

Message

From: TEO HOCS (DS) [/O=NIGOV/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=286B5F4D742442098CBED44F7B75FAAC-TEO HOCS (DS) TEO-]
Sent: 05/02/2020 8:52:31 AM
To: McCormick, Andrew (TEO) [Andrew.McCormick@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk]; Pearson, Karen [Karen.Pearson@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk]; **NR** [redacted]@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk; Stewart, Chris (TEO) [chris.stewart@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk]
CC: Lorraine Lynas [Lorraine.Lynas@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk]; TEO HOCS (DS) [HOCS@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk]
Subject: RE: Planning assumptions

If there is any ambiguity it would seem sensible to press for assumptions about all aspects of preparedness, including “non-negotiated outcome” which, given CDL’s comments yesterday, is now a scenario it is reasonable to plan for.

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)

From: McCormick, Andrew (TEO) <Andrew.McCormick@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 04 Feb 2020, 22:55
To: Pearson, Karen <Karen.Pearson@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, Andrew.McCormick@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk <Andrew.McCormick@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, **NR** [redacted]@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk <NR@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, Stewart, Chris (TEO) <chris.stewart@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: Lorraine Lynas <Lorraine.Lynas@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, TEO HOCS (DS) <HOCS@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning assumptions

Many thanks for this.

I was clear that the XO discussion was about preparedness - so planning assumptions would need to address:

- desired outcome (success of UK negotiation objectives)
- likely outcome (honestly, best case is a bare bones deal)

AND

- reasonable worst case (I can tolerate “non negotiated outcome”).

For all, but especially the last, planning will only be realistic if the planning assumptions are honest about the UK’s legal obligations under the Protocol. Honest communication with businesses should not be a big ask.

Hope this helps.

Many thanks

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)

From: Pearson, Karen <Karen.Pearson@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 04 Feb 2020, 10:40 pm
To: Andrew McCormick<Andrew.McCormick@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, NR <NR@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, Stewart, Chris (TEO) <chris.stewart@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: Lorraine Lynas <Lorraine.Lynas@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>, TEO HOCS (DS <HOCS@executiveoffice-ni.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning assumptions

Andrew

Minister Kearney asked at XO for access to planning assumptions. CDL agreed. As that can only have been in the context of the WA, as No Deal was off the table, we can expect to have access to assumptions which underpin the work needed in 2020.

We have seen nothing yet. And I'm worried this might take a backwards rather than forwards look.

NIO have been in touch with me today about planning assumptions. I have been clear in response that Minister K had secured a commitment. So we need to understand the context for any conversation about planning assumptions (what scenario do they wish to discuss?). We will participate in a first discussion tomorrow, and I've said this must focus on the context, and I will want to understand the governance arrangements too.

If the conversation with NIO is about assumptions for negotiations, I think that fits with what Minister K was asking about. **Do you agree?**

If this is no deal (please see below), we have no remit. But I can explore what NIO have in mind.

Minister Long, and Minister Swann, both raised no deal planning at the sub committee today. NR and I think we need to add this to the work programme reasonably soon to get a steer on what assumptions they want to us to plan on (I spoke to both Ministers after the meeting and they would welcome this being added to the programme). The sub committee is not tied to UKG planning assumptions but they will want us to be informed, so we need to keep an open dialogue with NIO as our main source of information on this at present. But joint planning with NIO is not a given until we have authority for that.

Which gives rise to planning for:

- our own analysis, pre restoration, was that gap analysis would be needed on the issues to be addressed between the protocol and a light FTA
- more recent analysis suggests we need to understand the gap between the protocol and no FTA

I intend to hold the line with NIO that we can engage with the remit set by Minister Kearney. Anything which looks or feels like no deal planning has to have sub committee endorsement. Chris will have a major interest in this.

Karen

Ps: the term No Deal is verboten in Whitehall. "Non negotiated outcome" is the new mantra apparently. We can decide what we want to call it from our perspective.

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)