



Proactive Release

The following Cabinet paper and related Cabinet minute has been proactively released by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, on behalf of Rt Hon Jacinda Ardern, Prime Minister:

COVID-19: Preparing to Review New Zealand's Level 3 Status

The following documents have been included in this release:

***Paper: COVID-19: Preparing to Review New Zealand's Level 3 Status
(CAB-20-SUB-0199 refers)***

***Minute: Preparing to Review New Zealand's Level 3 Status
(CAB-20-MIN-0199 refers)***

No information has been withheld in this material.

Cabinet

COVID-19: PREPARING TO REVIEW NEW ZEALAND'S LEVEL 3 STATUS

Proposal

1. This paper sets out the process that Ministers will follow to come to a decision on reviewing our Level 3 status on May 11.

Summary

2. We are continuing to make encouraging progress on our strategy to eliminate COVID-19. New cases are very low. As at May 1, it has been eleven days since our last confirmed cases of community transmission, ie cases with no known link to overseas travel or to an existing case. This, combined with our ongoing widespread testing, gives us confidence that there is no widespread transmission of COVID-19 at this time.
3. On May 11 we will again review our Alert Level, using the factors we have already agreed. It will involve a balanced assessment of our public health readiness, including on testing and contact tracing, the significant economic and social implications of moving down a Level or staying where we are, and the questions of social licence, public support and public compliance.
4. The Alert Level framework overall is serving us well. I propose in this paper some small adjustments to ensure that the thresholds for moving between Levels are applicable to all Levels, rather than just in the move from Level 4 to Level 3.
5. I also propose that we ask AOG officials to start the work to define what Level 1 would look like and the guidance and communications materials required. Any such move would of course rest on a careful assessment of the situation we faced at that time.
6. As we look to a future at the lower Alert Levels, we need to be confident that we have credible options to increase restrictions at a sub-national level if that is required to get control over an outbreak. Officials are continuing to work on operational mechanisms, within the existing legal framework, to take rapid action at the local or regional level if that was required to contain the virus, with appropriate interface with Cabinet decision-making but without raising the national Alert Level.
7. Officials are also developing separate advice on the border that will be submitted for Cabinet's consideration in the coming weeks. It may not be possible to make any near-term changes to the border safely, but it is as well to be prepared since border restrictions affect the ability of the New Zealand economy to recover. Close coordination with Australia and with Pacific partners will be required.
8. This paper fits together with two others that are also at Cabinet on May 4: one on what is permitted and not permitted at Level 2 and the preparedness for a shift, and the other a paper from the Attorney-General on the legal framework for the Alert Level system that was discussed at SWC last week. Together with the latest weekly monitoring report from AOG officials that will be at SWC on May 6, we will have all the building blocks in place for the paper at Cabinet on May 11 that will consider whether and when to move from Level 3.

Introduction

9. This paper discusses some pre-cursors to reviewing our Level 3 Alert status. It:
 - a. Reviews the elements of the Alert Level framework,
 - b. Mentions some issues of timing and enforcement that will arise in the Alert Level decision,
 - c. Briefly summarises how Level 2 looks by comparison with Level 3, a topic that is covered in more detail in the accompanying paper,
 - d. Explores sub-national controls, and
 - e. Explains the papers that are being created to support our decision on May 11.

Alert Level framework adjustments

10. There are now three pieces to our Alert Level framework:
 - a. The public Alert Levels Summary table, with the description of each Level and an indication of the control measures that might apply. This is supported by more detailed explanations of controls and extensive communications materials.
 - b. The seven factors that Cabinet agreed would guide all decisions on moving Levels.
 - c. The specific requirements against those factors that Cabinet set for moving from Alert Level 4 to Alert Level 3.
11. Overall the framework is effective and has proved its worth. It provides guidance but not a straitjacket for Cabinet-level decisions, as well as a basis for public communications. It is straightforward enough to be used as often as needed for decision-making with the information that we have readily coming to hand.
12. The first decision we made using all three pieces of the framework was to move out of lockdown into Alert Level 3. My officials have concluded that some tweaks to the Cabinet-agreed factors for decision-making would help it work for all Level change decisions, including going back up levels at the national level.

Alert Levels definitions

13. The four Alert Levels in our framework include a helpful high-level description of the situation we would expect to be in when we are at each stage. I am aware that some jurisdictions have set specific numeric thresholds for moving between Levels. These are appealing because of their clarity, but give too much power to just one input into decision-making and do not reflect the fact that there can be a lag in isolating the source of cases. I propose that we retain our general descriptive thresholds.
14. Our Alert Levels are set out in the two left-most columns of the table below.

The seven factors

15. There are seven factors that Cabinet has agreed to use in assessing changes between Levels. I propose only one small but important change, to separate out the effect on “at risk” populations from wider economic and social factors. The “at risk” populations include Māori, Pacific Peoples, people over 70, those in aged residential care, disabled people and people with existing conditions. This separation reflects how we have used the framework in practice.

16. The revised eight factors would be as follows (with the separated out measure in bold: this is the only change in this part of the framework):
- The Director-General of Health’s satisfaction on four health matters:
 - trends in the transmission of the virus (the threshold varies by Alert Level), including his confidence in the data,
 - the capacity and capability of our testing and contact tracing systems,
 - the effectiveness of our self-isolation, quarantine and border measures,
 - the capacity in the health system more generally to move to the new Level, including the workforce and ICU capacity, plus the availability of PPE for those for whom it is recommended.
 - Plus four wider factors for Cabinet to consider:
 - evidence of the effects of the measures on the economy and society more broadly,
 - **evidence of the impacts of the measures for at risk populations in particular,**
 - public attitudes towards the measures and the extent to which people and businesses understand, accept and abide by them, and
 - our ability to operationalise the restrictions, including satisfactory implementation planning.

The specific requirements for moving between Levels

17. Cabinet also agreed a specific threshold for community transmission that needed to be met to move from Level 4 to Level 3.
- “There is sufficient data from a range of sources including testing and surveillance that public health experts, statisticians and modellers can have reasonable certainty that undetected community transmission is unlikely”
18. I propose that we adjust this language so that it is neutral as between Levels, and can support moves both down and up. The table below summarises the existing public Alert Level settings, with the third column being the changed assessment that would be for the Director-General to make to inform each decision Cabinet made on Alert Levels.
19. I asked officials to also include the fourth column in the table. It is not formally part of the Alert Levels system but just provides an indication to ministers of what we might be seeing in terms of case numbers at each Level. I do not propose that we change the public Alert Level table at this time.
20. To repeat a point made earlier, in this context, “community transmission” means situations where the source of an infection is not from overseas travel, nor from a known case or cluster. It can take some days for the source of an infection to become clear.

Table 1: Proposed Alert Level thresholds

Existing public Alert Level Table		Cabinet mandated threshold	
Alert Level	Risk assessment	The Director-General of Health is satisfied that there is sufficient	What this Level might look like in practice

SENSITIVE

		data from a range of sources to have reasonable certainty that	
Level 4 – Lockdown Likely the disease is not contained	Community transmission is occurring Widespread outbreaks and new clusters	There is potentially significant undetected community transmission	Fast growth in case numbers Several emerging clusters Many cases with unknown transmission
Level 3 – Restrict High risk the disease is not contained	Community transmission might be happening New clusters may emerge but can be controlled through testing and tracing	Undetected community transmission is possible but unlikely	Growth in cases not contained to existing clusters No or few cases with unknown transmission
Level 2 – Reduce The disease is contained but the risk of community transmission remains	Household transmission could be occurring Single or isolated cluster outbreaks	Transmission is restricted to individual households or known clusters	Slow growth in case numbers Growth in cases mostly contained to existing clusters and cases No or few cases with unknown transmission for some days
Level 1 – Prepare The disease is contained in New Zealand	COVID-19 is uncontrolled overseas Isolated household transmission could be occurring in New Zealand	Transmission is restricted to isolated cases	Sporadic cases only No or few cases with unknown transmission for many days

Timing and transition issues

21. On May 11, Cabinet will have a range of options on whether and when to change Alert Level, and how to manage any transition from Level 3 controls. This paper does not seek any decisions on these matters.
22. As mentioned above, we will use the agreed framework in the assessment, balancing all aspects of the choices. We will need to consider our public health capabilities, the economic and social impacts of controls, and the position of at risk communities, as well as the important issues of continued public acceptance and compliance, and our ability to operationalise controls.
23. As part of this last point, Ministers will need to consider the adequacy of the enforcement framework. As discussed at SWC last week, there is some uncertainty about the ability to enforce some aspects of the controls at Level 2 under the existing legal framework, particularly in relation to mass gatherings in breach of the rules in private residences. More generally, officials are concerned that the use of a mix of

powers under three Acts is unsustainable as we move beyond the crisis response. New legislation is being worked on for introduction around May 14.

24. In my view it would sensible to have at least 48 hours between the announcement of a decision to move Levels and it taking effect to give businesses, schools, and other organisations time to prepare. As we have seen at all Levels, with any change we will all take time to figure out how to operate under new rules.
25. Whether we decide to change Levels or not, there will continue to be an important role for the Government in maintaining public confidence in the effectiveness of our control measures, including our systems for reporting breaches, ensuring compliance, and maintaining public life while protecting public health. At present we see high levels of compliance and support for restrictive controls. We will want to ensure that that continues.

Moving back up

26. As always, we will need to continue to monitor closely what happens with the spread of the virus. We need a pause button (which we have had with our two-weekly reconsiderations) and a reverse button, which would involve using the Cabinet-agreed factors to come to a decision to lift the national Alert Level. Given our mass testing programme and our much better understanding of our situation as regards COVID-19, we are now better placed to make these decisions if we need to.

Level 2 restrictions

27. CBC agreed the detailed controls under Levels 2, 3 and 4 on April 15 [CBC-20-MIN-004]. Compared with Level 3, Level 2 involves notably fewer restrictions on economic and social life, and relies more on people thinking about how to move about and interact safely than having specific prohibitions in place and enforced.
28. Even with the public health restrictions that will be in place, Level 2, when we get there, will bring a significant increase in daily freedoms. Notably, many more businesses will be able to reopen, including hospitality businesses, some personal services, retail shops, and commercial premises where many people might gather, eg, malls, cinemas and gyms. Schools and other educational institutions can start to return to more normal functioning. Social gatherings can resume.
29. We will of course maintain our active testing regime, continue to enhance our contact tracing capabilities, and continue to require self-isolation of those with symptoms, and those who test positive and their close contacts. We will maintain quarantine capabilities for those who cannot self-isolate effectively.
30. Formally, New Zealand's border restrictions will be reviewed in the May 11 paper where the Alert Level settings are considered. My expectation is that that review will leave the border closed to non-New Zealanders for the time being, with few and managed exceptions. Returning New Zealanders will continue to be quarantined.
31. As we transition to lower Alert Levels domestically and as other countries get control of the spread of COVID-19, we can start to consider what cross-border movement of passengers can be safely facilitated. Officials are developing separate advice on the border that will be submitted for Cabinet's consideration in the coming weeks. The objective is to ensure that New Zealand is well-positioned to preserve, protect, and rebuild international connections as soon as it is safe to do so. Close coordination with Australia and with Pacific partners will remain an important feature of this work.

Sub-national steps up

32. Cabinet has taken the view so far that only national movements in the Alert Level were appropriate. But as we move to lower Alert Levels, we need to be sure we are prepared for a situation where stronger public health measures are required in one area but we do not need to increase the Alert Level nationwide.
33. This might happen if we were to see a major outbreak in a particular town or several clusters emerging in a region, which caused us to conclude that there was undetected transmission in a community. Stronger control measures would reduce transmission within an area by reducing mixing of the people there, and contain travel in and out of the area, to prevent wider spread.

The response will depend on the situation

34. If an outbreak spreads beyond the ability of the contact tracing and isolation systems to contain it, the powers in section 70 and 71 of the Health Act allow controls to be put on activity at a sub-national level, as they do at the national level under the Alert Level framework. For example, the powers allow buildings to be closed, people to be quarantined, and travel to be restricted. This sort of activity could take place at a regional level, if the conditions require.
35. It is quite possible that future outbreaks will be localised (perhaps around an institution) and will not map to a wider regional geography or require an explicit change in the Alert Level status for a whole region. Previous advice on this issue has been that controls at the level of the CDEM regions (which map well to Regional Council boundaries) were operationally possible [COVID Ministers 16/04/20 decision]. But for a local outbreak, the first response would be enhanced public health measures. Detection through surveillance testing, followed by rapid contact tracing and isolation may well be sufficient to manage an outbreak before it spreads more widely.
36. In the event of widespread sub-national controls, decision-making, communications and exemptions would need to be managed carefully. There would also be some significant operational issues to manage. Large numbers of people might move if some sub-national controls were announced in advance of implementation. On the other hand, many people might be stranded on the wrong side of their home, work or support if there was no notice at all, or no process to move out of the area after the controls were imposed. Our experience with moving to Level 4 was that we needed to provide some additional flexibility for some movements after the original deadline.
37. Currently, Cabinet decides the Alert Levels and the relevant Ministers consider whether a State of Emergency and/or an Epidemic Notice is required. But those officials with specific powers under such legislation, like the Health Act, must exercise them independently and appropriately in support of the Government's strategy to control the spread of the virus. Officials are working on a bespoke legislative regime which would better clarify the relationship between Ministers as decision-makers and the role of officials with specific expertise in relation to those decisions.

Officials have been doing some operational planning

38. Systems are already in place for controls at a local level under the powers of the Medical Officers of Health. Although it may be unlikely to emerge, AOG officials have done some contingency planning for a scenario where different Alert Levels are implemented at the regional level. The scenario would involve regional border controls in the form of road blocks and managed entry and exit, tidily implemented in a small number of regions with 72 hours' notice. The Auckland/Waikato boundary is considered the most challenging.

39. Planning for these regional scenarios and for more localised control is ongoing. The response depends on the exact situation. For example, control of a suburb in a large urban centre would be quite different from control in a small regional township.

Preparing for the decision on May 11

40. The table below outlines the papers that together mean we will have all the information and decisions in place, and the most up-to-date data for the paper at Cabinet on May 11 that will consider our Level 3 status.
41. As mentioned above, there is an accompanying paper which is being considered at this meeting that outlines the Alert Level 2 requirements, key communication messages, and the work underway to prepare for a future shift. This includes work being coordinated across government and delivered by individual agencies. Cabinet is also considering today a paper from SWC on the legal framework for the Alert Level system.
42. To help along the active preparation work that is going on across the public sector, I propose that we now formally direct all government agencies to prepare for a move to Level 2.

Table 2: Papers in preparation for the May 11 decision

Date	Paper
May 4, Cabinet (PM, DPMC led)	Sets out the process for the Level 3 review decision (this paper)
May 4, Cabinet (PM, AOG led)	Outlines the requirements of Level 2, key messages and the work underway to prepare for a shift
May 4, Cabinet (AG)	Looks at the legal framework for the Alert Level system (SWC Report on April 29)
May 6, SWC (Minister of Health, AOG led)	Weekly monitoring report from AOG officials with the latest data
May 11, Cabinet (PM, DPMC led)	Level 3 review decision paper

Financial Implications

43. This paper has no direct financial implications.

Legislative Implications

44. The Alert Levels framework has worked well for the crisis response. However, as we move down the Levels and away from the initial urgency, we need to ensure that we continue to operate on a secure legal footing. At present we are using a mix of powers under three Acts, an approach that lacks clarity and transparency.
45. SWC has agreed to develop a bespoke COVID-19 legislative regime, which will give relevant decision-makers the necessary powers and flexibility to respond to the epidemic at both a local and national level over the longer-term. This will also ensure greater transparency for the public and clearer guidance for those who enforce the Alert Level framework.
46. Officials are working on draft legislation, to be ready for introduction around May 14. It is not intended for the new provisions to substantively amend the Health, Civil Defence Emergency Management or Epidemic Preparedness Acts. Rather, it will provide separate authority for a more nuanced range of measures to stop the spread of COVID-19 under all Alert Levels.

47. In addition, the Minister of Civil Defence could give notice of a national transition period over the whole of New Zealand (which lasts 90 days and can be further extended). A transition period is designed to assist the community's recovery from an emergency situation in the short, medium and long term. It enables access to a limited set of powers in the CDEM Act. Officials are working together to align this within the broader Alert Levels framework. It might provide a legal tool for any period between when we move to Level 2 and when the new statutory regime can be brought into force. This will be addressed as part of the weekly reconsideration of the State of National Emergency.
48. Even in the absence of a State of Emergency and without the new regime in force, powers under the Health Act that are central to our response at present can be activated either by the Minister of Health or the Prime Minister through an Epidemic Notice. The Ministry of Health anticipates these powers only being activated for the Medical Officers of Health with national jurisdiction, that is, the ones employed within the Ministry, rather than for all Medical Officers of Health. That will ensure nationally consistent decision-making, with appropriate political oversight.
49. But, in the absence of the bespoke regime, the CDEM and Health Act powers are not well-placed to deal with issues that may arise in the lower Alert Levels. The enactment of a special regime to provide the ability to enforce the restrictions at all Alert Levels should be a relevant consideration in whether to move Levels. It is an important component of delivering on our public health objectives.

Impact Analysis

50. The requirement for a Regulatory Impact Analysis did not apply because this is a policy proposal directly related to the COVID-19 response.

Human Rights

51. This paper has no direct human rights implications. The human rights implications of the controls in place to slow the spread of COVID-19 are significant and have been set out in detail in previous papers on Alert Level decisions [CAB-20-MIN-0161; CAB-20-MIN-0176]. Relevant departments will continue to keep all restrictive measures under review to ensure that they remain necessary and are implemented in a way that is consistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act.

Gender impact statement

52. This paper has no direct gender impact implications.

Disability Impact

53. It will be important to ensure that information is provided about Alert Level 2 in a range of formats (New Zealand Sign Language, blind formats, Easyread). Officials will work on getting the guidance and key messages translated into accessible formats.

Consultation

54. This paper was prepared by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (Policy Advisory Group). Consultation on a draft of the paper was undertaken with the Ministries of Health, Business, Innovation and Employment, Education, Social Development, Transport and Primary Industries, the All of Government COVID-19 unit, the Treasury, the State Services Commission, Crown Law and my Chief Science Advisor.

Communications

- 55. I will communicate the decisions set out in this paper after Cabinet agreement. Communications will be co-ordinated with the Government’s broader communications around its COVID-19 response.

Proactive Release

- 56. I intend to proactively release this Cabinet paper following Cabinet consideration.

Recommendations

- 57. The Prime Minister recommends that Cabinet:
 - 1. **note** the good progress on our national effort to eliminate COVID-19 so far;
 - 2. **note** that Cabinet will review our Alert Level 3 status on May 11;
 - 3. **note** that there will be a range of views on whether and when to change Levels and any transition period that would be appropriate, and that we will retain the flexibility to move back up the Levels if that is required;
 - 4. **note** that the factors Cabinet previously agreed for the Level 4 decision need to be adjusted to fit to all Alert Levels and to reflect the importance of impacts on at risk communities in our assessments [CAB-20-MIN-0161 refers];
 - 5. **agree** that the principal matters that will be taken into consideration in determining nationwide Alert Levels in New Zealand are:
 - 5.1. that the Director-General of Health is satisfied that:
 - 5.1.1. there is sufficient data from a range of sources to have reasonable certainty that the situation in regard to transmission of the virus is in line with the table in the next recommendation;
 - 5.1.2. there is sufficient capacity and capability in our testing and contact tracing, with surge capacity available in the case of an outbreak;
 - 5.1.3. our self-isolation, quarantine and border measures are sufficiently robust and adhered to;
 - 5.1.4. there is capacity in the health system more generally, including the workforce and ICU capacity (plus the availability of PPE for those for whom it is recommended);
 - 5.2. evidence of the effects of the measures on the economy and society more broadly,
 - 5.3. evidence of the impacts of the measures for at risk populations in particular,
 - 5.4. public attitudes towards the measures and the extent to which people and businesses understand, accept and abide by them,
 - 5.5. our ability to operationalise the restrictions, including satisfactory implementation planning.
 - 6. **note** the following thresholds for transmission at each Alert Level in line with the previous recommendation:

Alert Level	The Director General of Health is satisfied that there is sufficient data from a range of sources to have
--------------------	--

SENSITIVE

	reasonable certainty that:
Level 4 – Lockdown Likely the disease is not contained	There is potentially significant undetected community transmission
Level 3 – Restrict High risk the disease is not contained	Undetected community transmission is possible but unlikely
Level 2 – Reduce The disease is contained but the risk of community transmission remains	Transmission is restricted to individual households or known clusters
Level 1 – Prepare The disease is contained in New Zealand	Transmission is restricted to isolated cases

7. **note** that Level 2 involves a substantial reduction in restrictions relative to Level 3, and relies more on people thinking about how to move about and interact safely than on having specific prohibitions in place and enforced;
8. **note** that officials are continuing to look at the operational mechanisms that can be used to take rapid action at the local or regional level if that was required to contain the virus, and without raising the national Alert Level;
9. **note** that there would be some questions of communications and some practical issues in implementing sub-national controls in a large geographic area;
10. **direct** AOG officials to report to Cabinet on the plans for sub-national control;
11. **direct** government agencies to prepare for a possible move to Level 2, including preparing:
 - 11.1. internal implementation requirements; and
 - 11.2. guidance, communications and support for sectors and the public;
12. **direct** AOG officials to commence work on the controls that will be required at Level 1 and how to communicate and operationalise them; and
13. **agree** that Cabinet's decisions today will be communicated by the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. Jacinda Ardern
Prime Minister



Cabinet

Minute of Decision

This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.

Preparing to Review New Zealand's Level 3 Status

Portfolio **Prime Minister**

On 4 May 2020, Cabinet:

- 1 **noted** the good progress on our national effort to eliminate COVID-19 so far, as outlined in the paper attached to CAB-20-SUB-0199;
- 2 **noted** that Cabinet will review New Zealand's Alert Level 3 status on 11 May 2020;
- 3 **noted** that there will be a range of views on whether and when to change Alert Levels and any transition period that would be appropriate, and that we will retain the flexibility to move back up the Levels if that is required;
- 4 **noted** that the factors Cabinet previously agreed for the Level 4 decision need to be adjusted to fit to all Alert Levels and to reflect the importance of impacts on at-risk communities in our assessments [CAB-20-MIN-0161];
- 5 **agreed** that the principal matters that will be taken into consideration in determining nationwide Alert Levels in New Zealand are:
 - 5.1 that the Director-General of Health is satisfied that:
 - 5.1.1 there is sufficient data from a range of sources to have reasonable certainty that the situation in regard to transmission of the virus is in line with the table in paragraph 6 below;
 - 5.1.2 there is sufficient capacity and capability in our testing and contact tracing, with surge capacity available in the case of an outbreak;
 - 5.1.3 our self-isolation, quarantine and border measures are sufficiently robust and adhered to;
 - 5.1.4 there is capacity in the health system more generally, including the workforce and ICU capacity (plus the availability of personal protective equipment for those for whom it is recommended);
 - 5.2 evidence of the effects of the measures on the economy and society more broadly;
 - 5.3 evidence of the impacts of the measures for at-risk populations in particular;

- 5.4 public attitudes towards the measures and the extent to which people and businesses understand, accept, and abide by them;
- 5.5 our ability to operationalise the restrictions, including satisfactory implementation planning;

6 **noted** the following thresholds for transmission at each Alert Level in line with the previous paragraph:

Alert Level	The Director General of Health is satisfied that there is sufficient data from a range of sources to have reasonable certainty that:
Level 4 – Lockdown Likely the disease is not contained	There is potentially significant undetected community transmission
Level 3 – Restrict High risk the disease is not contained	Undetected community transmission is possible but unlikely
Level 2 – Reduce The disease is contained but the risk of community transmission remains	Transmission is restricted to individual households or known clusters
Level 1 – Prepare The disease is contained in New Zealand	Transmission is restricted to isolated cases

7 **noted** that Level 2 involves a substantial reduction in restrictions relative to Level 3, and relies more on people thinking about how to move about and interact safely than on having specific prohibitions in place and enforced;

8 **noted** that officials are continuing to look at the operational mechanisms that can be used to take rapid action at the local or regional level if that was required to contain the virus, and without raising the national Alert Level;

9 **noted** that there would be some questions of communications and some practical issues in implementing sub-national controls in a large geographic area;

10 **directed** All of Government officials to report to Cabinet on the plans for sub-national control;

11 **directed** government agencies to prepare for a possible move to Level 2, including preparing:

11.1 internal implementation requirements; and

11.2 guidance, communications, and support for sectors and the public;

12 **directed** All of Government officials to commence work on the controls that will be required at Level 1 and how to communicate and operationalise them;

13 **agreed** that Cabinet’s decisions set out above be communicated by the Prime Minister.

Michael Webster
Secretary of the Cabinet