

Document 1

Email exchanges of 15 July 2020

From: McAllan M (Màiri) (Special Adviser) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 15 July 2020 13:11
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Attendees at wedding ceremony.

Many thanks.

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Sent: 15 July 2020 13:05
To: McAllan M (Màiri) (Special Adviser) ; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Subject: RE: Attendees at wedding ceremony.

Màiri

Yes, we will be reviewing generally for 30 July and can include the point on children in that review.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: McAllan M (Màiri) (Special Adviser) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 15 July 2020 13:04
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Attendees at wedding ceremony.

Thanks [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]– yes, I'm sensing a bit of push back from the apparent inconsistency that while children generally do not need to physically distance, they are treated in the same way as adults when it comes to weddings.

Will this be reviewed on 30 July?

Mairi

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 15 July 2020 12:58
To: McAllan M (Màiri) (Special Adviser) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot; [redacted-

s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Attendees at wedding ceremony.

Màiri

Yes, children are included in the 20 cap, given the need to keep tight controls on numbers generally.

We intend to review the position generally at the end of this month, as part of the next review, and if need be could consider then if any specific provision should be made for children.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: McAllan M (Màiri) (Special Adviser) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 15 July 2020 12:53

To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: Attendees at wedding ceremony.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

I understand you are both best to speak to re wedding ceremonies.

Very quick question on the guidance – of the 20 maximum attendees, I understand this includes a priest but does it include children (who, if under 12, are no longer required to physically distance)?

Many thanks
M

Mairi McAllan
Special Adviser to the First Minister

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 2

Extract of submission dated 28 July 2020

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Justice: Civil: Family

Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy and Tourism
Minister for Community Safety

COVID-19: MARRIAGE AND CIVIL PARTNERSHIP WEDDING RECEPTIONS

Purpose

1. To provide advice on marriage and civil partnership.

[redacted- out of scope]

Children under 12?

2. In his statement to Parliament last week on education, the DFM said that subject to complementary risk mitigation measures being implemented, there is no requirement for physical distancing between children in primary schools. However, this is between primary school pupils. At marriages and civil partnerships, adults will, of course, be present

[redacted- out of scope]

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Justice: Civil: Family
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

28 July 2020

Document 3

Extracts of email exchanges of August and September 2020

From: Curtis PS (Penelope) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 02 September 2020 15:24
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] m@gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Crossman D (David) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

For the record, I discussed with [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] and some colleagues this morning and we agreed that [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] wouldn't put this submission up just now pending wider work on potential regulatory change on physical distancing and the under 12s and on potential changes to guidance which imposes limits on numbers who can attend certain events and ceremonies. I was concerned that we hadn't thought through the underpinning approach to under 12s and would make some changes in one area that would have implications in others.

Penny

Penny Curtis - Exit Strategy Team

Deputy Director Elections and FOI Division | Directorate for Constitution and Cabinet | Scottish Government | 2W.02A | St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 02 September 2020 09:39
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted-

s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Crossman D (David) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot> Curtis PS (Penelope) [[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot

Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Hello [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Many thanks for this. We do not have any comments on the submission. [redacted- out of scope]

Thanks again

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] | [Burial and Cremation Team](#) | [Scottish Government](#) | [St Andrew's House](#) | [Regent Road](#) | [Edinburgh EH1 3DG](#) | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 01 September 2020 17:22
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Crossman D (David) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot> Curtis PS (Penelope) [[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot

Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Thanks,

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]



[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] | Professional Regulatory Adviser |
Chief Nursing Officer's Directorate | Scottish Government | St Andrew's House (Room 2:ER)
Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot

From: Crossman D (David) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 28 August 2020 16:51

To: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief Nursing Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) <Brian.Dornan@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Coming late to this and I think there is some consistency of views which I don't want disrupt.

On 5, I think that the risks of not counting the under 12s into the denominator are:

1. Who is to say a child is under or over 12?
2. There has to be an upper limit where this is simply a good idea and that relates to the space. With a lot of children adult physical distancing will become a problem. As Jason says a couple of extra children won't matter and is not reasonable but 2 or more to every adult brings practical difficulties.

These are however not necessarily going to be critical to implementation and as such I would agree with Gregor that for the time being not counting them in is reasonable but could be reviewed.

BW
David

From: Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 28 August 2020 09:28

To: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason)

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief Nursing Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Dear [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

As we have all said this is a balance of risks and benefits. I am very comfortable to go with the views expressed below, and not include children under 12.

Kind regards
Marion

Professor Marion Bain

**Interim Deputy Chief Medical Officer
Scottish Government**

Mob: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 28 August 2020 09:17
To: Leitch J (Jason) <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief Nursing Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]



From: DCMO Health COVID19 <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 27 August 2020 17:58
To: Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Smith G (Gregor) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief Nursing Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Many thanks Marion,

I am sure CMO, CNO and NCD will also wish to add their views, but I've added my comments to yours below (in blue).

With warm regards,

Nicola.

Dr Nicola Steedman

Interim Deputy Chief Medical Officer
Scottish Government

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: Bain MB (Marion) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 27 August 2020 10:02
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Smith G (Gregor) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Steedman N (Nicola) (DCMO) @gov.scot>;

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] McQueen F (Fiona) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: DCMO : Chief Scientist Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief
Nursing Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B
(Brian) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Dear [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

I have added my comments in red under the relevant questions in your email below.

For points 5 [redacted- out of scope] in particular there is a balance of clinical and
public health risks and benefits to consider. I have given my view but it will be helpful
to ensure a clinical consensus on this. I have therefore copied my other clinical
colleagues in for their review.

Kind regards
Marion

Professor Marion Bain

**Interim Deputy Chief Medical Officer
Scottish Government**

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 26 August 2020 19:14

To: DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Cc: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO : Chief Scientist
Office [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCNO : Chief Nursing Officer [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Leitch J (Jason) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Dornan B (Brian) [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted-
s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Henderson G (Gavin) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted-

s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

<https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk:8443/documents/A29605017/details>

DCMO

[paras 1- 4 redacted- out of scope]

5. The second point is whether children under 12 should **not** be counted towards the current limits contained in guidance on the numbers who can attend a marriage, funeral or place of worship. Again, the argument in favour of not counting children under 12 is they do not need to physically distance from other children and from adults. The arguments in favour of continuing to count children towards the limits seem to be about the risks of sending the wrong message generally on numbers who can attend these events and potential concerns about increasing numbers at “pinch-points” (eg entrances and exits at buildings and toilet facilities). Again, I would be grateful for your views.

Our clinical and public health concerns about gatherings have primarily been about:

1. the potential of these often emotional events having a significantly higher risk of people generally not physically distancing
2. the increased risks associated with larger numbers of people coming together generally, based on the evidence from mass gatherings/events

My view on balance would therefore be that we should continue to count children under 12 at the current time.

I am actually less sure about this. I would probably not count children in this, particularly in the “non wedding, non funeral places of worship setting” (where the limit is 50). If we do not think that younger children are the major sources of transmission, and we allow them to mix freely in other indoor settings and schools then there is a consistency point here. But I suspect CMO, CNO and NCD will agree with Marion on this and I am happy to go with the majority clinical view.

[para 6 redacted- out of scope]

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Family Law Policy

Scottish Government

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 4

Extract of email related to document 3 above

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 27 August 2020 10:49

To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @revenue.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Drought A (Andrew) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Strang F (Frank) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Hi [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

[redacted- out of scope]

Not sure on the bottleneck point and having overall caps on numbers at weddings, funerals etc. This is a behavioural science question I think, but generally its helpful to a narrative of people being mindful that there are restrictions upon them and that things should not feel normal by keeping such limits in place (esp at weddings where there will be alcohol which seems to erode behavioural compliance in any case).

Good that Marion will discuss with colleagues - in amending the policy position further clinical consideration would be helpful as the judgement for us to make is to what extent do we feel we need legislation (not just guidance) to achieve proportionate management of risk in those under 12?



[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] C1 Non-Clinical Public Health Policy
COVID Ready Society Division
Scottish Government

T [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)].

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] [@gov.scot](mailto:[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot)

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] [@gov.scot](mailto:[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot)

Document 5

Extract of email exchange related to document 3

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Sent: 28 August 2020 11:50
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; Marshall R (Robert) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Thanks [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]. Makes sense. Only thing re the sub I guess is whether in light of this pretty clear cut advice from health leads, and their comments' emphasis on consistency in arguing for taking under 12s out of the caps (which I strongly agree with) the sub could now make the case for this a bit more strongly. Obviously up to you (conscious we are using **your** sub as a Trojan horse here)!

Presume [redacted- out of scope] if our Ministers do approve this change, at which point we can all make our respective amendments to our guidance and brief this out to stakeholders.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Sent: 28 August 2020 11:42
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; Marshall R (Robert) ; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Hi. I've done a draft submission on this (above) and I guess next step is for me to tidy that up and put to Ministers? Happy to take any further comments on it.

Once Ministers have cleared, [redacted- out of scope] we could also change our respective pieces of guidance.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Sent: 28 August 2020 11:02
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; Marshall R (Robert) [redacted-

s.38(1)(b)]@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] and [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] cc Robert and [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

This seems helpfully clear that we need not now include under 12s in the caps [redacted- out of scope]. Do you think we can each now crack on with [redacted- out of scope] amending our guidance, or do we need to catch up on this first (including with [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] et al)?

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 6

Extract of email exchange related to document 3

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Sent: 02 September 2020 07:40
To: Curtis PS (Penelope) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

Penny

Hi. Yes, be good to have a chat. I think places of worship ([redacted- s.38(1)(b)]) and Burials and Cremation ([redacted- s.38(1)(b)]) should attend too. I'll check calendars and set up a Skype?

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: Curtis PS (Penelope) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Sent: 01 September 2020 18:28
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: [redacted out of scope] the under 12s

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

I'm just back so catching up on things (and I haven't caught up with all my emails yet so forgive anything daft)

[redacted- out of scope], can I check on thinking about how children interact with other discussions on numbers at weddings. [redacted- out of scope].

I think it will work better to separate the issue [redacted- out of scope] from the discussion of numbers at funerals/weddings (and places of worship). Worth a quick chat?

Penny

Penny Curtis - Exit Strategy Team
Deputy Director Elections and FOI Division | Directorate for Constitution and Cabinet | Scottish Government | 2W.02A | St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG | [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] | Mobile [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 7

Extracts from draft submission- version of draft circulated in document 3 as at 1 September 2020 (17:22)

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Cabinet Secretary for Communities and Local Government
Minister for Children and Young People
Minister for Community Safety
Minister for Public Health, Sport and Wellbeing

CORONAVIRUS: [REDACTED OUT OF SCOPE]: CHILDREN UNDER 12

Purpose

1. To provide advice on a potential change [redacted out of scope] for children under 12. This submission has been discussed with clinical advisers.

Priority

2. **Routine.**

Detail

[content of paragraphs 3- 10 redacted- out of scope]

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

Numbers attending marriages, civil partnerships, funeral services and places of worship: children under 12

11. In the Regulations, marriage ceremonies and civil partnerships are excepted from the continuing restrictions on public gatherings. At present, the SG guidance on marriage ceremonies and civil partnership registrations advises that no more than 20

people should attend, excluding the celebrant/registrars, any required interpreter and staff employed by the venue.

12. Some correspondents are suggesting children should be excluded from the headcount in marriages and civil partnerships. The arguments put forward by correspondents include:

- children are not subject to the same physical distancing requirements as adults;
- children have now returned to school and so they are already mingling in larger groups in that context; and
- children's experiences of the pandemic have been difficult enough.

13. We have taken a cautious approach to funeral services and guidance on the restriction on attendance has been set at the same level as that of marriages. The current cap on attendance at funeral services is set out in SG funeral services guidance at 20 people, not including the funeral director, celebrant or staff at the venue. It would be appropriate for funeral attendance to take the same approach as for marriages and exclude children under 12 from the maximum attendance count.

14. Places of worship are also exempt from the restrictions on gatherings. SG guidance advises that no more than 50 people should attend a place of worship to participate in a congregational act of worship, regardless of the size of the venue.

15. Up until now, we have indicated that children **do** count towards the limits of 20, for marriage ceremonies, civil partnerships and funeral services, and 50 for acts of worship. There are arguments children under 12 should continue to count towards these limits as:

- It remain good practice in the context of the current pandemic to keep numbers at social gatherings low.
- Increasing numbers at marriages and civil partnerships could send the wrong message generally.
- Increasing numbers at marriage ceremonies and civil partnership registrations by excluding children from the limit of 20 might cause pressure at "pinch-points" (eg at toilets and at entrances and exits). [Marriages and civil partnerships in Scotland can take place at a wide variety of locations, including hotels and other hospitality locations

16. On the other hand, there is an argument that the correspondents have a point as children are less likely to transmit the virus and, according to SG guidance, do not need to physically distance.

17. On balance, we take the view that children under 12 should not count towards the limits on numbers at marriage ceremonies, civil partnership registrations and funerals. We would propose to amend the relevant pieces of guidance accordingly. You will wish to note that this could also impact shortly on numbers allowed at wedding receptions and funeral wakes as our intention is that numbers allowed at receptions and wakes should be aligned with the numbers allowed at ceremonies.

Conclusion

18. You are asked to agree that:

- [redacted- out of scope]
- on marriages, civil partnerships, funeral services and acts of worship, children under 12 should no longer count towards the respective caps of 20 and 50 contained in guidance.

19. If you agree these recommendations, we would propose to put a submission to the First Minister accordingly to seek her clearance.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Unit

XX September 2020

Copy List:	For Action	For Comments	For Information		
			Portfolio Interest	Constit Interest	General Awareness
Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport					X
Cabinet Secretary for Justice					
Cabinet Secretary for Economy, Fair Work and Culture			X		
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Tourism and the Economy			X		
Lord Advocate					X

DG Education, Communities and Justice
Neil Rennick, Director, Justice
Director, Children and Families
Iona Colvin, Chief Social Work Adviser
Innes Fyfe, Deputy Director, Health & Wellbeing
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Unit
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Unit
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Community Learning and Development
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], GIRFEC policy
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Supporting Maternal and Child Wellbeing
Gavin Henderson, Civil Law
Director for Population Health
Director COVID-19
CMO
DCMO
Jason Leitch, National Clinical Director
Dr Mini Mishra, Senior Medical Officer
Dr Andrew Riley, Senior Medical Officer
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], COVID-19 Response
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], COVID-19 Response
Burial and Cremation inbox
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Physical distancing policy
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Major events policy
Bettina Sizeland, Tourism and Major Events
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Tourism
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Tourism
Paul Lowe, Registrar General
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], NRS
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], NRS
Brian Dornan, Exit Strategy Team
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Exit Strategy team
Penny Curtis, Exit Strategy team
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Health Protection

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Organisational
Readiness
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Organisational
Readiness
Dominic Munro, Exit strategy team
Stephen Gallagher, Director for Local
Government and Communities
Robert Marshall, Connected Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Burials and
Cremations
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Law Unit
Solicitor to the Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
COVID-19 Policy
COVID-19 Communications
Liz Lloyd, Special Adviser
Davie Hutchison, Special Adviser
Jeanette Campbell, Special Adviser
John McFarlane, Special Adviser
Colin McAllister, Special Adviser

Document 8

Extracts from draft submission- version of draft circulated in emails in document 3 as at 26 August 2020 (at 19:14)

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Cabinet Secretary for Communities and Local Government
Minister for Children and Young People
Minister for Community Safety
Minister for Public Health, Sport and Wellbeing

CORONAVIRUS: [REDACTED OUT OF SCOPE]:CHILDREN UNDER 12

Purpose

1. To provide advice on a potential change [redacted out of scope] for children under 12. This submission has been discussed with clinical advisers.

Priority

2. **Routine.**

Detail

[content of paragraphs 3- 9 redacted- out of scope]

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

Numbers attending marriages, civil partnerships, funeral services and places of worship: children under 12

10. In the Regulations, marriage ceremonies and civil partnerships are excepted from the continuing restrictions on public gatherings. At present, the SG guidance on marriage ceremonies and civil partnership registrations advises that no more than 20 people should attend, excluding the celebrant/registrar, any required interpreter and staff employed by the venue.

11. Some correspondents are suggesting children should be excluded from the headcount in marriages and civil partnerships. The arguments put forward by correspondents include:

- children are not subject to the same physical distancing requirements as adults;
- children have now returned to school and so they are already mingling in larger groups in that context; and
- children's experiences of the pandemic have been difficult enough.

12. We have taken a cautious approach to funeral services and guidance on the restriction on attendance has been set at the same level as that of marriages. The current cap on attendance at funeral services is set out in SG funeral services guidance at 20 people, not including the funeral director, celebrant or staff at the venue. It would be appropriate for funeral attendance to take the same approach as for marriages and exclude children under 12 from the maximum attendance count.

13. Places of worship are also exempt from the restrictions on gatherings. SG guidance advises that no more than 50 people should attend a place of worship to participate in a congregational act of worship, regardless of the size of the venue.

14. Up until now, we have indicated that children **do** count towards the limits of 20, for marriage ceremonies, civil partnerships and funeral services, and 50 for acts of worship. There are arguments children under 12 should continue to count towards these limits as:

- It remain good practice in the context of the current pandemic to keep numbers at social gatherings low.
- Increasing numbers at marriages and civil partnerships could send the wrong message generally.
- Increasing numbers at marriage ceremonies and civil partnership registrations by excluding children from the limit of 20 might cause pressure at "pinch-points" (eg at toilets and at entrances and exits). [Marriages and civil partnerships in Scotland can take place at a wide variety of locations, including hotels and other hospitality locations

15. On the other hand, there is an argument that the correspondents have a point as children are less likely to transmit the virus and, according to SG guidance, do not need to physically distance.

16. On balance, we take the view that children under 12 should not count towards the limits on numbers at marriage ceremonies, civil partnership registrations and funerals. We would propose to amend the relevant pieces of guidance accordingly. You will wish to note that this could also impact shortly on numbers allowed at wedding receptions and funeral wakes as our intention is that numbers allowed at receptions and wakes should be aligned with the numbers allowed at ceremonies.

Conclusion

17. You are asked to agree that:

- [redacted- out of scope]
- on marriages, civil partnerships, funeral services and acts of worship, children under 12 should no longer count towards the respective caps of 20 and 50 contained in guidance.

19. If you agree these recommendations, we would propose to put a submission to the First Minister accordingly to seek her clearance.

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Unit

XX September 2020

Copy List:	For Action	For Comments	For Information		
			Portfolio Interest	Constit Interest	General Awareness
Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport					X
Cabinet Secretary for Justice					
Cabinet Secretary for Economy, Fair Work and Culture			X		
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Tourism and the Economy			X		
Lord Advocate					X

DG Education, Communities and Justice
 Neil Rennick, Director, Justice
 Director, Children and Families
 Iona Colvin, Chief Social Work Adviser
 Innes Fyfe, Deputy Director, Health & Wellbeing
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Unit
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Unit
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Community Learning and Development
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], GIRFEC policy
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Supporting Maternal and Child Wellbeing
 Gavin Henderson, Civil Law
 Director for Population Health
 Director COVID-19
 CMO
 DCMO
 Jason Leitch, National Clinical Director
 Dr Mini Mishra, Senior Medical Officer
 Dr Andrew Riley, Senior Medical Officer
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], COVID-19 Response
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], COVID-19 Response
 Burial and Cremation inbox
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Physical distancing policy
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Major events policy
 Bettina Sizeland, Tourism and Major Events
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Tourism
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Tourism
 Paul Lowe, Registrar General
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], NRS
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], NRS
 Brian Dornan, Exit Strategy Team
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Exit Strategy team
 Penny Curtis, Exit Strategy team
 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Health Protection

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Organisational
Readiness
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Organisational
Readiness
Dominic Munro, Exit strategy team
Stephen Gallagher, Director for Local
Government and Communities
Robert Marshall, Connected Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Connected
Communities
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Burials and
Cremations
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], Family Law Unit
Solicitor to the Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)], SGLD
COVID-19 Policy
COVID-19 Communications
Liz Lloyd, Special Adviser
Davie Hutchison, Special Adviser
Jeanette Campbell, Special Adviser
John McFarlane, Special Adviser
Colin McAllister, Special Adviser

Document 9

Extract of document dated 18 December 2020

**COVID 19
REVIEW OF THE FRAMEWORK
MARRIAGE CEREMONIES**

POINTS RAISED BY CORRESPONDENTS (AND INITIAL VIEWS OF FAMILY LAW POLICY UNIT)

[redacted- out of scope]

No.	Point raised	View from Family Law Policy Unit
1	Children under 12 should be exempt from the cap of 20 attendees contained in guidance.	<p>We do not consider there should be a general exemption of this nature. Marriage ceremonies are already given more generous treatment than other gatherings.</p> <p>However, there may be an argument about allowing the couple and guests to bring along any “babes in arms” without the “babes in arms” counting towards the 20 limit. It may be difficult, for example, to leave “babes in arms” with a baby-sitter. However this would likely result in complaints about excluding “babes in arms” from the limit and not other young children.</p> <p>We would need to consider what is meant by “babes in arms” and obtain advice from maternal health colleagues on whether there is indeed an argument that very young children should be allowed to accompany their</p>

		parents at marriage ceremonies and if there is an age or other cut-off which could be applied in guidance.
--	--	--

[redacted- out of scope]

**Family Law Policy Unit
December 2020**

Document 10

Extract from background note dated 15 January 2021

[redacted- out of scope]

1. There are regular requests (including in the correspondence we receive) to exclude children from the limits of people who can attend a marriage ceremony.
2. We have some sympathy with these arguments, particularly in relation to “babes in arms” of the couple getting married. However:
 - Now is not a good time to be relaxing restrictions – they have more recently been tightened up.
 - If we excluded children from the limits, we would need to decide what the cut-off age would be for children to be excluded. This may be difficult both to determine and to enforce.
 - Unlike some other activities (eg outdoor play), marriage ceremonies are not designed to be for the benefit of children.

Contact: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Ext: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 11

Email exchanges in 29 and 30 March 2021 circulating document

From: Harden J (John) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 30 March 2021 20:07
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot
Cc: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Rennick NS (Neil) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Updating the guidance on weddings.

Hi [redacted- s.38(1)(b)],
Comments added.
Happy to discuss.
John

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Dr John Harden
Deputy National Clinical Director
Scottish Government
M: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Regent Road
Edinburgh EH1 3DG



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 30 March 2021 19:30
To: Harden J (John) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 <DCMOHealth.COVID19@gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation <BurialandCremation@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>;

Rennick NS (Neil) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Updating the guidance on weddings.

<https://erdm.scotland.gov.uk:8443/documents/A32668276/details>

John

Many thanks.

I attach in ERDM and word a list of asks from stakeholders, along with our thoughts. Grateful for your views – if helpful, we have included a column in the table for clinical views .

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

From: Harden J (John) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Sent: 29 March 2021 09:41
To: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>
Cc: Chief Medical Officer [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>; Rennick NS (Neil) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Updating the guidance on weddings.

Hi [redacted- s.38(1)(b)],
Yes, happy to review.
Just to not I am on leave from Friday and still have my clinical day on Thursday.
John

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Dr John Harden
Deputy National Clinical Director
Scottish Government
M: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Regent Road

Edinburgh EH1 3DG



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

From: [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Sent: 29 March 2021 09:39

To: Harden J (John) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Cc: Chief Medical Officer <[redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; DCMO Health COVID19 [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Burial & Cremation [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)]@nrscotland.gov.uk>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>; Rennick NS (Neil) [redacted- s.38(1)(b)] @gov.scot>

Subject: Updating the guidance on weddings.

John

Hi. Following points made by the wedding industry and other stakeholders (eg local authority registrars), we are pulling together a table on possible amendments to our guidance (and also covering areas we do **not** intend to amend in the guidance) for the changes planned for 26 April. It will take us a couple of days to finish this table but then we'd plan to send to you for clinical views. Is that an OK way to proceed from your perspective?

[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]
Family Law Policy
Scottish Government
[redacted- s.38(1)(b)]

Document 12

Extract of document circulated in email exchanges forming document 11 dated as at 30 March 2021, 20:07

Who	No.	Views from stakeholders	Position generally	Comment	Overall view from policy	Clinical view
Correspondence from couples	13	Children under 12 should be excluded from the number of people permitted to attend, especially infants. Reference is often made in correspondence to other areas where young people are able to gather.	Children under 12 have been generally exempt from the permitted number of people allowed to gather indoors and outdoors provided they come from the permitted number of households	<p>This is less pertinent once the numbers are increased to 50 people, which should allow couples to invite guests inclusive of children</p> <p>Excluding children from the limit could significantly increase the number of people attending given there is no limit on households at weddings</p> <p>It might also have</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Children under 12 (and under 1) should continue to count towards the limits on numbers who can attend marriage ceremonies and wedding receptions.</p>	Agree with the position

Who	No.	Views from stakeholders	Position generally	Comment	Overall view from policy	Clinical view
				<p>implications for capacity limits. Weddings are not generally for children (unlike, for example, outside play).</p> <p>We understand the point that young children (e.g. under 1 year old) should not count towards the limits as it may be difficult to arrange childcare and they are generally very attached to their parents.</p> <p>However, there could be difficulty in setting and enforcing an age. And it</p>		

Who	No.	Views from stakeholders	Position generally	Comment	Overall view from policy	Clinical view
				should be less of an issue once the numbers are increased to 50 people		

Document 13

Extract from document last updated as at 21 July 2021

[redacted- out of scope]

From 26 April 2021

3. Children

You asked why children are included in the numbers who may attend a wedding. The Scottish Government has to consider the overall effect of the restrictions in place, and the risks that arise.

Weddings are an exception to the general rules on gatherings. This reflects their importance in people's lives. The number of people who can attend a wedding is higher than the number of people who are generally allowed to meet.

If we were to exclude children from the numbers for wedding ceremonies, this could significantly increase the number of people attending. This in turn could increase the risk of transmission. And it is important that we ease restrictions gradually in order to understand the effect of changes we have made.

[redacted- out of scope]

From 16 March 2021

[redacted out of scope]

7. Children

You asked why children are included in the limit of 5 people who may attend a wedding in protection level 4. The Scottish Government has to consider the overall effect of the restrictions in place, and the risks that arise. There are restrictions on gatherings as a consequence of the pandemic. These rules allow children under 12 to play together outside. This reflects the benefits to children of playing with other children outside.

Weddings are an exception to the general rules on gatherings. This reflects their importance in people's lives. The number of people who can attend a wedding is higher than the number of people who are generally allowed to meet. Regrettably, this means that at present children are included in the limit for wedding ceremonies.

The Scottish Government has limited the number of people who can attend a marriage ceremony as part of a package of measures including restrictions on travel and other social gatherings. The aim is to reduce transmission of the virus. If we were to exclude children from the limit for wedding ceremonies, this could significantly increase the number of people attending. This in turn could increase the risk of transmission.

[redacted- out of scope]

From 23 February 2021

[redacted- out of scope]

Children

You asked why children are included in the limit of 5 people who may attend a wedding in protection level 4. The Scottish Government has to consider the overall effect of the restrictions in place, and the risks that arise. There are restrictions on gatherings as a consequence of the pandemic. These rules allow children under 12 to play together outside. This reflects the benefits to children of playing with other children outside.

Weddings are an exception to the general rules on gatherings. This reflects their importance in people's lives. The number of people who can attend a wedding is higher than the number of people who are generally allowed to meet. Regrettably, this means that at present children are included in the limit for wedding ceremonies.

If we were to exclude children from this limit, this could significantly increase the number of people attending. This in turn could increase the risk of transmission. As the First Minister said on 4 January, there is "significant uncertainty about the impact of the new variant on transmission amongst young people. We therefore have to adopt a cautious approach at this stage."

We will continue to keep the restrictions under close review.

[redacted- out of scope]

Phase 3 – from 2 November

[redacted out of scope]

Children

You asked why children are included in the limit of 20 people who may attend a wedding.

There are restrictions on gatherings as a consequence of the current pandemic, with some specific provisions in place to reflect, for example, that children under 12 may wish to play together outside. However, weddings are an exception to the general rules on gatherings. This reflects their importance in people's lives. The number of people who can attend a wedding is higher than the number of people who are generally allowed to meet in one place. Regrettably, this means that at present children are included in the limit.

If we were to exclude children from this limit, children from several different households could attend a wedding, significantly increasing the number of people

attending. And as you may know, under the current rules on meeting others inside, children under 12 are excluded from the numbers but must belong to one of the two households meeting. This reflects the additional risks that arise when mixing inside. If we excluded children from the limit on the number who can attend weddings, it is likely that some weddings would have children attending from three or more households. The current position takes account of public health advice and is easy to understand and enforce.

The Scottish Government has to consider the overall effect of the restrictions in place, and the risks that arise. We recognise that some of the restrictions may be difficult to understand or may not seem fair. But as the [First Minister said](#) on 11 September: “what can sometimes appear to be inconsistencies are actually the essential trade-offs that we need to make to avoid going back into lockdown more completely and to avoid, if at all possible, of having to close schools again.”

We will continue to keep the restrictions under review, with a formal review every three weeks.

[redacted- out of scope]

Phase 3 – after review on 10 September

[redacted out of scope]

Children

You asked why children are included in the limit of 20 people who may attend a wedding.

There are restrictions on gatherings as a consequence of the current pandemic, with some specific provisions in place to reflect, for example, that children under 12 may wish to play together outside. However, weddings are an exception to the general rules on gatherings. This reflects their importance in people's lives. The number of people who can attend a wedding is higher than the number of people who are generally allowed to meet in one place. Regrettably, this means that at present children are included in the limit.

If we were to exclude children from this limit, children from several different households could attend a wedding, significantly increasing the number of people attending. And as you may know, under the current rules on meeting others inside, children under 12 are excluded from the numbers but must belong to one of the two households meeting. This reflects the additional risks that arise when mixing inside. If we excluded children from the limit on the number who can attend weddings, it is likely that some weddings would have children attending from three or more households. The current position takes account of public health advice and is easy to understand and enforce.

The Scottish Government has to consider the overall effect of the restrictions in place, and the risks that arise. We recognise that some of the restrictions may be difficult to understand or may not seem fair. But as the [First Minister said](#) on 11

September: “what can sometimes appear to be inconsistencies are actually the essential trade-offs that we need to make to avoid going back into lockdown more completely and to avoid, if at all possible, of having to close schools again.”

We will continue to keep the restrictions under review, with a formal review every three weeks.

[redacted- out of scope]