

Message

From: Cole, Andy [/O=NIGOV/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E89D976D781B48F0988B1F9E2B788FB1-ANDY COLE 2109965]
Sent: 20/05/2021 4:45:59 PM
To: McGuicken, Mark [mark.mcguicken@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk]; [NR] [NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk]
CC: Clydesdale, Alison [alison.clydesdale@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk]; [NR] [NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk]
Subject: RE: New Pandemic Preparedness Board

Content with compromise yes as we don't want to spook the horses....and yes, do see us increasingly passing leads to the policy/subject experts.

We can provide the cross cutting join outside of the workings of any sub-group or Board – that would be a good function of that square Alison had called the “risk management board”, but will be a different name – that's exactly where all the sub group risks are scrutinised and any cross cutting challenge made.

From: McGuicken, Mark
Sent: 20 May 2021 16:42
To: Cole, Andy <Andy.Cole@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; [NR] [NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison <Alison.Clydesdale@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; [NR] <[NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: New Pandemic Preparedness Board

Andy,

My one concern about not be implicit about TEO involvement is this particular issue was a major issues for [NR] (and more so Liz Redmond) when we discussed closing the old Resilience Programme. We went to lengths to emphasis at the last CCG that we wouldn't go back onto silos and leave this with Health as (had been seen from COVID) a pandemic hits all sections of life not simply Health. It may be more prudent to, as you say put Health front and centre, but accept that TEO has a wider government system preparedness role but we could, through time, take an increasing back seat?

PD

Information

Mark McGuicken | Head of Civil Contingencies Policy Branch

Room E4.07 | 2nd Floor Castle Buildings | Stormont | Belfast | BT4 3SR

Contact: ✉ mark.mcguicken@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk | ☎ Tel: [I&S] / [I&S] | 📠 DD: [I&S]



From: Cole, Andy
Sent: 20 May 2021 16:34
To: [NR] [NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison <Alison.Clydesdale@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; McGuicken, Mark <Mark.McGuicken@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; [NR] [NR]@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: New Pandemic Preparedness Board

This is interesting [NR] – and it links to our wider repositioning around the governance and assurance model – which will be built around the sub/working groups structures and join into CCG NI.

Broadly I'm content with the approach – what is good is that DOH see they do have a clear role in this. I wonder is it sufficient in the email not to be sooo conclusive to Anne that TEO will also sit on the Board at this stage, although may need to provide some level of reassurance that we “are in the loop” also.

....the reason I highlight this...and it's only a view at this stage (with no evidence), is I am not convinced about TEO role on all of these groups/Boards, and my first reaction is we shouldn't be on this Board (again perhaps wrong). The work being brought forward on the SG/WG assurance framework may provide better light and shade on all of this which is why I'm keen to see that in a few weeks before would make a call on it.

For me (again only my view not expressed to others, just my head!) TEO/CCPB gig is to have the infrastructure and control framework in place – and for the right people to be leading the right expert work and making the right joins. So just the way we expect DfI to lead on flooding risk – I'd expect them to provide assurance back to CCG NI and Exec – and TEO role is just to know and understand and have working knowledge of it happening. There is no point having a subject expert chairing a group to provide assurance....if TEO sit at the table each and every time – that logic would have us in every group ever existing. So with flu, clear DOH lead to lead the sub group – and clear lead to sit on CO Board – and provide that CO line of sight back into their own group which they lead and own – and provide into CCG NI the necessary assurance. I don't see any TEO value in being at that.

This isn't saying we are just on the touchline – we will support across all of these structures with capacity building and training exercising and joining the dots – but we should not be involved in assurance work for which the subject specialist lead sits elsewhere is my feel.

I got on a bit of a soapbox there!! In short, I'm in agreement re getting DOH onto that Board – if there is any way to not be so explicit about our role, consider that. I think the work coming forward to June CCG NI will help formulate all of this in our head for the future.

A

From: [NR]
Sent: 20 May 2021 15:58
To: Cole, Andy <Andy.Cole@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison <Alison.Clydesdale@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; McGuicken, Mark <Mark.McGuicken@executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>; [NR] [NR] <executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk>
Subject: New Pandemic Preparedness Board

Andy

At the Resilience Officials Working Group (ROWG) meeting yesterday afternoon CCS advised a new UK wide Pandemic Preparedness Board will replace the old UK wide Pan Flu Readiness Board and to come back to CCS Control if you have not been contacted on this and want to be a part of it – it was the old Pandemic Flu Readiness Board which drove the work for the CCG (NI) Pan Flu Sub Group, which DoH lead – would now just need a name change, presumably to the Pandemic Preparedness Sub Group

I spoke yesterday to [NR] who said DoH were unaware of this new Board – I suggested that, as before, DoH will lead on this for NI and would need to join the Board – [NR] agreed but wanted DoJ and TEO to also be involved as they were in the old Pandemic Flu Readiness Board – I never attended any meetings and had very little involvement in Pan

Flu, usually **NR** but DoJ and TEO did attend the Pandemic Flu Readiness Board alongside DoH – I spoke to Doreen McClintock today and she was also unaware of this new Board but is content for DoJ to remain involved from an Excess Deaths perspective and for her to be the DoJ rep on the Board

I have spoken to Mark and we both agree that we should email DoH to say we have been made aware of this new Board and that as before DoH should lead on this issue with support from DoJ and TEO – DoH should email CCS control as the NI lead with the names of the DoH, DoJ and TEO participants (we don't want 3 separate emails from DoH, DoJ and TEO, should be one NI email which should come from the lead, DoH)

Are you content with this approach? Proposed email to Anne, cc'd to Doreen, is below – probably best sent from Mark (as participants are at Gd7 level):

NR

As you are aware at a recent CO meeting CCS advised us that a new UK wide Pandemic Preparedness Board will replace the old UK wide Pan Flu Readiness Board and to email CCS Control if you have not been contacted re this and want to be a part of it – this is all the information we have at the moment and we can review the situation as it develops

NI would need to be represented on this new Board, as our number one risk, and following past practice we recommend that DoH takes the lead on this issue, supported by both DoJ and TEO – Doreen has agreed to be the DoJ rep and I will be the TEO rep

Grateful if you could email CCS Control (ccs.control@cabinetoffice.gov.uk) with the names of the NI reps from DoH, DoJ and TEO, cc'ing them in for information

Many thanks

Many thanks

NR

Civil Contingencies Policy Branch

Castle Buildings | Stormont | Belfast | BT4 3SR

Contact: ✉ **NR** @executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk | ☎ Tel:

I&S

I&S



The
Executive Office