up Stuart.

Can I just check that this position applies to the number of excess deaths assumption as well? The logic of the assumptions that have already been briefed into COBR (50% population infected, of which 2% mortality rate) takes you to a smaller number than the pan flu assumption (660K vs 850K) and that is one I already hear being used. The difference is material I think in planning terms. Fine if the solution here is to give range, but at the moment I worry we have a hard to explain inconsistency.

Katharine



Katharine Hammond Director, Civil Contingencies Secretariat Cabinet Secretariat E: Katharine.Hammond@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk T

From: Wainwright, Stuart (Go Science) <<u>Stuart.Wainwright@Go-Science.gov.uk</u>>
Sent: 05 February 2020 15:06
To: Hammond, Katharine - [Flex-C] <<u>Katharine.Hammond@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk</u>>; Grant, Natasha -ISRG Civil
Contingencies Secretariat <<u>Natasha.Grant@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk</u>>; Grant, Natasha -ISRG Civil
Contingencies Secretariat <<u>Natasha.Grant@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk</u>>;
Cc: Vallance, Patrick (GO-Science) <<u>P.Vallance1@go-science.gov.uk</u>>; Harris, Samantha (Go Science)
<<u>Samantha.Harris@go-science.gov.uk</u>>; <u>Name Redacted</u> (Go Science)
<u>Name Redacted</u> Whitty, Chris
Subject: Planning assumptions

Katharine and Tasha

Thank you for the exchange earlier and we've discussed with Patrick

As flagged, SAGE is already considering emerging evidence and confidence levels at each meeting and given these does still consider the pan flu RWC to be appropriate as a reasonable worst case scenario for coronavirus. We will take SAGE through this again at the next meeting and also check on the appropriateness of each individual pan flu planning assumption given the latest evidence and confidence, and whether there needs to be any changes in the RWC for coronavirus. I should be clear that confidence levels are likely to remain low for many parts of the evidence base at this time

We'll aim to crystalise their latest assessment in a clear manner which can be shared easily.

We may need to pick up with you further issues around who owns planning assumptions as they are refined

Stuart

Government Office for Science Dr Stuart Wainwright Director I&S stuart.wainwright@go-science.gov.uk www.gov.uk/go-science | @uksciencechief

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <u>http://www.symanteccloud.com</u>

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

This e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. Any views expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Department of Health and Social Care. Please note: Incoming and outgoing email messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications.