

1. Introduction

This paper updates LAP on the status of Boroughs' assessment following a peer review within the SRRF areas against MSL in order to provide practitioner comments and recommendations to LAP for consideration. The results and identified trends are intended to allow LAP to consider if any further action or support is required to enhance London's local authority resilience capability.

2. Recommendations

- **LAP are requested to consider recommending to all local authorities incorporating business continuity to their internal and/ or external auditing regime in order to uphold assurance for business continuity across all council services.**
- **LAP are requested agree to monitor the implementation of the following work items through the LAP Business plan 2015 – 2017:**
 - **Excess Deaths**
 - **Identification of the Vulnerable**
 - **Mass Fatalities**
 - **Humanitarian Assistance training**
- **LAP considers whether Community Resilience and Business Continuity promotion require a London wide consistent approach prepared by practitioners or if the implementation of this capability should remain at local discretion.**
- **LAP considers the opportunity of greater collaboration between boroughs and LFB-EP, e.g. provision of off-the-shelf exercises by LFB EP.**

3. Background

The concept of Minimum Standards for London's local authorities is well established following the implementation of both MSL 1 in 2009 and MSL 2 in 2010. Emergency Planning teams have worked hard to achieve a consistent set of standards applicable to all boroughs that set the benchmark for resilience capabilities across the capital's 33 local authorities. In 2013 the Minimum Standards were consolidated into a single set of standards.

Comparisons to previous assessments have been made within the results section of this paper. It should be noted that the results from 2012 and 2011 cannot be used for an exact comparison due to the revision of MSL in 2013 however they provide a useful point of reference to chart the progress of the implementation of the Standards. It was noted in the 2013 assessment that a drop in the assessed capabilities was expected given the focus, funding and priority given to preparedness to the Olympics. It is encouraging that there has not been a further decrease in capability since.

32 Boroughs participated in the Peer review.

4. The results of the MSL assessment

Assessment	Green	Amber	Red
MSL Peer review (Nov/ Dec 2014)	85 %	15 %	< 0.5 %
MSL Self assessment (Dec 2013)	85 %	14 %	1 %
MSL (O) Self assessment (Feb 2012)	89 %	10 %	< 1 %
MSL 2 Peer Review (Jan 2011)	77 %	20 %	3 %

5. Trends

The following capabilities have been identified for comment and recommendations as they have more than a quarter (9 or more boroughs) reporting an Amber or Red rating.

The capabilities identified in the 2013 review through the same analysis were as follows: Humanitarian Assistance, CBRN(E), Mass Fatalities, Excess Deaths, Fuel Disruption, Community Resilience for Emergencies and BC Promotion Strategy.

Although not meeting the threshold of 9 boroughs several boroughs are concerned that training and exercising needs for borough staff exceed current capabilities. In addition it is felt that the general availability of staff for training and exercises has declined due to the increased outsourcing of council services.

Capability	Number of Ambers and Reds	Comment / Recommendation
2.2 Business Continuity	9 Amber 1 Red	Boroughs reported concerns regarding as to whether adequate business continuity plans were in place across all council services. Most boroughs agreed that it was very useful to have internal and/or external audits to maintain continuing assurance for business continuity management. It is advised LAP recommends local authorities to consider incorporating internal and/ or external auditing in order to uphold assurance for business continuity across all council services.
2.4 Humanitarian Assistance**	13 Amber	Concerns from boroughs regarding amount and training of staff available to provide psychosocial care at HAC and issues in maintaining a sufficient pool of volunteers. It is recommended LAP considers a centralised training programme for boroughs to improve this specific capability for a focused group of humanitarian assistance staff.

<p>2.7 Identification of Vulnerable Persons</p>	<p>13 Amber</p>	<p>Several boroughs are not satisfied with their current capabilities to obtain appropriate data during an emergency, concerns exist regarding cooperation with partner agencies and the ease of sharing information. It should be noted that a partnership guidance document on the Identification of Vulnerable Persons to provide further support to boroughs is currently being approved by LRPB.</p> <p>It is recommended that boroughs focus on the development of this capability following the publication of the regional guidance.</p>
<p>2.14 Mass Fatalities**</p>	<p>11 Amber</p>	<p>The majority of issues still lie in the agreement of financial funding of costs incurred by a borough hosting a DDM or NEMA facility. London boroughs within the West London Coronial District are currently preparing a briefing paper regarding financial arrangements following a mass fatalities incident which will be shared across London.</p> <p>It is recommended LAP monitors mass fatalities planning regarding adequate financial arrangements following the publication of the briefing paper.</p>
<p>2.15 Excess Deaths**</p>	<p>13 Amber 1 Red</p>	<p>The new London framework has undergone major changes and just been re-published in 2014. According to the framework, an incident of this nature is likely to affect all boroughs, therefore it will take time for each borough needs to identify internal possibilities to extend local capabilities, e.g. storage, burial, etc.</p> <p>It is recommended that LAP further monitors the implementation of local Excess Deaths planning following the recent publication of the new London Framework and exercising due to take place at SRRF in 2015.</p>
<p>2.25 Community Resilience for Emergencies**</p>	<p>10 Amber</p>	<p>Boroughs reported concerns regarding the appropriate amount and kind of measures to be put into place to adequately enhance community resilience within their boroughs. In addition, it should be noted that the implementation of any local strategy is likely to incur costs in publication and advertising and requires the support from other departments, in particular communications departments.</p> <p>It is recommended that LAP considers whether community resilience requires a London wide consistent approach prepared by practitioners or if the implementation of this capability should remain at local discretion.</p>
<p>2.27 BC Promotion Strategy**</p>	<p>9 Amber 1 Red</p>	<p>Although the importance of Business Continuity advice to SMEs has been widely recognized, boroughs reported that demand from businesses within their boroughs was very low.</p>

		It is recommended that LAP considers whether BC promotion requires a London wide consistent approach prepared by practitioners or if the implementation of this capability should remain at local discretion.
--	--	---

** Denotes capability identified in both 2013 and 2014 review.

6. Conclusion

It can be observed that the overall rating of resilience preparedness has remained at a constant level since the last assessment with a decline in red ratings. This development shows that boroughs are in a good position to maintain emergency preparedness and response standards over time.

It is encouraging that capabilities requiring an immediate response, such as Shelter, Evacuation, Flood and Severe Weather response, have not been identified within the trends as requiring further work.

However, almost the same capabilities as last year have been identified as lacking widespread capability which indicates that boroughs might require additional support to adequately develop these capabilities.

Consideration should be given to the fact that it is a challenge for EP teams to improve resource intensive capabilities such as Community Resilience and Business Continuity Promotion with only limited resources.

Appendix 1 – Self assessment results by Borough

Ref	LFB EP	Central					NC					NE					SE					SW					West					Total amber	Total red	Sum (a + r)						
		City of London Kensington & Chelsea	Lambeth	Southwark	Tower Hamlets	City of Westminster	Barnet	Camden	Enfield	Hackney	Haringey	Islington	Barking & Dagenham	Havering	Newham	Redbridge	Waltham Forest	Bexley	Bromley	Croydon	Greenwich	Lewisham	Kingsdon	Merton	Richmond	Sutton	Wandsworth	Brent	Ealing	Hammersmith & Fulham	Harrow				Hillingdon	Hounslow				
1.1	Activation Time	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0	
1.2	Use of Standardised Documentation	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0
1.3	Tempo of Information Sharing	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0	
1.4	Provision of Personnel (LALO)	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	3	0	3	
1.5	Provision of Personnel (LLACC)	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	
1.6	Debrief Reports	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	2	0	2	
1.7	Provision of Personnel (LLAG)	n/a	g	n/a	g	g	g	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	n/a	g	g	a	g	g	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	n/a	g	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	1	0	1		
1.8	LLAG Procedures	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	
1.9	LLACC Staffing	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	
1.10	Communications (Mass messaging)	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0	
1.11	Communications Means	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0
1.12	Communications Means Hierarchy	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	1	0	1	
1.13	Communications provision at SCC	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	
1.14a	Training Provided by LFBEP	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	
1.14b	Training Provided by Boroughs	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	6	0	6	

Ref	LFB EP	Central					NC				NE				SE				SW				West					Total amber	Total red	Sum (a + r)													
		City of London	Kensington & Chelsea	Lambeth	Southwark	Tower Hamlets	City of Westminster	Barnet	Camden	Enfield	Hackney	Haringey	Islington	Barking & Dagenham	Havering	Newham	Redbridge	Waltham Forest	Bexley	Bromley	Croydon	Greenwich	Lewisham	Kingston	Merton	Richmond	Sutton				Wandsworth	Brent	Ealing	Hammersmith & Fulham	Harrow	Hillingdon	Hounslow						
1.15a	Pan-London Exercising	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0				
1.15b	Borough Level exercising	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	7	0	7			
1.16	Oversight by LAP	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0			
2.1	Generic Emergency Management Plan	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	2	0	2			
2.2	Business Continuity framework / Management system	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	9	1	10		
2.3	Recovery Management	g	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	7	0	7		
2.4	Humanitarian Assistance	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	13	0	13	
2.5	Shelter	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	1	0	1	
2.6	Evacuation	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	6	0	6
2.7	Identification of Vulnerable Persons	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	13	0	13	
2.8	Warning, Informing and alerting	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	4	0	4
2.9	Resilient Telecommunications	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	2	0	2	
2.10	Structural Collapse and Site Clearance	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	3	0	3
2.11	Chemical, Biological Radiological & Nuclear (Explosion)	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	8	0	8
2.12	Designated Disaster Mortuary	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	n/a	g	n/a	g	n/a	n/a	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a	n/a	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	g	1	0	1	

Ref	LFB EP	Central					NC				NE				SE				SW				West					Total amber	Total red	Sum (a + r)																																	
		City of London	Kensington & Chelsea	Lambeth	Southwark	Tower Hamlets	City of Westminster	Barnet	Camden	Enfield	Hackney	Haringey	Islington	Barking & Dagenham	Havering	Newham	Redbridge	Waltham Forest	Bexley	Bromley	Croydon	Greenwich	Lewisham	Kingston	Merton	Richmond	Sutton				Wandsworth	Brent	Ealing	Hammersmith & Fulham	Harrow	Hillingdon	Hounslow																										
2.13	National Emergency Mortuary Arrangements	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	a	a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	a	n/a	n/a	a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	4	0	4																							
2.14	Mass Fatalities Plan	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	11	0	11																			
2.15	Excess Deaths Plan	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	r	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	13	1	14																				
2.16	Flood Response Plan	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	2	0	2																
2.17	Pandemic Influenza Plan	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	7	0	7																
2.18	Contingency Plan for Outbreak of a notifiable animal disease	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	8	0	8														
2.19	Severe Weather	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	3	0	3														
2.20	Fuel Disruption	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	r	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	6	2	8													
2.21	Control Of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) - Top Tier	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	n/a	g	g	n/a	n/a	g	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0												
2.22	COMAH Lower-Tier	n/a	g	g	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	g	g	n/a	g	g	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	0	0	0											
2.23	Pipeline Safety Regulations	n/a	g	n/a	g	n/a	n/a	g	n/a	g	n/a	n/a	a	g	g	g	n/a	g	a	a	g	n/a	n/a	g	n/a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	3	0	3										
2.24	Radiation Emergency Preparedness and Public Information (REPPiR)	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	8	0	8									
2.25	Community Resilience for Emergencies	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	10	0	10								
2.26	Borough Risk Register	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	4	0	4					
2.27	Business Continuity Promotion Strategy	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	r	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	9	1	10

RAG Key

<p>GREEN (operational)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability or plan is documented (not necessarily a stand alone document/plan) and where required agreed by multi-agency partners; • Majority of key roles are trained and/or appropriate training programme is in place; and • Plan has been successfully exercised or utilised. <p>Note: An established capability that is undergoing systematic review should be assessed as green provided it meets the above criteria.</p>
<p>AMBER (operational but requires development)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An operational capability is in place but requires development (outside of systematic review), e.g; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requires formal documentation and / or agreement; ○ Requires development of training programme / some key personnel have not been trained in their role and there is no programme in place to do so; ○ Requires exercising / validating.
<p>RED (not operational)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is deemed that there is no operational capability or plan in place, e.g; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are significant gaps in identification of personnel to undertake specific roles; ○ There are significant gaps in provision of training / core required skills; ○ The capability has not been operated or validated / exercised.

Appendix 2 – Further Observations

The following capabilities have been identified for comment, however do not have a quarter (9 or more boroughs) reporting an Amber or Red rating.

Capability	Comment / Recommendation
1.14b & 1.15b Borough Level Training and Exercising	Several boroughs are concerned that training and exercising needs for borough staff exceed current capabilities. In addition it is felt that the general availability of staff for training and exercises has declined due to the increased outsourcing of council services. It is recommended that LAP considers the opportunity of greater collaboration between boroughs and LFB-EP, e.g. provision of off-the-shelf exercises by LFB EP.
2.26 Borough Risk Register	Several boroughs reported concerns regarding the current format of BRRs. In addition, boroughs mentioned a lack of input from partner agencies. It is recommended that LAP considers the efficacy of using a template risk register to be used by BRF.