

1. Introduction

This paper updates LAP on the status of Boroughs’ assessment following the first self assessment against MSL with the newly introduced assessment criteria. The results and identified trends are intended to allow practitioners to consider if any action is required to enhance London’s local authority resilience capability locally and to provide direction to those MSL that require a wider regional level of support to enhance to be approved by LAP.

2. Recommendations

- **LAP are requested to agree to continuation of the current 2015/17 Business Plan with these results informing the future detailed business plans in line with the adoption of the SLA.**
- **LAP are requested to agree to a review of the MSL to ensure that they meet the expectations from both Central Government and the LRF and provide appropriate direction to local authorities’ planning.**
- **LAP are requested to endorse that no evidence to validate results is requested this year but is done in future assessments now that expectations of evidence requirements are clear.**
- **LAP are requested to take this paper to CELC for wider discussion and to note the preparedness of individual boroughs.**

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. In 2013 the Minimum Standards were consolidated into a single set of standards. In order to further improve the MSL assessment process by making it more comparable, objective and accurate, new assessment criteria were developed and introduced in 2015; these were applied to a selected number of functional areas from MSL part 2.

Comparisons to previous assessments have been made within the results section of this paper, where possible. It should be noted that previous results cannot be used for an exact comparison due to the introduction of the new assessment criteria, however they provide a useful point of reference to chart the progress of the implementation of the Standards.

32 Boroughs participated in the Self Assessment.

4. The results of the MSL assessment

Assessment	Green	Amber	Red
MSL Self Assessment (Dec 2015)	81 %	17.5 %	1.5 %
MSL Peer review (Nov/ Dec 2014)	84 %	15 %	< 1 %

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. Conclusions

Overall, 12 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. A detailed overview of these trends can be found in Appendix 2.

There continues to be a gradual downward scoring of Green capabilities however this is not a dramatic decline and should be considered across an increasing expectation in some areas (e.g. a changed expectation in fuel disruption planning to now have in place Business Continuity arrangements for 10 days fuel within organisations rather than the plan in place to access fuel in a disruption from Government supported schemes to prioritise fuel to essential services).

There has also been an increased expectation in seven of the MSL assessed this year for boroughs to demonstrate the process behind the capability development. Whilst this shouldn't affect the overall capability assessment it has required a greater evidential requirement which is a new demand on boroughs to demonstrate.

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. This demonstrates appropriate prioritisation of planning and gives an assurance that the immediate response to an emergency is in place.

6. Recommendations

Individual recommendations for the MSL identified as a regional trend are outlined within appendix 2. It is proposed that the LAP business plan continues over its current two year lifespan, as it already includes those areas identified for further work, and that these results are included in the development of the new business plan. This would be done in line with the adoption of the Service Level Agreement and consideration given within that process to where the capability, or the support to develop it can be most efficiently and effectively derived on a borough or more regional basis.

There are, inevitably, changing expectations within some of the MSL, which in turn leads to a variance in interpretation of the requirement to meet a minimum collective requirement (e.g. Fuel planning or community resilience work). It is also applicable that some expectations within the MSL, whilst understandable, are unrealistic following detailed work to improve the capability (e.g. Identification of Vulnerable People or Resilient Communications). It is therefore timely whilst finalising the assessment methodology to redefine some of the MSL and bring them in line with current expectations of both Central Government and the LRF balanced against the reality of what can be achieved to add value to the resilience of London.

The enhanced assessment methodology requires further refinement following this pilot assessment. It is therefore reasonable this year not to request evidence of

boroughs to justify their scores but to build that as an expectation for all future assessments now that they are aware of the types of evidence they will be required to submit to validate individual ratings.

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	Kingston	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	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	1	0	1		
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	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	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	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0
1.6	Debrief Reports	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	
1.7	Provision of Personnel (LLAG)	n/a	G	n/a	A	G	G	n/a	G	G	G		G	G	G	G	G	n/a	G	G	G	G	n/a	G	G	G	G	G	n/a	G	n/a	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	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	0	0	0
1.10	Communications (Mass messaging)	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	G	G	1	0	1	
1.11	Communications Means	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	4	0	4	
1.12	Communications Means Hierarchy	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
1.13	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	0	0	0
1.14a		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	0	0	0
1.14b	Training Provided by Boroughs	n/a	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	A		G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	8	0	8

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
1.15a	Pan-London Exercising	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	3	0	3
1.15b	Borough Level exercising	n/a	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	4	0	4
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	0	0	0
2.1	Generic Emergency Management Plan	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	3	0	3
2.2	Business Continuity framework / Management system	G	G	A	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	R	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	6	1	7
2.3	Recovery Management	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	A	G	G	G	A	G	A	A	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	10	0	10
2.4	Humanitarian Assistance	G	G	A	A	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	R	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	A	10	1	11
2.5	Shelter	G	G	A	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	A	G	4	0	4
2.6	Evacuation	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	4	0	4
2.7	Identification of Vulnerable Persons	A	A	A	A	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	A	G	G	R	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	A	13	1	14
2.8	Warning, Informing and Alerting	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	R	G	G	G	R	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	5	2	7
2.9	Resilient Telecommunications	A	G	A	A	G	G	G	A	A	G	R	G	G	G	R	G	G	A	G	A	A	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	A	A	G	11	2	13
2.10	Structural Collapse and Site Clearance	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	5	0	5
2.11	Chemical, Biological Radiological & Nuclear (Explosion)	A	A	A	G	G	A	G	A	A	G	G	A	G	A	G	A	A	A	G	A	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	R	A	G	15	1	16
2.12	Designated Disaster Mortuary	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	A	n/a	A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	G	G	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	G	n/a	G	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	0	2

Ref	LFBEF	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	
1.1	Activation Time	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	1	0	1		
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	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	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	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0
1.6	Debrief Reports	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	
1.7	Provision of Personnel (LLAG)	n/a	G	n/a	A	G	G	n/a	G	G	G		G	G	G	G	n/a	G	G	G	G	n/a	G	G	G	G	G	n/a	G	n/a	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	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	0	0	0
1.10	Communications (Mass messaging)	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	G	G	1	0	1	
1.11	Communications Means	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	4	0	4	
1.12	Communications Means Hierarchy	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	
1.13	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	0	0	0
1.14a		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	0	0	0
1.14b	Training Provided by Boroughs	n/a	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	A	A		G	G	G	A	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	A	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	8	0	8	

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 – Trends

The table below gives an overview of the trends identified within the MSL Self Assessment 2015 results. The table includes useful background information and additional comments on the results:

Capability	No. of Ambers / Reds	Previously identified as trend	New / old assessment	LAP Business plan	Comments	Recommendations
2.3 Recovery Management	10 Amber	--	old	Key deliverable 2016 /2017: Review of the London Recovery Management Protocol	Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber, indicated that an update of the capability is required or currently on the way. This might be due to Exercise Preparer 2015, which focused on Recovery Management, and prompted London boroughs to evaluate their current capabilities in more detail revealing issues that might otherwise have remained undetected.	The Recovery Management Protocol is due for review in 2016 by LFB EP. There has also recently been a training guide and recommendations for local Recovery plan development. It is recommended that this be allowed to come to fruition within Boroughs before further work on this subject commissioned.
2.4 Humanitarian Assistance	10 Amber, 1 Red	2013, 2014	new	Key deliverable 2016 /2017: Review of the London Humanitarian Assistance Plan Agreed by LAP to be monitored over 2015 / 16	Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber, indicated that an update of the capability is required or currently on the way. A few London boroughs are still concerned regarding amount and training of staff available to provide psychosocial care at HAC.	Humanitarian Assistance is a key focus for EUR which should improve the understanding and training needs in more detail following the exercise. It is also an area with external training delivery provision to non Emergency Planning staff. The turnover of staff in service delivery departments and the expense of external training provision are limiting factors in the ability to implement this

				due to MSL results 2014		capability fully.
2.7 Identification of Vulnerable Persons	13 Amber, 1 Red	2014	new	Agreed by LAP to be monitored over 2015 / 16 due to MSL results 2014	<p>Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber or red, indicated that they are still developing this capability both within the borough and in a multi-agency environment following the publication of the pan London guidance document in January 2015.</p> <p>Several boroughs are not satisfied with current capabilities to obtain appropriate data during an emergency and the cooperation with partner agencies.</p>	Multi agency London specific guidance was issued in late 2014 for adoption by boroughs. The common limiting factor to this capability is the reliance on partner agencies to supply vulnerable persons details. This is an area to re-look at the reality of the expectations placed upon local authorities and the operational need for a consolidated multi agency list of vulnerable persons in an incident.
2.9 Resilient Telecommunications	11 Amber, 2 Red	---	new	---	<p>London boroughs flagging this capability as amber or red, reported a variety of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability exists but is not documented • Capability not fully developed • No adequate governance process in place for the capability <p>It is likely that these issues have come to light now, as boroughs were required to complete the new detailed assessment in the latest self assessment.</p>	There is further work on the regional Resilient Telecoms plan expected this year. It should be noted that it has taken over 6 years to write and approve the regional plan and it provides no clear expectations of the local level. This requirement needs to be reassessed in line with the difficulties of the regional planning, the improved service provision of telecoms reliability and to clarify within the MSL what a borough is reasonably expected to provide.
2.11	15	---	old	---	London boroughs reporting this	The regional plan (following delay) has

CBRN(E)	Amber, 1 Red				<p>capability as amber or red, indicated that the capability within their borough is currently limited due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability not documented • Currently no training and exercising programme in place • Capability requires review 	<p>been published in late 2015. Time should be given for boroughs to implement the guidance and procedures of this regional plan at the local level before further work is commissioned,</p>
2.14 Mass Fatalities	12 Amber, 2 Red	2013, 2014	old	<p>Agreed by LAP to be monitored over 2015 / 16 due to MSL results 2014</p>	<p>London boroughs reporting this capability amber or red indicated that the capability was still being developed and therefore only limited at the moment.</p> <p>It can be assumed that the majority of issues still lie in the agreement of financial funding of costs incurred by a borough hosting a DDM or NEMA facility.</p> <p>A guidance paper regarding financial arrangements following a mass fatalities incident has been produced and shared with boroughs in April 2015.</p>	<p>The financial arrangements guidance note should be re issued to support the development of local financial agreements within coronial areas.</p> <p>The provision of mass fatalities arrangements within EUR will provide validation of the utility of this guidance and any existing arrangements in place.</p>
2.15 Excess Deaths	15 Amber	2013, 2014	new	<p>Agreed by LAP to be monitored over 2015 / 16 due to MSL results 2014</p>	<p>Following the recent review of the London framework and the subsequent SRRF Summer Workshop Programme 2015 for Excess Deaths, many boroughs are still in the development phase for this plan.</p>	<p>Work on Excess Deaths is ongoing following the publication of the Regional plan in early 2015. There is also work within West London boroughs to provide a model for mapping local death management resources for an excess deaths scenario. It is recommended that</p>

					A number of recommendations have been made at the SRRF Summer Workshop and it is expected to take some time for each borough to identify internal possibilities to extend local capabilities, e.g. storage, burial, etc.	this work is allowed to come to fruition.
2.18 Contingency plan for the outbreak of a notifiable animal disease	12 Amber, 2 Red	---	old	---	Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber or red, indicated that an update of the capability and / or training and exercising is required.	It is recommended that within the new LAP Business Plan that a training programme to improve awareness of the requirements of Notifiable animal disease planning and response for all boroughs. This could benefit from central provision to reduce duplication and provide better access to expert agencies and advice. This is also a relatively low risk to London.
2.20 Fuel Disruption	10 Amber, 2 Red	2013	old	Key deliverable 2015 /2016: Fuel planning review on behalf of the partnership	Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber or red, indicated that the capability is not fully developed at the moment, as boroughs are still waiting for the publication of new national guidance to support local planning.	Work is in train to revise the London Fuel protocol which will be led by local authorities (anticipated to be published in June 2016) and will include guidance for local planning. Local planning would not be expected until this work is complete.
2.23 REPIR	6 Amber, 3 Red	---	old	---	Most boroughs reporting this capability as amber or red, indicated that an update of the capability and / or training and exercising is required.	The requirement to provide central training and guidance can be taken forward by LFB EP as the agency responsible for REPIR planning. It was last exercised last an SRRF level in 2011 and therefore a further session can be organised for 2016.

2.25 Community Resilience for Emergencies	8 Amber, 1 Red	2013, 2014	old	Part of the Work Programme – ongoing in line with work at the regional level (without date)	<p>Several boroughs reported that they have currently no strategy in place or that the strategy is currently in development.</p> <p>As noted in previous assessments, 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>	This MSL should be reviewed as part of a wider expectation review of the MSL. It has continually been a problematic MSL to achieve. The new BC promotion format of a central repository of guidance and greater central engagement should be assessed to determine whether that model can be used for Community resilience also.
2.27 BC Promotion Strategy	9 Amber, 2 Red	2013, 2014	old	Key deliverable 2015 /2016: Business Continuity Promotion Guidance	Several boroughs reported that they have currently no strategy in place or that they have only a limited capability to support SMEs.	Work is ongoing as updated to LAP in Feb 2016 on a more centralised model to engage with the SE community and provide a legacy set of tools and ideas to support local engagement with SMEs.