

**To:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>  
**From:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)>  
**Sent:** Fri 5/8/2020 3:21:18 AM  
**Subject:** RE: (10)(2e) way of thinking on MML's first vs Pandemic first  
**Received:** Fri 5/8/2020 3:21:18 AM

Herken ik uit tel gesprek met hem  
 Hij snapt beide belangen goed en wil volgens mij een praktisch werkbare oplossing  
 Benoedigend is ook dat hij iemand van WBVR aan boord haalt in zn team

(10)(2e) (10)(2e)  
 (10)(2e)  
 M (10)(2e) (10)(2e)  
 E (10)(2e) @minvws.nl

---

**Van:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>  
**Datum:** donderdag 07 mei 2020 11:51 PM  
**Aan:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)> <(10)(2e)@minvws.nl>  
**Onderwerp:** FW: (10)(2e) way of thinking on MML's first vs Pandemic first

FYI – iets meer genuanceerd gedachtengoed dan eerder op de dag leek, wel de realisatie dat we de pandemielabs volop nodig hebben.

Ik denk dat een mogelijke vraag om morgenochtend te stellen is “hoe zorgen we dat we de pandemielabs niet alleen testen met tientallen monsters, maar juist ook met duizendtallen?”, en “laten we daarmee het principe van 1 GGD met vast 1 pandemielab (en dan niet de MML) los?”

Groeten,

(10)(2e)  
 (10)(2e)  
 Email: (10)(2e)@mckinsey.com  
 (10)(2e) (10)(2e) | Tel: (10)(2e) (10)(2e) | E-mail: (10)(2e)@mckinsey.com  
 McKinsey & Company, Amstel 344, 1017 AS Amsterdam, the Netherlands

---

**From:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:38 PM  
**To:** (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>; (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@mckinsey.com>  
**Subject:** (10)(2e) way of thinking on MML's first vs Pandemic first

Hi team,

Today after our session at 12 I had another conversation with (10)(2e) to talk me through his plan.

I drafted the attached slide that I will finalize tomorrow with him.

His way of thinking is the following:

- They will test CoronIT in the next weeks, which means streams from GGD's will be moved to MMLs. This has taken a lot of effort to ensure could happen
- When the testing is done both MML's & pandemic labs will be close to full, so the focus “MML's first or Pandemic labs first” should not matter
- In July he wants to evaluate with the knowledge he has and determine the way to the November scenario that could have “pandemic first, MMLs second” if that is needed for optimal solution as 70K is only possible with a real optimal solution.
- He indicates “we really need the MML's” so we also need to show them, that it will be busy and it is best to take them on now.

I follow his train of thought and think we can really work with this.

Let me know if you have feedback or things I need to consider tomorrow.

KR,  
(10)(2e)

(10)(2e) (10)(2e)  
McKinsey & Company, Amstel 344, 1017 AS Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
Mob: (10)(2e) (10)(2e) (10)(2e) | Tel: (10)(2e) (10)(2e) (10)(2e) |  
Email: (10)(2e) @mckinsey.com

-----+-----  
This email is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received it  
in error, please notify us immediately and then delete it. Please do not  
copy it, disclose its contents or use it for any purpose.  
-----+-----