

MINUTES
Local Authorities Panel – Implementation Group (LAP-IG)
26th May 2016 09.30
Room LG-01 LFB HQ, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL

Sector Represented	Name	Organisation
Central SRRF LAs & Practitioner Advisor to Chair of LAP	David Kerry	RB Kensington & Chelsea (Chair)
North East SRRF LAs	David McClory	LB Barking and Dagenham
South East SRRF LAs	Kelly Jack	LB Croydon
West SRRF LAs	Donna Wootton	LB Hillingdon
South West SRRF LAs	Adam Viccari	LB Merton
North Central SRRF LAs	Peter Ng	LB Hackney
Central SRRF LAs	Andy Snazell	LB Southwark
Secretariat	Mark Sawyer	LFB EP
Secretariat	Graham Burbage	LFB EP
Apologies		
Central SRRF LAs	Gary Locker	City of London
London Resilience Team	Susan Price	LRT

Decisions	
1	The Group agreed to the recommendations in Paper 07 on standardisation opportunities following EUR. The EUR work team leads should be invited, if willing, to do an initial assessment within 3 months of what could be achieved, its scope and terms of reference. LAP-IG would then decide on work allocation and work leads.
2	The Group agreed to the recommendation in Paper 06 on MSL New Assessment Options 2016. The Group noted with gratitude the progress made by the Working Group and their commitment to champion the process and support boroughs.
3	The Group agreed for LFB EP to produce a draft update of the LAP Business Plan for 2016-17 based on the key deliverables for 2016-17 previously included, work endorsed at the Meeting to develop standardisation, LLAG arrangements training and exercise programme scheduled for this period, work overseeing the implementation of the SLA, and, revision and maintenance of plans in line with the LRPB programme. The draft would be considered at the workshop (see action 3) along with developing a longer term business plan covering 2017-2020.
4	The Group agreed to the recommendation in paper 08 on LLAG Training and Role with the additional point that secondary LLAGs if asked to step up would be advised to use their own Deputy LLAG and Loggist.
5.	The Group agreed that Paper 09 – Emergency Planning Monitoring Report – would not be sent to LAP for their meeting on 1 st June.
6	The Group approved the Disruption to Telecoms for Responders Framework. The Group proposed formal thanks to Alan Palmer for his work on the Framework. See also action 4.
Actions	
By	

1	Secretariat to ask LRT for an update on the request for agencies being asked to review their individual capacity to respond to a Paris style attack (as mentioned in paragraph 3.1 of the minutes of the 26 th January 2016 meeting).	Secretariat
2	The draft SLA would be sent to Doug Patterson for comment before being sent to LFB. The Chair would inform Doug Patterson of the Group's reservations on the document eg potential issues with Boroughs' Procurement Teams, the source of funding within Boroughs, no mention of dispute resolution or efficiencies.	Chair
3	Secretariat to arrange an extra meeting of LAP-IG towards the end of June to workshop a longer term business plan. In the meantime Group members would consult their Boroughs.	Secretariat/ Group Members
4	Linked to the Disruption to Telecoms for Responders Framework a presentation on RAYNET should be given to the SRRFs at a convenient meeting.	Secretariat
5	Consideration should be given to the best way to inform Boroughs about the Partnership Situational Awareness Project.	Secretariat
6	The Group agreed at the request of the Chair of LAP to conduct an intelligent assessment of the status of EP in London using all available data including the EP Monitoring Report, MSL reviews and anecdotal evidence. To be discussed at the extra end June meeting.	All

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

- 1.1. **The Chair** opened the meeting and welcomed attendees particularly **Donna Wootton** on her first LAP-IG meeting and **Andy Snazell** for deputising for Gary Locker. **The Chair** said he was reasonably confident that the next meeting of LAP-IG would be chaired by a local authority Chief Executive.

2. Minutes of last meeting (paper 02)

- 2.1. The Group agreed that the minutes of 26th January 2016 meeting were an accurate account. **Peter Ng** raised a point in relation to paragraph 3.1 and asked what had been the responses to the request for each agency to review its individual capability to respond to a Paris style attack. In the absence of a member of LRT the Secretariat would request an update.

Action - Secretariat to ask LRT for an update on the request for agencies being asked to review their individual capacity to respond to a Paris style attack (as mentioned in paragraph 3.1 of the minutes of the 26th January 2016 meeting).

- 2.2. **The Chair** gave an update on the actions of the previous meeting.

Actions		Update
1	E-mail to be sent to local authorities to explain the SLA	Completed.
2	BRF Capabilities Maturity Assessment recommendations to be raised to LAP	Completed.
3	To find a new West SRRF Representative	Completed.

4	The Secretariat to raise with the Environment Agency on the definitive list on reservoir planning	Completed and circulated with a link to RD.
5	Raise to LAP the need for a new LAP IG Chair	The Chair said that LAP were fully aware and that representations had been
		made.

3. LRT Update (oral update)

- 3.1. In the absence of LRT **Mark Sawyer** gave an update of the merger of LRT and LFBEP. In practice the merger had occurred with a unified budget and a temporary name of the Civil Contingencies Group. That was likely to change and would not include any reference to LFB. The general approach had been evolution rather than revolution. The new top Management structure was in place with further changes to come. The role of LRT secondees would be part of the discussion on the new Team's shape.

4. Local Authority / LFB EP SLA (paper 04)

- 4.1. **The Chair** explained that the Working Group had followed the clear remit from LAP on the format and length of the SLA and the intention to produce a SLA that would not require rewriting every year. The annual payment would be something that LAP with CELC would agree. Comments had been received from the West and North Central and some changes were made to the document. The SLA Working Group had circulated a Q&A responding to the comments. The next step was for the draft to be sent to Doug Patterson for clearance on behalf of LAP and then sent to Steve Hamm at LFB for comment prior to final approval. The detail underpinning the SLA on specific workstreams and timescales would be contained in LAP's Business Plan and this would be the means by which LAP would hold LFB-EP to account for their delivery.
- 4.2. During discussion the following points were made:
- LAs and EPOs were fully supportive of the continuing role of LFB-EP to provide a central support role to the boroughs and LLAG. There was support for the annual payments from boroughs that were now necessary.
 - There was concern from some LAs at the process by which the £15k payment and the SLA had been made. Some felt that there should have been a legal agreement, overseen by lawyers. Some believed that their Chief Executives would expect their emergency planning and legal teams to agree the SLA, rather than this being done centrally by LAP. Others were satisfied with the process so far.
 - Some LAs queried why the SLA would be signed by LAP, and not individually by all 33 local authorities. A number of LAs would expect the SLA to be reviewed by their legal or procurement departments. It was noted that the LLAG MoU had been signed by all LAs.

- Some LAs had queried why the SLA did not contain anything that held LFBEP to account, or any form of dispute resolution.
- A number of LAs wished LAP to be aware that the £15K annual payment had been taken from existing emergency planning team budgets. This was despite the representations by LAP to Chief Executives that it should be funded additionally to existing budgets.
- The SLA did not mention the annual payment from local authorities to LFBEP.

- 4.3. In summary **the Chair** thanked the Group for their constructive comments and said that the Working Group had discharged their brief from LAP. The Group's comments and concerns would be sent to Doug Patterson when the SLA was submitted to him.

Action - The draft SLA would be sent to Doug Patterson for comment before being sent to LFB. The Chair would inform Doug Patterson of the Group's reservations on the document eg potential issues with Boroughs' Procurement Teams, the source of funding within Boroughs, no mention of dispute resolution or efficiencies.

5. Standardisation opportunities following Exercise Unified Response (Paper 07)

- 5.1. **The Chair** outlined a conversation held the previous week with the Chair of LAP. A number of relevant points had been made:

- CELC had discussed EUR and some of the initial learning at the April meeting. Particular thanks to Hackney had been mentioned for hiring furniture for the SRC.
- There was potential for future SCGs to be Chaired by a local authority Chief Executive at an earlier stage to reflect an earlier concentration on wider impacts.
- There would be more resilience for the LLAG role including training eg the MAGIC course.
- A report would be made to the Leaders Group and CELC on London's LAs' emergency planning capability with a view to identifying recommendations for emergency planning and resilience for local government for 2020s. This would be complimented by the establishment of the Director Level Group as recommended in the Norwell Review..
- There would be another look at the Norwell review's recommendations. LAP-IG to conduct an intelligent assessment of the status of EP in London using all available data including the EP Monitoring Report, MSL reviews and anecdotal evidence.
- The relationship with the MSLs. **The Chair** noted that LAP closely examined the results of the MSLs' reviews.

- 5.2. On standardisation, **Mark Sawyer** spoke to Paper 07 and outlined the three recommendations following a meeting of the EUR workstream leads. Sharing scarce resources while retaining local sovereignty was important. **The Chair** noted that the EUR BECC was impressive but there had been a number of

different ways of working and that standardised job descriptions, eg for controllers, would assist Teams from different boroughs to integrate and might assist retaining volunteers.

- 5.3. **Donna Wootton** agreed in principle and mentioned mutual aid capability. One of the West boroughs had mentioned they would ask Ealing to run their SRC. **Donna** also mentioned from their own experience that standardisation was time consuming. **Peter Ng** also agreed in principle and mentioned that contact links into local authorities were likely to differ markedly. **David McClory** said the standardisation process between Waltham Forest and Barking and Dagenham had been a long and difficult process. The standardisation of core skills was the right way to go but retaining local skills and identifying best practice across boroughs remained important.
- 5.4. The Group noted that standardisation would be resource intensive and that it would not be practical for the EUR workstream leads to undertake all the work. **Donna** mentioned that Ealing would be pulling back on representation on pan London groups due to lack of resources. **The Chair** agreed the working group be established to oversee the workstreams with Boroughs contributing and with LFB-EP also being involved. After some further discussion the following decision was reached.

Decision - The Group agreed to the recommendations in Paper 07 on standardisation opportunities following EUR. The EUR workstream leads should be invited, if willing, to do an initial assessment within 3 months of what could be achieved, its scope and terms of reference. LAP-IG would then decide on work allocation and work leads.

6. MSL New Assessment Options 2016 (paper 06)

- 6.1. **Donna Wootton** said she was content with the new approach on MSL assessment and supported the 3 year cycle in line with the workstreams in the Business Plan. The longer term proposal to include local auditors was welcomed. **David McClory** supported the new approach but noted that local auditors would inevitably have their own way to conducting audits. **The Chair** said that if a process was in place then the audit should be easier. After some further discussion the Group reached the following decision.

Decision - The Group agreed to the recommendation in Paper 06 on MSL New Assessment Options 2016. The Group noted with gratitude the progress made by the Working Group and their commitment to champion the process and support boroughs.

7. Business Plan (Paper 05)

- 7.1. **Peter Ng** said the business plan needed tightening up and that some of it related to external sources. **Mark Sawyer** said it related to 2015-17 and the key deliverables for that period. **The Chair** proposed that the Business Plan needed a further meeting and that it should be split into two – one for 2016-17 and a longer term Business Plan covering 2017-20. **Mark Sawyer** suggested for 2016-17 the BP should be based on based on the key deliverables for

2016-17, work endorsed at the Meeting to develop standardisation, LLAG arrangements training and exercise programme scheduled for 2016-17, work overseeing the implementation of the SLA, and, revision and maintenance of plans in line with the LRPB programme. The Group agreed. The meeting should be held towards the end of June if possible and deputies would attend if the Group's members were not available.

Decision - The Group agreed for LFB EP to produce a draft update of the LAP Business Plan for 2016-17 based on the key deliverables for 2016-17 previously included, work endorsed at the Meeting to develop standardisation, LLAG arrangements training and exercise programme scheduled for this period, work overseeing the implementation of the SLA, and, revision and maintenance of plans in line with the LRPB programme. The draft would be considered at the workshop (see action 3) along with developing a longer term business plan covering 2017-2020.

8. LLAG training and role (paper 08)

- 8.1. **Mark Sawyer** spoke to Paper 08. **Mark** mentioned one further point in relation to secondary LLAGs. If they were asked to step up they would be advised to use their own Deputy LLAG and Loggist. The Group agreed.

Decision - The Group agreed to the recommendation in paper 08 on LLAG Training and Role with the additional point that secondary LLAGs if asked to step up would be advised to use their own Deputy LLAG and Loggist.

9. Emergency Planning Monitoring Report (Paper 09)

- 9.1. **Mark Sawyer** introduced the paper and said that it was not for sending to LAP at this stage. **David McClory** said there appeared to be some interesting trends such as fewer rest centre staff and an increase in incidents. **David** noted that the BRC did not always attend once a rest centre was sent up. **The Chair** said overall interpretation was difficult and that more time was required to identify quantifiable trends. The next monitoring report would be sent to LAP.

Decision - The Group agreed that Paper 09 – Emergency Planning Monitoring Report – would not be sent to LAP for their meeting on 1st June.

10. Partnership Plans for approval (Paper 10)

- 10.1. **Peter Ng** said the NC had no issues with the Disruption to Telecons for Responders Plan v2.1.1 and proposed formal thanks be given to the report's author Alan Palmer. **Peter** and **the Chair** noted that their boroughs no longer had a satellite phone. **Mark** confirmed that satellite phones were now optional with LFB EP choosing to retain theirs at Merton for the time being. **Donna** asked whether there was a briefing paper available on RAYNET. After some discussion it was agreed that a presentation on RAYNET should be given to the SRRFs at a convenient meeting.

Decision - The Group approved the Disruption to Telecoms for Responders Framework. The Group proposed formal thanks to Alan Palmer for his work on the Framework.

Action - Linked to the Disruption to Telecoms for Responders Framework a presentation on RAYNET should be given to the SRRFs at a convenient meeting.

11. Partnership Situational Awareness Project Update (Paper 11)

- 11.1. Mark Sawyer** spoke to Paper 11 and mentioned that demonstrations of the IT system would be made at the next round of SRRFs. The Group suggested that Boroughs needed to be brought up to speed with the project.

Action - Consideration should be given to the best way to inform Boroughs about the Partnership Situational Awareness Project.

12. Any other business

- 12.1. Kelly Jack** said that Risky Business, Chaired by Don Randall, held on May 13th had been a successful event.
- 12.2. David McClory** said he had been disappointed by no representation from the Police at the NE SRRF or the LAS at BRF level. **The Chair** suggested that be discussed at a later meeting if not covered during the LRF review.
- 12.3. Mark Sawyer** asked how the Chair of LAP's request to carry out an intelligent assessment of the status of EP in London using all available data including the EP Monitoring Report, MSL reviews and anecdotal evidence. **The Chair** suggested it be added to the Business Plan meeting. The Group agreed.

Action - The Group agreed at the request of the Chair of LAP to conduct an intelligent assessment of the status of EP in London using all available data including the EP Monitoring Report, MSL reviews and anecdotal evidence. To be discussed at the extra end June meeting.

13. Future meeting dates

- Extra meeting to be arranged for end June.
- 20th September 2016.