

MINUTES
Local Authorities Panel – Implementation Group (LAP-IG)
28th September 2016 16.00
Westminster City Council, 64 Victoria Street, London, SW1E 6QP

| Sector Represented | Name | Organisation |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Local Authorities (Chair) | Charlie Parker | Westminster City Council |
| Practitioner Advisor to Chair of LAP | David Kerry | RB Kensington & Chelsea |
| North East SRRF LAs | David McClory Jeremy Reynolds | LB Barking and Dagenham LB Redbridge |
| South East SRRF LAs | Kelly Jack | LB Croydon |
| West SRRF LAs | Donna Wootton | LB Ealing |
| North Central SRRF LAs | Andrew Meek | LB Haringey |
| Central SRRF LAs | Jo Couzens | LB Lambeth |
| Secretariat | John Hetherington Mark Sawyer Graham Burbage | London Resilience |
| Apologies | | |
| Central SRRF LAs | Gary Locker | City of London |
| North Central SRRF LAs | Peter Ng | LB Hackney |
| South West SRRF LAs | Adam Viccari | LB Merton |

| Decisions | | |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| 1 | The Group agreed that the SLA should be sent to LAP for their final review on 3 rd October prior to formal sign off by the Chair of LAP and LFEPA. | |
| 2 | The Group agreed to the recommendations on the Standardisation Project paper (Paper 04). | |
| 3 | The Group agreed on a meeting in w/b 17th October to develop the LAP business plan. | |
| 4 | The Group agreed to the recommendations in the MSL Review papers (Papers 08a-c). | |
| 5. | The Group agreed the LRF Plans should be presented to the LRF and the issues on Fuel Disruption represented for LAP and the LRF to consider. | |
| 6 | The Group agreed the proposals outlined from the SRRF review (Paper 10) should be sent to LAP for their consideration as Chairs of the Fora. | |
| 7 | The Group agreed to the recommendations in the Training and Exercise update (Paper 11). | |
| 8 | The Group endorsed the recommendations in Paper 11a Loggist Training Options and agreed Option C. | |
| Actions | By | |
| 1 | Secretariat to circulate potential dates for the LAP Business Plan meeting in w/b 17th October. | Secretariat |
| 2 | Secretariat to consult with members on the option of holding the premeeting a few days before the main meeting to allow time for reflection. | All |
| 3 | The training and exercising sub-group to reform to prepare for Ex Safer City. | Secretariat |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| 4 | Secretariat to circulate confirmed levels of borough participation in Exercise Safer City 2017. | |
| 5 | A business case to be written for the adoption of the Emergency Services Network by local authorities. | Secretariat |
| | | |

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

1.1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. **The Chair** said he was looking forward to working with the Group on resilience matters and would be relying on their expertise and advice.

2. Minutes of last meeting (paper 02)

2.1. The Group agreed that the minutes of 26th May 2016 were an accurate account. **David Kerry** reported that the actions had either been completed or were being progressed.

3. Service Level Agreement (oral update)

3.1. John Hetherington explained that the SLA had been drafted by the Working Group and submitted to LFB. The LFB Legal team had made some minor drafting changes concerning statutory and non statutory functions and the way was clear for it to be signed off by Steve Hamm (Head of London Resilience) on behalf of LFEPA. The SLA would start from 1 April 2016 to cover payments made in 2016-17 and would be subject to review. The time frame for the review to take place was discussed and would be contemplated in conjunction with LAP. The LAP Business Plan would provide the detail supporting the SLA.

3.2. The Group agreed that the SLA satisfied their requirements and should be sent to LAP for their meeting on 3rd October for final review.

Decision – The Group agreed that the SLA should be sent to LAP for their final review on 3rd October prior to formal sign off by the Chair of LAP and LFEPA.

4. EP 2020 (oral update)

4.1. Mark Sawyer explained the background to the project which had been commissioned by John Barradell, as the Chair of LAP, for Mark, supported by David Kerry and Doug Flight (London Councils), to undertake a review of the status of LA emergency planning in London. This is with a view to making recommendations that will enhance individual and collective resilience into the 2020s. The review would report to John Barradell, followed by LAP, the Directors' meeting on 24th October, CELC on 4th November and then the Leaders' Committee. The report would draw on background information produced from previous monitoring data, MSL reviews and interviews with practitioners. The report would cover a number of areas including:

- Corporate Policy
- Governance and Planning
- Collaboration
- Robust Gold arrangements including Charing SCG meetings.

- Standardisation.
- Assurance

5. Standardisation Project (Paper 04)

5.1. Mark Sawyer spoke to paper 04 and explained the value of standardisation across the five areas based on lessons from EUR. Standardisation Initiation Documents (SIDs) had been drawn up by the work stream leads.

5.2. David Kerry said the potential benefits of standardisation had been identified during EUR. **Mark** said the next step was for the Working Group to meet on 20th October to develop the core skill sets across the five areas and look at aspects that cut across some or all of them. A further update would be given at the next LAP-IG meeting.

5.3. The Chair observed that while standardisation was likely to become the norm it was true to say that parts of London differed considerably, e.g. in terms of risk, so there needed to be flexibility with the standardisation context. **Mark** said that EP2020 recognised those differences.

5.4. Mark said in terms of monitoring it was clear that the numbers of emergency planning and rest centre staff had decreased but there had been more demand on EP staff to deal with a wider range of issues and incidents. **Andrew Meek** said that where there was a good EP Team the Chief Executive was likely to put them to a wider corporate use. **David McClory** said they had been called out on smaller scaled incidents outside the norm. **The Chair** considered that was inevitable.

Decision – the Group agreed to the recommendations on the Standardisation Project paper (paper 04).

6. LAP Business Plan (Paper 07)

6.1. John Hetherington said the draft business plan in paper 07 was for illustration and omitted detail in order to generate a collaborative scripting of the final plan. The intention was to develop a feel for relevant themes and was likely to include what LFEPA would be delivering, borough reciprocation and specific tasks (e.g. training and exercising) for a particular year. The proposal was to establish a small working group to meet in either w/b 17th October or 31st October, leaving November to flesh out the BP using the SRRFs followed by an All Boroughs' Managers' Meeting in December.

6.2. The Group agreed on a meeting in w/b 17th October. The Secretariat would circulate dates.

6.3. Donna Wootton said she would gather views from the West Boroughs. **David Kerry** said it was important to ensure there was a sufficient number of workstreams to get the best value for money from LFEPA.

6.4. The Chair said it would be useful to include an horizon scanning and risk section. For instance, a potential post Brexit issue might be for local authorities to deal with the relocation of people from Calais which would be a risk although it would be difficult to quantify. **John Hetherington** said the BP would include Regional and Partnership work and include year 1 in detail and years 2 and 3 in more general terms. **David Kerry** said the BP should link to the Partnership BP and MSLs. **Andrew Meek** said that there would be business changes

for boroughs due to standardisation which would need to be recognised in resourcing commitments.

Decision The Group agreed on a meeting in w/b 17th October to discuss the LAP business plan.

Action – Secretariat to circulate potential dates for the LAP Business Plan meeting in w/b 17th October

7. MSL Review (Papers 08a-c)

7.1. David McClory spoke to papers 8a-c and explained the work of the MSL working group following the changes to the assessment process. The interactive workshop arranged for September 30th would present and explain the changes to boroughs and include a session on how to complete the MSLs' assessment forms. There had been some changes to the MSLs which were explained in in paper 8a including changes to plans and capabilities and reducing the number of MSLs from 27 to 21, e.g. merging Mass Fatalities to combine DDM and NEMA. The working group had devised a regime for the next 3 years to align the assessment process with the LAP Business Plan and the London Resilience Work Plan. **David Kerry** said that it was likely that the new assessment process involving more evidence could mean a drop in the number of green status in the RAG system and more ambers and reds. **David McClory** said that change would be helpful as it would identify which boroughs were struggling and how best they could be helped.

7.2. The Chair noted and appreciated the progress that had been made and asked for a further update at the next meeting.

Decision – The Group agreed to the recommendations in the MSL Review papers (Papers 08a-c).

8. LRF documents for approval

8.1. John Hetherington explained there were four plans for approval. The main one was the Fuel Disruption Protocol. **David Kerry** explained the work behind producing the Protocol. A Working Group comprising Simon Freestone, Hari Waterfield and Alex Townsend-Drake had produced the draft. The Protocol had been reduced from 73 pages to 12. While the Protocol had been reviewed there was no assurance available. It was unlikely that the Government would initiate the National Emergency Plan for Fuel. The Protocol encouraged organisations and local areas to plan for 10 days of fuel resilience. There was not an expectation that there would be bunkered fuel stocks to cover 10 days but that business continuity arrangements be in place to cover that period. That fitted in with the National Planning Assumptions. **David** considered it unlikely that all boroughs had 10 days supply as they had been told before not to store fuel and that mutual aid was unlikely to be practical. **David** also raised that the MPS would no longer take responsibility for Designated Fuel Stations and detailing the planning for them in advance of a fuel emergency. This would become an extra burden on local authority planning. **David** concluded that this was one of the first occurrences of a plan being presented to the LRF with associated commentary outlining issues in the delivery of the capability and shortcomings in assurance of the capability.

8.2. The Chair said the extent of fuel disruption and the impact it would have would vary across the country and that London's public transport system clearly differed to more remote areas which would have a greater dependence on individual transport by car. There was no clear solution so it was legitimate to raise the issue with the LRF.

Decision – the Group agreed the LRF Plans should be presented to the LRF and the issues on Fuel Disruption represented for LAP and the LRF to consider.

9. SRRF Review (Paper 10)

9.1. John Hetherington spoke to paper 10 and explained it had been a self commissioned review to identify ways to make the SRRFs more useful and provide improved communications between the BRFs and the LRF and align the regional and local priorities in relation to resilience across London. The proposal was to hold two SRRF business meetings – Spring and Autumn – and a workshop in each quarter held at LFB HQ. The next steps were to present the paper to LAP followed by the LRF and, if agreed, implement the change in 2017. **John** said it had been noted that other partners had been pulling away from the SRRFs and therefore there was a balance to be struck between the number of business meetings to meet the desires of local responders and also centralised agencies that attend multiple SRRF.

9.2. Jeremy Reynolds said the SRRFs had been a useful forum for the local EPOs to meet. **Donna Wootton** said the West EPOs met separately but considered the loss of CE involvement from the omitted third SRRF meeting was unfortunate. **Jo Couzins** asked about the involvement of the Directors' forum. **Mark Sawyer** said it was the start of the process with Directors.

Decision – the Group agreed the proposals outlined from the SRRF review (Paper 10) should be sent to LAP for their consideration as Chairs of the Fora.

10. Training and Exercise update (Paper 11)

10.1. Mark Sawyer introduced paper 11 and asked for any questions or comments on proposals. **Donna Wootton** said that Exercise Safer City was very important as it tested all resilient arrangements and that all boroughs should be encouraged to participate as fully as possible. **Mark Sawyer** said a list of participating boroughs could be sent to the Group. **Mark** also referred to the Exercise Planning Group for Exercise Safer City 2017 needing to be re-established and that he would action this.

10.2. The Chair noted that participation in exercises was linked to the MSL point on potentially struggling boroughs.

10.3. Mark Sawyer asked the Group to consider the loggist training options for LLAG and support staff, detailed in Paper 11a. The group agreed Option C was the best way developing and delivering the training, noting the benefit this offers in terms of making it available for boroughs to deliver locally.

Decision – the Group agreed to the recommendations in the Training and Exercise update Paper 11.

Decision – The Group endorsed the recommendations in Paper 11a Loggist Training Options and agreed Option C.

Action – The training and exercising sub-group to reform to prepare for Ex Safer City

11. Airwave/Emergency Services Network update (Paper 12)

11.1. John Hetherington outlined the current known position on the transition to the ESN network. There was an emergency services forum to provide a collective approach to the transition to ESN. A business case would be needed to provide the evidence and argument for local authorities to adopt ESN in favour of another all informed radio network. The latter's timetable was June 2017 and implementation was for the winter of 2018-19.

Action – A business case to be written for the adoption of the Emergency Services Network by local authorities.

12. Any Other Business and Future meeting dates

12.1. There was no further business. On future meeting dates **the Chair** suggested the Group consider holding the pre meeting a few days before the main meeting to allow time for reflection. **The Group** agreed to consider the proposal, with the Secretariat available to capture views.

Action - Secretariat to consult with members on the option of holding the pre-meeting a few days before the main meeting to allow time for reflection.

12.2. David McClory said this was his last LAP-IG meeting. **The Chair** thanked **David** for his valuable contribution to the Group's work.

London Fire Brigade Emergency Planning October 2016