

**MINUTES OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES' PANEL (LAP)
 2nd February 2017, Corporate Room 2, 15:00 Guildhall**

Name	Organisation
John Barradell	Chair (Town Clerk City of London Corporation)
Charlie Adan	SW SRRF (CE RB Kingston)
Mary Harpley	West SRRF (CE LB Hounslow)
Eleanor Kelly	Central SRRF (CE Southwark)
Charlie Parker	LAP IG (CE City of Westminster)
Doug Patterson	SE SRRF (CE LB Bromley)
Lesley Seary	NC SRRF (CE LB Islington)
John O'Brien	CE London Councils
Dr Fiona Wilcox	Westminster's Coroner
Tim Owen	Head of City Operations, Major Events, London
David Kerry	Practitioner Advisor to the Chair (EPO RB Kensington & Chelsea)
Andrew Meek	Humanitarian Assistance lead for London
Dave Johnson	TfL
Mari Rogerson	DCLG RED
John Hetherington	London Resilience Secretariat
Mark Sawyer	London Resilience Secretariat
Graham Burbage	London Resilience Secretariat (Minutes)
Chanelle Cook	London Resilience Secretariat
Apologies	
Kim Bromley-Derry	NE SRRF (CE LB Newham)

No.	Actions	Lead
1	Andrew Meek to take the matter of pre-identifying venues to the Humanitarian Assistance Working Group.	Andrew Meek
2	The Croydon Tram Incident Debrief Team to be advised to seek the views of the Coroner if not already arranged.	Secretariat
3	Secretariat to undertake a mapping exercise to identify mortuary and coronial area specific trends.	Secretariat
4	LAP-IG to reconsider the proposed change of timing for the MSL assessments.	LAP-IG
5	All to send any comments on the Move to Critical draft document to the Secretariat.	All
6	Suggestions on venues or events for the outer boroughs in relation to London Bridge Planning to be sent to Mari Rogerson or via the Secretariat.	All
7	John O'Brien to consider the need to produce a briefing note for Members on London Bridge.	John O'Brien
8	Andrew Meek to ensure potential costs associated to Paper 04c are established prior to holding discussions with the British Red Cross.	Andrew Meek

No.	Decision
1	The Panel agreed to the recommendations in Paper 04a on the Harris review update.
2	The Panel agreed the recommendations in Paper 04b on the EP2020 Review Update.
3	The Panel agreed the recommendations in Paper 04c on Humanitarian Assistance Planning.

4	The Panel agreed to the recommendations in paper 04d on MSL Peer Review Results 2016 with the exception of the change of assessment period which requires further consideration.
5	The Panel agreed to the recommendations in paper 06b on the Future of the London Strategic Salt Stockpile.
6	The Panel was content with paper 07 on the LAP Business Plan

1. Welcome, introductions & apologies for absence

1.1. The Chair opened the meeting, introductions were made and apologies noted. The Chair welcomed Charlie Adan to her first LAP Meeting.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (paper 02)

2.1. The Panel agreed that the minutes of the 3rd October 2016 meeting were accurate. The Chair said that Dr Jonathan Hildebrand's passing was a great loss to the London Resilience Community and that he had made a major contribution to Public Health in London. The Panel agreed.

2.2. An update on the actions was as follows:

No.	Actions	Update
1	DCLG to send out guidance letter regarding London Bridge to Chief Executives via Secretariat.	Complete.
2	London Bridge framework update to become a standing item.	On the agenda.
3	An implementation group to be formed to take forward the recommendations in Paper 04b.	Complete.
4	Confirm Newham's Gold training can be shared and obtain a copy to share with all London local authorities.	Mark Sawyer reported this was in progress.
5	Update on mortuaries to become a standing item.	Complete.

3. Future of Emergency Planning in London

Service Level Agreement

3.1. The Chair said it was important for there to be a degree of separation once LFEPA was abolished and subsumed under the Mayor's control whilst maintaining support for the LLAG arrangements remained vital. The SLA would ensure that degree of independence but with no increased burden on Chief Executives. The Chair thanked John Hetherington for his work in this area.

Harris Review Update (Paper 04a)

3.2. The Chair said the paper made two key recommendations and invited any comments. The Panel was content with the recommendations.

Decision – The Panel agreed to the recommendations in Paper 04a.

EP 2020 Review Update (paper 04b)

3.3. Mark Sawyer introduced Paper 04b and asked the Panel to endorse the delivery plan set out in Annex A and to receive further progress reports at future meetings. Work in the four key areas had started and LAP-IG would ensure the work was progressed efficiently and in a coordinated manner.

Decision - The Panel agreed the recommendations in Paper 04b on the EP2020 Review Update.

3.4. **Doug Patterson** asked about the proposed shadowing role for LLAG during an incident. **The Chair** explained that the next LLAG on the Rota would be briefed before the allocated handover time so they would be better sighted on the key issues. Further into an incident a small cadre of CEs with appropriate training would take on Chairing the SCGs. **Doug** said he was content.

3.5. **Mark** also mentioned four sub-regional lead Local Authority CEs had been identified to act in a coordination capacity. **Charlie Adan** asked about general resource implications. **Lesley Seary** explained that any significant work from LAP that had implications for CEs and resources would be considered by CELC so that all CEs would be aware of what had been agreed.

3.6. **John O'Brien** mentioned that the future of Emergency Planning and Harris Report would be raised at the Leaders' Committee on 7th February.

Standardisation Project

3.7. **David Kerry** explained the project was a follow up to EUR and covered elements including local authorities' command and control arrangements, Humanitarian Assistance and LALOs. The objective was to reduce workloads in boroughs and add value at regional level including mutual aid as staff would be trained in the same way. The Control Centre aspects would be tested at Exercise Safer City on 9th February and the project was due to be completed by the end of 2017. LAP-IG was undertaking the governance of the project.

Humanitarian Assistance Proposal

3.8. **Andrew Meek** introduced paper 04c. **Andrew** explained that Humanitarian Assistance was a key local authority led capability. The draft London Humanitarian Assistance Framework taking full account of the lessons from Exercise Unified Response had been sent out for consultation. There were two key proposals in paper 04c. Firstly, identifying a cadre of 6 Directors of Adult Services to ensure high quality leadership to the HA response in London. Secondly, taking account of the reduction in number of local authority staff that further work was undertaken to engage with the voluntary and business sectors to identify community volunteers.

3.9. **Dr Fiona Wilcox** said it was a good idea to involve the voluntary sector. Ideally, it would be helpful to identify potential sites in the each Coronial District in advance, akin to DDMs. It could be linked to the mass fatalities' discussions. **Eleanor Kelly** agreed it was a good idea to involve the voluntary and business sector but it might take the BRC some time to find enough volunteers for each incident and it was important to look at the practicalities. Eleanor Kelly then said that it was important to retain a local authority capability as they will still retain the responsibility.

Action - Andrew Meek to take the matter of pre-identifying venues to the Humanitarian Assistance Working Group.

3.10. **Mary Harpley** agreed it was difficult to maintain a sufficient number of volunteers within boroughs and that establishing other sources was sensible but questioned their reliability compared to local authority staff. **Charlie Parker** said while the concept was the right direction of travel it was important to identify any costs for CEs including hidden ones such as subsidies. **The Chair** confirmed it was important to identify a suitable building during an incident to avoid a repetition of the expensive change of location during 7/7.

3.11. **Andrew Meek** said while some pre planning on buildings could be done they tended to be rented out so it was difficult to have formal arrangements in place. **Andrew** considered that if there was an incident such buildings could be vacated which would negate any need for any costs to earmark such buildings on a standby basis.

Action - Andrew Meek to ensure potential costs associated to Paper 04c are established prior to holding discussions with the British Red Cross.

3.12. **The Chair** asked the Panel if they were content with the recommendations in paper 04c. **The Panel** was content.

Decision – The Panel agreed the recommendations in Paper 04c on Humanitarian Assistance Planning.

Coronial Matters

3.13. **Dr Fiona Wilcox** spoke of the coronial issues relating to the response to the Croydon tram crash. **The Chair** asked whether the Coroner was attending the Croydon debrief on 3rd February and requested that Dr Wilcox's points should be raised there.

Action - The Croydon Tram Incident Debrief Team to be advised to seek the views of the Coroner if not already arranged.

3.14. On mortuary capacity **Dr Wilcox** said the mortuaries were very full. Flu had increased the number of deaths and put a strain on capacity. St George's was full. **Charlie Adan** said that Kingston had their Excess Deaths Plan in operation. **John Hetherington** said the last 4 weekly monitoring figures had shown around 72% capacity compared to 50-55% outside winter months. This compared to around 80% in 2013-14. **Mark Sawyer** noted that Sutton was at 87% capacity so there might be an issue in south west London.

3.15. **Eleanor Kelly** said the mortuary capacity issue was linked to a full review of the death management process which so far had not been possible to take forward.

3.16. **The Chair** said it was LAP's responsibility to flag up any London wide concerns. There was some spare capacity across London although some areas appeared stretched. Once capacity reached 80% across London it would get flagged by the Secretariat.

Action - Secretariat to undertake a mapping exercise to identify mortuary and coronial area specific trends.

Minimum Standards for London Assessment (paper 04d)

3.17. **John Hetherington** introduced the paper and explained it summarised the results of all 33 boroughs for the first time and provided an opportunity for Boroughs' self reflection, identifying trends and transparency of assurance. Ambers meant there was a capacity but needed development. Reds required considerable more work for a capability to be in place. Identified trends needing more work included mass fatalities, identifying vulnerable people and fuel disruption. These would be the subject matter of the SRRF workshops in 2017. One recommendation concerned moving the assessment period from before Christmas to February and March.

3.18. **Mary Harpley** said she doubted moving the assessment dates would make much difference to the workload as long as it is scheduled in advance. **Doug Patterson** agreed. **The Chair** suggested the process take place before the budget was set so an area identified as Red could potentially have more resources or, possibly, a protected level of resources. **Charlie Parker** suggested that perhaps the assessment should be done at the 6 month stage to allow a greater level of focus and consideration in the budget setting process. **Doug Patterson** said the MSL assessments would allow EPOs more influence on the budget setting process as there would be clear information available.

3.19. **The Chair** asked LAP-IG to look at the timing issue again taking account of the points made. The paper could be submitted to CELC as the timing issue was for the following year.

Action – LAP-IG to reconsider the proposed change of timing for the MSL assessments.

Decision – The Panel agreed to the recommendations in paper 04d on MSL Peer Review Results 2016 with the exception of the change of assessment period which requires further consideration.

4. Current Threats and Hazards

Move to Critical

4.1. **Mark Sawyer** explained that the paper followed a useful workshop held in October 2016 and was an early draft attempting to provide strategic guidance for to CEs to support preparations for or response to an increase in the UK Threat Level.

4.2. **Mary Harpley** said that on a quick read it was an excellent document. **Doug Patterson** said it was very useful. **The Chair** invited further comments by e-mail to the Secretariat. **John O'Brien** said it would be a useful short note to Leaders.

Action – all to send any comments on the Move to Critical draft document to the Secretariat.

Security Clearance Requirements

4.3. **The Chair** said there were likely to be briefings for CEs on returning foreign fighters for which security clearance was required. CEs had been written to by DCLG on the importance of clearance and **the Chair** noted that only 6 current CEs in London had the appropriate SC clearance. **Charlie Parker** said he was filling out the forms electronically as requested but it had been a very slow process. **The Chair** said that clearance in previous roles was not likely to be valid.

Prevent Support to LLAG

4.4. **Mark Sawyer** outlined the progress made on the recommendations identified during the Prevent workshop held in September 2016. The Workshop had involved borough staff responsible for Prevent and community engagement plus emergency planning teams. Since the Workshop good progress had been made although there was a need to develop the means of ensuring local authority specific recommendations were adopted and the relationships with the Police formalised to ensure it is embedded within core business. LAP-IG had agreed that the Prevent engagement function in support of operational response, should be incorporated into MSLs.

5. Winter Preparedness

Future of the London Strategic Salt Stockpile (paper 06b)

5.1. **Dave Johnson** introduced the paper and explained that the existing salt supplies was sufficient for normal use in the Winter but would last less time if there was snowfall. The existing reserves of 27,000t was located in Dagenham but the lease would terminate in June. TfL needed to find an alternative location in time for next Winter. TfL requested that London highways authorities replenished their salt stocks at the end of Winter by purchasing at competitive rates from the reserves in Dagenham, with the monies reinvested in new stock. **Dave** said TfL would be happy to send invoices out in 2017-18 if that helped.

5.2. **Andrew Meek** said authorities would need to be mindful of any existing contractual arrangements with existing suppliers. **David Kerry** said that since the winter had been mild there might not be much need to replenish supplies.

5.3. **The Chair** said the first two recommendations were accepted and the third was more for LOTAG colleagues but 14 days sounded right.

Decision – the Panel agreed to the recommendations in paper 06b on Future of the London Strategic Salt Stockpile.

6. LAP Business Plan (Paper 07)

6.1. **John Hetherington** introduced paper 07 and explained the Business Plan now contained a forward and a more balanced level of detail between regional support and borough level deliverables, building on the involvement from LAP-IG. The intention was to add a dashboard as a reporting tool for continued reporting to LAP. The Panel was content with the Business Plan.

Decision – the Panel was content with paper 07 on the LAP Business Plan.

7. London Bridge Planning (oral update)

7.1. **Tim Owen** gave an update on planning and that progress had been made on the four main areas of work - Media Operations, Crowds and Visitors, Health and Transport. On transport a great deal of detailed work was taking place on all varieties of transport from main railways, main and local roads to taxis and river transport. Roads policy was being worked on including freight displacement. Information would probably be shared using Resilience Direct. The main impacted boroughs would be Camden, City of London, Lambeth, Southwark, Kensington and Chelsea, Islington and Westminster. The Royal Parks would also be impacted. Jonathan Spencer from the Royal Household would visit the impacted boroughs to go through the planning.

7.2. It was assumed that crowds would gather along the route as they did with the Torch Relay and Tour De France. There could be a role for commercial stadiums with large video screens and the Royal Parks using large screens. **Mari Rogerson** mentioned the DCLG letter that had been sent to all London Chief Executives and said any suggestions on venues or event for the outer boroughs could be sent to her or via the Secretariat.

Action - suggestions on venues or events for the outer boroughs in relation to London Bridge Planning to be sent to Mari Rogerson or via the Secretariat.

7.3. **Charlie Adan** said that not all the Royal Boroughs were in Central London but would be doing something to mark the occasion and would need to be linked in. **Tim** said that was expected and coordination would come via Jonathan Spencer.

7.4. **Charlie Parker** said there would be a degree of local expectation among Members on local interpretation of activity and proclamations. **Tim** said that the local Ceremonial Officers would be briefed. There would be two official Proclamations and Boroughs could use those as a basis for their own. **The Chair** agreed that the political management would be important to manage Members' expectations. **John O'Brien** said that coordination was crucial. A London Councils' paper for Members would be useful.

Action - John O'Brien to consider the need to produce a briefing note for Members on London Bridge.

7.5. **The Chair** asked whether the local authority Gold arrangements could be used to help the process and said it was important that there were assurances of adequate welfare arrangements for, in particular, the elderly who might be standing in queues for long periods. **Tim** said it was envisaged that the Gold arrangements would be used and that welfare concerns would be taken into account.

8. DCLG Resilience and Emergencies Division

8.1. **Mari Rogerson** said that the National Risk Assumptions and Planning Assumptions were on Resilience Direct so should be accessible. A video for local authority CEs was being worked on. The Resilience Capabilities' Survey would be launched on 28th April with local authorities given a three week deadline for completion. It was in a more user friendly format. Finally, the LRF Chairs' Conference was due to be held on 2nd March in London.

9. Update from London Resilience Forum

9.1. **John Hetherington** said the LRF was due to meet on 6th February and would be giving further consideration to Lord Harris' report as a follow up to the 8th December meeting. The LRF would also be considering the Risk Register and the Strategic Coordination Protocol. The latter would require further development. The LRF would also consider the new lessons policy including

the debrief protocol. LAP-IG had agreed to include lessons learned on its agenda as a standing item.

10. Update from LAP-IG (Oral report)

10.1. **David Kerry** said LAP-IG had considered a number of burst water mains incidents and the varying degrees of response from Thames Water. The intention was to conduct a survey across boroughs to collect data in order to have an evidence based assessment before deciding how to progress the issue.

11. Date of next Meeting.

11.1. Monday June 5th, 14:30 at the Guildhall.

London Fire Brigade Emergency Planning, February 2017