

# Minutes (Public Version)

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>London Local Resilience Forum</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>Monday 11 February 2013</b>
<b>Time</b>	<b>3.00 pm</b>
<b>Place</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, City Hall</b>

**Attending** (in alphabetical order of organisation):

Don Randall, Head of Security, Bank of England (Business Sector Panel)  
Dave Wildbore, Chief Superintendent, British Transport Police  
John Barradell, Town Clerk and Chief Executive, City of London Corporation  
Ian Harrison, Head of Resilience and Community Safety, City of London Corporation  
Wayne Chance, Chief Superintendent, City of London Police  
James Cruddas, Head of Resilience and Emergencies Division, Department for Communities and Local Government  
Howard Davidson, Director South East, Environment Agency  
Mike More, Chair, Local Authorities Panel  
Richard Webber, Director of Operations, London Ambulance Service  
John O'Brien, Chief Executive, London Councils  
Col Hugh Bodington, Chief of Staff, London District (Military)  
Steve Hamm, Assistant Commissioner, London Fire Brigade  
Andrew Pritchard, Head of Emergency Planning, London Fire Brigade  
Mark Rowley, Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)  
Ed Stearns, Gold Communications Group Chair, MPS  
Peter Boorman, Deputy Head of Emergency Preparedness & Resilience Development Manager, NHS London  
Sarah Burchard, Emergency Risk Specialist, Thames Water  
Mike Weston, Operations Director, Transport for London  
Nigel Furlong, Head of Resilience Planning, Transport for London (Transport Sector Panel)  
Steve Bath, Utilities Sector Panel (Maintenance Delivery Electricity Manager, National Grid)

**Greater London Authority officers:**

Hamish Cameron, London Resilience Manager  
Alison Ingleby, London Resilience Officer  
Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer

## 1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 The Senior Committee Officer opened the meeting and reported that the Chair was chairing a meeting of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. The meeting consented to John Barradell chairing the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies had been received from Ian Dyson, City of London Police, Mark Rogers, Met Office, and Ven Dr Paul Wright, Chair of the Faith Sector Panel.

## **2. Minutes and Matters Arising from Previous Meeting**

- 2.1 **The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 8 November 2012 as a correct record, subject to the list of attendees to be corrected (John O'Brien not having attended the meeting).**
- 2.2 London Ambulance Service (LAS) gave a short update on the previous item about operational arrangements between the MPS and LAS. A decision on funding in 2013/14 was expected in late February or early March.

## **3. Update on Risks and Capability Gaps**

- 3.1 The London Resilience Manager introduced a risk matrix which combines threats and hazards and can be used as a tool to measure risk against capabilities.

### **Threats**

- 3.2 MPS gave an oral report on current threats, noting that there was no change in the terrorism threat levels from international sources at 'Substantial' and from dissident Republican sources at 'Moderate'. The situation in relation to domestic extremism appeared to be quieter.

### **Hazards**

- 3.3 DCLG explained that the perceived hazards that could have an impact on London over the next six months remained unchanged, although there was some likelihood of disruption from seasonal severe weather.

## **4. London Resilience Business Risk Framework – Survey Report**

- 4.1 The Chair of the Business Sector Panel introduced the report and thanked the London Resilience Team and the Post Office Ltd for their involvement in the risk identification survey. The Business Sector Panel has established a number of working groups to take specific pieces of work forward.
- 4.2 The Group noted the report and agreed to consider how this piece of work could link into other partnership work. It was also noted that the potential impact on business of threats was not always taken into account by partner organisations and could be further incorporated into resilience planning.

## **5. London 7 July Inquest – Recommendations Progress Update**

- 5.1 The London Resilience Manager introduced the report and reported that the recommendations had generally been completed, but that some work relating to the Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Project (JESIP) and London Emergency Services Liaison Panel (LESLP) was ongoing.
- 5.2 The Forum noted the report and agreed that the item should remain on future agendas.

## 6. Process for Identifying Lessons and Recommendations from the Olympics

- 6.1 LFB introduced the report, explaining that it summarised the process used to identify the resilience lessons from the Olympics. It was noted that the recommendations and actions from the Olympics lessons group were discussed at the London Resilience Review workshop on 14 January 2012, with the outcome incorporated into the diagram of decisions for discussion under Agenda Item 7.

## 7. London Resilience Review

- 7.1 The London Resilience Manager introduced this item, setting out the staffing and secondment arrangements of the London Resilience Team (LRT) and emphasising that the size of the Team was significantly smaller than when there was a Government Office for London (GOL) maintaining responsibility for resilience issues in London.
- 7.2 DCLG also reported that the role of liaising across Government, which had been part of the GOL team's responsibilities remained with DCLG.
- 7.3 The Group then discussed the individual decisions set out in the diagram of decisions (Report 42 07). The following decisions were taken:

### London Resilience Team

- Decision b1: Restrict expectations of what partnership wants to achieve due to size of team and overall resources.
- Decision b2: Formal agreements to be put in place between LRT and organisations providing secondees as to the role and time commitment each secondee will provide; **Action**: Organisations providing secondees to LRT to work with GLA to produce formal agreements

### Risk Assessment

- Decision c1: London Resilience Partnership will include threats and hazards in risk assessment and capability development; **Action**: LLAG to include assessment of threats in risk assessment process. MPS to provide appropriate resources to assist in threat assessment.
- Decision c2: The London Risk Advisory Group is to prepare a planning assumptions document. These assumptions are to be used by responders in developing agency specific capabilities with a view to providing assurance on multi-agency capabilities; **Action**: LLAG to agree planning assumptions document.
- Decision c3: Partnership activity to focus on risk based programme with development of common capabilities to address risks; **Action**: LRF to set priorities based on risk information from LLAG

### Capability Development

- Decision d1: The Delivery Plan to cover a timescale of two years.
- Decision d2: The list of high-impact/low-likelihood risks (Storm surge,

reservoir failure, effusive volcanic eruption and radioactive release) was noted but not added to the table of suggested prioritisation of capabilities.

- Decision d3: The role of the lead agencies as set out on page 7 of the London Resilience Strategy was agreed, with delegation and collaboration with partner organisations as necessary. **Action**: Nominated leads of capability development groups to contact LRT by 15 February if they are not content to take the lead role.
- Decision d4: Undertake work to develop arrangements for communicating with the public and other key communities (e.g. Businesses, Voluntary sector etc); **Action**: LRF to task GLA To form a multi-agency group and lead this work.
- Decision d5: The group is to identify how the success of the volunteers in providing information to the public in a disruptive event can be carried forward; **Action**: Group to take forward.

### **Training and Exercising**

- Decision e1: LRF to continue to engage closely with partnership training and exercising programme; **Action**: LRF to receive regular updates on training and exercising and participate in strategic training and exercising events.
- Decision e2: Commission Training and Exercising group to develop a structured training, testing and exercising programme; **Action**: Training and Exercising Group to develop programme and report back to LRF (via LRPB).
- Decision e3: Training and exercising group to continue, as a priority work stream, reporting to LRPB; **Action**: Partners to commit to resourcing training and exercising group.

### **Coordination and Information Sharing**

- Decision f1: The Consequence and Resilience Partnership (CARP) is to amend London Command, Control and Information Sharing arrangements to incorporate the good practice of the Olympics after consultation with national agencies; **Action**: CARP to update and consult on London C3i protocol.
- Decision f2: Undertake a review to identify key functions and capabilities to achieve Command, Control, Coordination, Cooperation and Communication in an incident; **Action**: LRF to task LRT to carry out review.
- Decision f3: Develop options for increasing capability to provide day to day (and incident) London resilience situational awareness for all partners; **Action**: LRF to task LRT to produce paper of options
- Decision f4: LRT is to lead in the process of coordinating information on behalf of the resilience partnership; the LRF should resource LRT to carry out its role of managing information on behalf of the partnership; the LRF should identify a physical home for LRT to carry out this role; LRT should continue to produce CRIP / weekly telecom.

### **Learning Lessons**

- Decision g1: LRT to maintain the lessons learnt database on behalf of LRPB; **Action**: LRT to maintain database and report progress against lessons to LRPB.

### **Processes and Structures**

- Decision a1: Piece of work to review how best to link the work of LESLP into the London Resilience Partnership; **Action**: LRT, on behalf of the Chair of the LRF, to look into and report back.
- Decision a2: The LRPB is to rationalise the number of groups and plans in the resilience partnership; **Action**: LRPB to carry out review.
- Decision a3: LRPB is to ensure that the Terms of Reference for all working groups are shared across the partnership; **Action**: LRPB to review Terms of Reference for consistency and share across Partnership.
- Decision a4: Use Capability Gap Analysis as a key touchstone for future LRF work; **Action**: Capability Gap Analysis to be built into LRPB and LRF processes, linked to delivery plan & regular updates to be provided to LRF.
- Decision a5: Confirm agreement of capability development process; **Action**: LRF to confirm agreement, LRPB to promote new process in capability development across partnership.
- Decision a6: LRPB to investigate how London Resilience plans can be signed off if this role is not carried out by LRF. **Action**: LRPB to agree a process for sign-off of London Resilience plans.
- Decision a7: That the mission statement and strategy for the London Resilience Partnership be approved.
- Decision a8 Confirm the governance and assurance role of the LRF in the London Resilience Partnership.
- Decision A9: Take forward revised LRF meeting agenda with supporting explanatory document.

7.4 The Forum agreed the proposed terms of reference set out in paper 42 08.

## **8. Escalation of Issues for London Resilience Forum Action**

- 8.1 The Local Authorities Sector Panel reported on a meeting of the Panel on 8 February where some concern had been expressed about changes in local authorities' responsibility for health, particularly in relation to gaps in clarity of accountability and capacity to take on the responsibilities. NHS London indicated that there was ongoing work to provide further briefing for local authorities and to clarify existing guidance where there had been some misinterpretation.
- 8.2 There were no further updates from the Business, Communications, Health or Transport Sector Panels.
- 8.3 The London Resilience Manager gave an update on the work of the LRPB. There would be a Gold training day on 26 April; partner organisations were encouraged to allow Gold lead officers to attend the event.
- 8.4 The Sub-Regional Tier Secretariat reported that the next round of meetings would take place between 26 February and 15 March where local arrangements, particularly in relation to the NHS and local authorities would be exercised.

## **9. Confirmation of Priorities**

- 9.1 The London Resilience Manager summed up the main decisions of the meeting, in particular the commitment that partner organisations had made as lead organisations for the work on capabilities, the two-year timescale and order of priority that had been agreed.

## **10. Any Other Business**

- 10.1 There was no other business.

## **11. Date of Next Meeting**

- 11.1 The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 10 June 2013 at 2.00pm.