

Witness Statement of: Gary Reason

No. of statement: 2

Exhibits: 24 to 75

Date of statement: 2 December 2019

GRENFELL TOWER PUBLIC INQUIRY

WITNESS STATEMENT OF GARY REASON

I, Gary Reason will say as follows:

1. I make this statement in response to the Grenfell Tower Inquiry's (the Inquiry) further request for evidence dated 7 October 2019.
2. I refer to my earlier statement dated 12 February 2019, which sets out my career at the London Fire Brigade (the Brigade) and my subsequent involvement following the Grenfell Tower fire.
3. In accordance with the further request I exhibit the following documents:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	Rule 9 question	GTI Reference
GR/24	Minutes of the Operational Directorates Coordination Board (ODCB) meeting dated 4 March 2013	Question 3	
GR/25	Lakanal House Inquest Coroner's Rule 43 Letters- Action Plan Monitoring Report dated August 2013	Question 4	
GR/26	Minutes of the ODCB meeting	Question 5	

	dated 3 June 2013		
GR/27	Minutes of the ODCB meeting dated 4 July 2013	Question 5	
GR/28	Overview of the Operational Response- DAC Tim Cutbill	Question 6(a)(i)	
GR/29	Key Factors that influenced the Lakanal House fire development- Dave Crowder (BRE)	Question 6(a)(ii)	
GR/30	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda dated 24 July 2013	Question 6(b)	
GR/31	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda dated 28 August 2013	Question 6(b)	
GR/32	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda, dated 30 September 2013	Question 6(b)	
GR/33	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda, dated 14 November 2013	Question 6(b)	
GR/34	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda, dated 23 January 2014	Question 6(b)	
GR/35	Lakanal House Working Group Meeting Agenda dated 31 March 2014	Question 6(b)	
GR/36	High Rise Communications Plan November 2013 and March 2014	Question 6(b)	
GR/37	Incident Command Developments Briefing Note dated 17 January 2014	Question 6(b)	
GR/38	Lakanal House Working Group update report (draft) for Strategy Committee (March 2014)	Question 6(b)	

GR/39	Lifts provided for fire service use briefing note, November 2013	Question 6(c)	
GR/40	Composite action plan dated August 2013	Question 7(c)	
GR/41	Composite action plan dated September 2013	Question 7(c)	
GR/42	Composite action plan dated November 2013	Question 7(c)	
GR/43	Composite action plan dated March 2014	Question 7(c)	
GR/44	Minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting held on 11 July 2014	Question 8	
GR/45	Report to the Strategy Committee- Summary List of Actions Arising- FEP 2259	Question 8	
GR/46	End of Year Monitoring of Commitments in the London Safety Plan and Key Projects for 2013.14 (end March 2014)- FEP 2260	Question 8	
GR/47	Bids for DCLG Transformation Funding for 2015/16- FEP 2261	Question 8	
GR/48	Lakanal House Working Group- FEP 2262	Question 8	
GR/49	Hoarding: a Progress Update and view from the Borough Commanders- FEP 2263	Question 8	
GR/50	Alternative First Response to Automatic Fire Alarms- FEP 2264	Question 8	
GR/51	Structural Fire Safety in New and Refurbished Buildings, Report to the Strategy Committee, authored by Deputy Commissioner Rita	Question 8	

	Dexter, dated 11 July 2014- FEP 2265		
GR/52	Agenda and minutes of the Brigade's Corporate Management Board meeting on 17 October 2013	Question 9(a)	
GR/53	Agenda and minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting on Tuesday 12 November 2013	Question 9(b)	
GR/54	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 3 September 2012	Question 10	
GR/55	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 4 March 2013	Question 10	
GR/56	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 3 September 2013	Question 10	
GR/57	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 10 March 2014	Question 10	
GR/58	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 17 September 2014	Question 10	
GR/59	ODCB Incident Monitoring 6 Monthly Report, dated 8 September 2015	Question 10	
GR/60	Operational News 13 (August 2009)	Question 11	
GR/61	Operational News Special (January 2010)	Question 11	
GR/62	Dynamic and Intelligent Operational Training (DIOT)	Question 14(d)	

	Operational Procedures Update (4 March 2013)		
GR/63	Terms of Reference for the Corporate Management Board (CMB)	Question 15(a)	
GR/64	Notes of the CMB meeting held on 18 December 2013	Question 15(a) and 15(c)	
GR/65	Notes of the CMB meeting held on 18 February 2015	Question 15(a) and 15(e)	
GR/66	Agenda and minutes of the ODCB meeting held on 14 October 2013	Question 15(b)	
GR/67	Agenda and minutes of the ODCB meeting held on 17 September 2014	Question 15(d)	
GR/68	Agenda and minutes of the ODCB meeting held on 8 December 2014	Question 15(d)	
GR/69	Final version of exhibit GR/18	Question 16	
GR/70	Coroner's Inquests following the fire at Lakanal House on 3 July 2009 dated 20 June 2013 (FEP 2072)	Question 17(a)	
GR/71	Training Commissioning and Alteration Process (TCAP) Form 1- number 0153- Lakanal House Training Case Study	Question 17(a)	
GR/72	'Review of the Actions ordered after the Lakanal House Fire, 3 rd July 2009' - draft report with track changes.	Question 18(a)	
GR/73	Email from Gary Reason to Dany Cotton and David Lindridge-	Question 18(a)	

	Subject '2012-12-17 Report' dated 31 December 2012		
GR/74	Email from Gary Reason to Ron Dobson, Rita Dexter, Sue Budden, Dany Cotton and David Lindridge- Subject 'Lakanal House Action Plan Review' dated 4 January 2013	Question 18 (b)	
GR/75	Agenda and minutes of the Lakanal House Board meeting dated September 2013	Question 18(d)	

4. As set out in my statement dated 12 February 2019, I retired from the Brigade in January 2015. In the days following the Grenfell Tower fire in June 2017 I was contacted by the London Fire Commissioner and asked to assist the Brigade with establishing an investigation team (GTIRT) to undertake the Brigade's internal Safety and Learning Review and to support the Metropolitan Police Service's criminal investigations. I then left the Brigade on 31 July 2019 when my contract came to an end.
5. My statement provides my responses to the further information sought by the inquiry. The responses provided are to those questions raised within my knowledge and scope of responsibility. However, a number of the questions raised are outside of my direct knowledge and I have clearly indicated in this statement where I am unable to provide the Inquiry with any further assistance. For ease of reference I have set out below each question raised in the Inquiry's further request for evidence and my response.

1. In paragraphs 3 to 5, you state that you were the Head of the Training and Development Department from February 2008 to April 2010. Please set out what, if any, involvement you had with the action points regarding training as identified by the LFB before the Lakanal House Inquest ("pre-inquest actions") as set out in the Lakanal Assurance Report ("the Assurance Report"). In particular, please set out the

detail of your involvement (if any) regarding the formulation and implementation of action points 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25 and 33 of the Assurance Report.

6. During my tenure as the Head of the Brigade's Training and Development (HoTD) department between February 2008 and April 2011, I had no involvement in the implementation of the action points 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25 and 33 as detailed in the Lakanal Assurance Report dated 2018. The actions specifically detailing training interventions (action points 8, 11, 12, 16 and 17) all involved Brigade Control and, as I stated in paragraph 4 of my witness statement dated 12 February 2019, as the HoTD department I had no responsibility for the design, delivery or evaluation of Brigade Control training activities. Brigade Control had its own training department directly managed by the Senior Management Team within Brigade Control.

2. In paragraph 4, you describe the "Future Options for Training" project. Please provide the documents which set out the terms of reference, the individuals and/or committees and/or boards involved in the project and the conclusions of the project.

7. I did not have any direct involvement in the "Future Options for Training" (FoFT) project. As set out within my statement dated 12 February 2019 at paragraph 4, the FoFT project was a corporate project. Peter Groves (The Brigade's current Assistant Director, Training and Professional Development) was the Project Manager for this initiative. I understand that Peter Groves will set out the detail of the FoFT project in a statement to be provided to the Inquiry.

3. In paragraph 5, you state that at the meeting of the Lakanal Board on 3 February 2012 that there was one action marked as 'still in progress' which was allocated to the Head of Operational Procedure, a department within your Directorate. Please provide the following detail:

- a. Was this action point 25?*
- b. On the assumption that it was action point 25, please set out what actions you took to ensure that that action point was completed. This should include detail on, but not limited to, the development and introduction of PN 803 and the introduction, development and evaluation of the mandatory training requirement*

*for watch-based staff to complete training on the search and rescue procedure.
[See the Lakanal Assurance report at p.18]*

8. I believe that the relevant paragraph of my statement dated 12 February 2019 is paragraph 16 rather than paragraph 5 as detailed in the request for further evidence. The one action I refer to as marked as 'still in progress' was action point 25.
9. Action point 25 relates to the development and publication of Policy Note 803 (PN 803) covering search and rescue operations. I had no involvement in the development of this policy and by the time I took up the role of Director of Operational Resilience and Training (DoRT) in January 2012, the policy had already been finalised and was going through the final 'sign off' process of Staff Side (Fire Brigade Union) consultation. This was done through the Brigade Joint Council for Health and Safety at Work (BJCHSW) meetings. PN 803 was published on 27 July 2012. During the period of Staff Side consultation my recollection is that I received updates from the Head of Operational Policy (HoOP) on this issue as part of regular progress reporting for all operational policies that were under development. These updates would have been discussed at my monthly one-to-one meetings with the HoOP as the three-yearly policy review requirement was a corporate target at that time. These one-to-one meetings did not include a detailed review of the content of the policy notes. In addition to this, as this particular action point formed part of the Lakanal House Action Plan, updates on the plan's progress were routinely reviewed at the Lakanal House Board meetings.
10. At the time of the publication of PN 803 there was no mandatory training support package produced. However, as you will see from my statement dated 12 February 2012 on page 14, the theme of 'search and rescue' was included in the October 2013 Operational News publication. A mandatory training support package was produced for this topic as part of October 2013 Operational News. As can be seen from the minutes of the ODCB meeting held on 4 March 2013 this topic was revisited as a result of the issues that had emerged from the Lakanal House Inquest and the tragic events of the Shirley Tower (Hampshire) high-rise fire where two firefighters lost their lives. I set out further detail about the Operational News publications in my response to

question 11 below. I produce the minutes of the ODCB meeting of 4 March 2013 as exhibit (GR/24:).

4. In paragraph 20, you state that you produced an action plan that addressed the Coroner's Rule 43 recommendations and sub-tasks were developed. You further state that in developing sub-tasks, officers were directed to ensure that all outcomes were "measurable and where applicable sustainable"

- a. Please set out which officers you directed to complete each action point sub-task.*
- b. Please confirm who directed officers to ensure that the outcomes were measurable and where applicable sustainable.*
- c. If known to you, please set out which outcomes were intended to be sustainable and please elaborate on what was intended and what direction was given to officers.*

11. The Action Plan exhibited at (GR/25:) details which officers were directed to complete each action point sub-task.
12. As part of the inaugural meeting with all officers detailed in paragraph 19 of my statement dated 12 February 2019, I reminded everyone of the importance of developing responses to each action item so that they were measurable and where appropriate sustainable, i.e. where the solution(s) was not a 'one off' activity, it should be embedded into core business, such as those involving changes to existing training interventions. I did not go through each individual action point and sub task to provide specific direction to each officer as this was not required. At this time the Brigade had a very comprehensive suite of performance measures and these were routinely and robustly scrutinised by various Boards and Fire Authority's Elected Members at both the Authority meetings and the range of Committee meetings held monthly. As such, I was aware that all those involved in developing the Rule 43 responses were familiar and experienced in developing action plans and fully understood my point about the actions needing to be measurable and where applicable, sustainable. To avoid the risk of confusion my use of the term 'sustainable' in the context to the Rule 43 action plan was in relation to the solutions that were likely to be built into business-as-usual working practices, such as those relating to training.

13. In respect of question 4c I did not personally direct or influence the lead officers which of the proposed solutions should be sustainable.

5. In respect of paragraph 21, when was the action plan reviewed by members of the CMT and when was it agreed that the AC Dany Cotton (as she then was) should be given responsibility for overseeing and updating the action plan?

14. I don't recall the exact date of the Commissioner's Group meeting where the rule 43 action plan was reviewed as these meetings were not minuted. However, given that the original Rule 43 letter from the Coroner was dated 28 March 2013 and the Commissioner's (Ron Dobson) response to the Coroner was dated 23 May 2013, the work to develop the action plan and the meeting of the Commissioner's Group where the action plan was agreed would have been in late April or early May 2013. At this Commissioner's Group meeting I recall that there was also a discussion about which Board should review the progress of the Rule 43 action plan and it was agreed it would be at the ODCB meetings and that Assistant Commissioner (AC) Dany Cotton would be given this responsibility. AC Cotton was formally given the responsibility for overseeing and updating the Rule 43 action plan at the ODCB meeting held on 3 June 2013 where the Deputy Commissioner (Rita Dexter) asked AC Cotton to combine the action plans from both the Lakanal House and Shirley Tower Rule 43 letters and bring these back as regular updates to subsequent ODCB meetings. I produce the minutes of this ODCB meeting as exhibit (GR/26:). In addition to this at the ODCB meeting held on 4 July 2013, which I chaired, I gave further direction to AC Cotton in respect to the information that needed to be included in her Rule 43 action plan updates. I produce the minutes of the ODCB meeting held on 4 July 2013 as exhibit (GR/27:).

6. In respect of paragraph 29 and exhibit GR/3, please provide copies of:

- a. The following presentations, which should be provided in original format with speakers' notes, where such notes have been created:*
 - i. Overview of the Operational Response;*
 - ii. Key Factors that Influenced the Lakanal House fire development; and*
 - iii. Regulatory Reform Order and Fire Safety in High Rise Premises;*

- b. *Except for those already exhibited to your first witness statement, all of the documents set out under the heading “documentation/reports”;*
- c. *The following briefing notes:*
- i. *Lifts provided for fire service use (November 2013 meeting)*
 - ii. *Fire Services Management Committee Brief (December 2013 meeting);*
and
 - iii. *Premises Information Plate pilot (March 2014 meeting)*

15. The requested information is exhibited as follows:

Question Number	Title	Exhibit
6(a)(i)	Overview of the Operational Response- DAC Tim Cutbill	(GR/28:)
6(a)(ii)	Key Factors that influenced the Lakanal House fire development	(GR/29:)
6(a)(iii)	Regulatory Reform Order and Fire Safety in High Rise Premises	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Steve Turek dated 24 January 2019 as exhibit SPT/2
6(b)	Regular updates relating to the progress of the Coroner’s Rule 43 Recommendations- standing agenda item- I have produced the relevant Lakanal House Working Group meeting agendas and minutes	(GR/30:) (GR/31:) (GR/32:) (GR/33:) (GR/34:) (GR/35:)
6(b)	Overview of Fire Safety	This is the same document

	Regulatory Reform Order	as 6(a)(iii) above
6(b)	Letter sent to Brandon Lewis MP dated 26 September 2013 (and covering letter from Chairman to the LFEPA)	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Ron Dobson dated 28 January 2019 as exhibit RJD/11
6(b)	Protection of fire safety features in major refurbishment programmes – Audit proposal	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Rita Dexter dated 8 February 2019 as exhibit RMD/3
6(b)	High Rise Communication Plan	(GR/36:)
6(b)	Incident Command Developments	(GR/37:)
6(b)	Protection of fire safety features in major refurbishment programmes- Update Report	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Rita Dexter dated 8 February 2019 as exhibit RMD/4
6(b)	Borough Commanders' awareness of significant refurbishment projects in high rise residential premises- Update report	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Rita Dexter dated 8 February 2019 as exhibit RMD/4
6(b)	Better use of intelligence from fire safety work	I am advised that this has been produced in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Steve Turek

		dated 24 January 2019 as exhibit SPT/12
6(b)	LHWG update report (draft) for Strategy Committee	(GR/38:)
6(c)(i)	Lifts provided for fire service use	(GR/39:)
6(c)(ii)	Fire Services Management Committee Brief	I have requested this document from the Brigade, at the time of submitting my statement I have not yet obtained this.
6(c)(iii)	Premises Information Plate pilot	This is exhibited to my statement dated 12 February 2019 as exhibit GR/19

16. It should be noted that apart from the reports and briefing notes that I authored, as detailed and exhibited in my statement dated 12 February 2019 (at paragraph 32), I was not involved in the production of the remaining materials provided in response to question 6(a), (b) or (c).

7. In respect of paragraph 31:

- a. Please confirm the author of the composite action plan;*
- b. Please explain the issues that were being progressed by the Authority's Strategy Committee and how this influenced your work. Please provide documents evidencing the same; and*
- c. Please exhibit all of the composite action plans that were presented to the Lakanal House Working Group.*

17. I was the author of the composite action plan that was presented at each of the Lakanal House Working Group (LHWG) meetings. I produced the action plan using the Rule 43 related updates that were provided by AC Cotton to the ODCB meetings along with the updates I received from the other lead officers, who are named in the action plan

and who had specific responsibility for the actions that were specifically generated by the LHWG.

18. The issues that the LHWG directed to the Authority's Strategy Committee are set out in the LHWG Monitoring report dated January 2013, under the heading 'related issues being progressed by the Strategy Committee'. None of these four actions impacted and/or influenced my work as they did not sit within the responsibility of my Directorate. All four actions were progressed through the Deputy Commissioner's Directorate. I understand that former Deputy Commissioner Rita Dexter has provided a statement to the Inquiry, which deals with an overview of the work of the Strategy Committee.
19. The composite action plans are exhibited as (GR/40:); (GR/41:); (GR/42); (GR/43).

8. In respect of paragraph 33, please provide the minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting held on 11 July 2014 and all other documents considered by the Authority at this meeting.

20. I produce the minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting held on 11 July 2014 as Exhibit (GR/44:). I produce all other documents considered by the Authority at this meeting as exhibits (GR/45); (GR/46); (GR/47); (GR/48); (GR/49); (GR/50); (GR/51)

9. In respect of paragraph 34, please provide:

- a. The agenda and minutes of the Brigade's Corporate Management Board meeting on 17 October 2013; and*
- b. The agenda and minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting on 12 November 2013.*

21. I exhibit the agenda and minutes of the Brigade's Corporate Management Board meeting on 17 October 2013 as exhibit (GR/52). I exhibit the agenda and

minutes of the Authority's Strategy Committee meeting on 12 November 2013 as exhibit (GR/53).

10. In respect of paragraph 39, please provide all of the reports presented at the six-monthly meetings of the ODCB between 2009 and June 2017.

22. I produce at exhibits (GR/54:); (GR/55:); (GR/56:); (GR/57:); (GR/58:) and (GR/59:) the reports presented at the six-monthly meetings of the ODCB.

11. In respect of paragraph 41 and the Operational News publications, please explain:

- a. Who drafted the publications;*
- b. How these were disseminated to operational staff;*
- c. How did the LFB check and/or ensure that the publications were read, understood and implemented by staff;*
- d. Once the Operational News publications were disseminated, did the LFB make these publications available to new or returning staff? If so, how?*
- e. Once the Operational News publications were disseminated, were operational staff required to re-read the publications to refresh their knowledge?*

23. The Operational News publications were initially drafted by the department within which the policy lead for the article sat. In the majority of cases this was the Operational Policy (OP) department, who are responsible for most of the Brigade's operational policies. However, the Operational Assurance department had responsibility for overseeing the development of the final content and for ensuring that there was consistency in the style and presentation of the Operational News publications. The Brigade's Communications department had responsibility for formatting the Operational News in terms of layout and embedding images etc. The Communications department was also responsible for publishing Operational News along with the associated messaging as described in paragraph 24 below.

24. Operational News was published electronically on the Brigade's intranet system 'Hotwire'. Hard copies of Operational News were also sent to all fire stations and all

Brigade premises where uniformed operational officers worked. To coincide with its publication, the Communications department issued the following communications:

- i. An email message was sent to all staff advising of the Operational News publication;
 - ii. A message was posted on the 'Hotwire' home page (this was the page that automatically opened when staff logged onto a Brigade computer);
 - iii. An article would be included in the 'Manager's Update' publication. 'Manager's Update' is a pdf monthly e-newsletter for managers, drafted, formatted and distributed by the Brigade's Internal Communications Manager. Its aim is for managers to share information with each other about projects, changes in policies, big picture topics as well as giving managers a heads-up to internal communications coming out for all staff. It is emailed to all leading firefighters and above, Fire Rescue Service (FRS), and Assistant Operations Managers in Brigade Control.
25. In addition to the above lines of communication, if an Operational News article included a mandatory station training support package, an automated entry was created in the station diary work queue. The station diary was a software application provided to enable effective management and recording of the activities of station based staff. Once the automatic entry was added to station diary work queue it was then the responsibility of the Watch Managers at fire stations to programme this training as part of the watch based training plan.
26. On the back page of every Operational News publication a table was included detailing all the supporting information available for each article. This table included guidance on whether the article had a specific training support package and how to access it. The training associated with each article was colour coded as follows:
- Red- representing articles that had mandatory training for all watches;
 - Amber- representing articles that had training which was mandatory for all watches to which the training was relevant;
 - Green- representing articles that had training, which was optional and which could be included in the watch training programme at the discretion of the Watch Manager, based upon identified watch training needs.

27. Mandatory training was expected to be completed within 3 months of the Operational News publication. Watches were required to programme the training in the Brigade's Station, Training, Evaluation and Performance (STEP) application. Once the training was successfully completed, STEP automatically populated the Individual Training Record (ITR) of each firefighter and officer (who was on duty and had completed the training) to detail that they had completed the mandatory training support package.
28. The table on the last page of Operational News also detailed where there was a Senior Officer Computer Based Training (CBT) module available. Senior officers were expected to successfully complete these CBT packages within three months of the publication of Operational News. Similar to the watch based mandatory training support packages, once the senior officer had successfully completed the training and passed the knowledge assessments (usually contained within the CBT packages), this was automatically recorded on the officer's Individual Training Record (ITR).
29. Once Operational News publications were created and launched they remained on the Brigade's 'Big Learning' portal (formerly known as the 'Knowledge Centre') so that they could be accessed by all firefighters and officers at any time. The 'Big Learning' portal also contained all the training support packages, CBT modules, associated policy notes and other relevant bibliographies. This information was also available to all staff.
30. It was the responsibility of the Watch Manager at a fire station to assess the training needs of their respective staff. They were also responsible for establishing the training programme for their Watch. The Station Managers, Borough Commanders and Area Deputy Assistance Commissioners (DACs) also had responsibilities for overseeing the training that was being undertaken by their watches and staff as part of the suite of Service Standards used by the Brigade at this time. In addition to the local management of training, ODCB could revisit issues/themes for a number of reasons, such as, where a six-monthly 'Incident Monitoring' report indicated that the intended service improvement had not been fully resolved by the publication of the Operational News article and/or the associated mandatory training support package or CBT module, or a significant policy development was about to be initiated. In these situations the ODCB could instruct that same theme(s) be revisited in future Operational News publications.

This could include directing watch based and/or senior officers to redo an existing or revised training package(s). For example, since the inaugural Operational News publication was launched in August 2006 high-rise incident related topics have featured in the following publications, primarily as a result of policy and equipment developments:

- i. Ops News 5 - August 2007
- ii. Ops News 10 - November 2008
- iii. Ops News 20 - November 2011
- iv. Ops News 28 -December 2014
- v. Ops News 31 - July 2016
- vi. Ops News 34 - February 2018
- vii. Ops News 36 - February 2019
- viii. Ops News 37 – August 2019

31. In addition to the local management and assurance of training, from January 2008 the Brigade also ran a programme of Operational Professionalism Audits, which covered the following themes:

- i. Breathing apparatus
- ii. Firefighter emergency
- iii. Fire behaviour
- iv. Firefighting techniques
- v. Pumps and pumping
- vi. High rise procedure

32. More information on the Operational Professionalism Audits can be found in Operational News 13 (August 2009) (**GR/60**) and the Operational News Special (January 2010) (**GR/61**) publications.

12. In respect of paragraph 42, please provide a copy of the 'running log' that was maintained.

33. The 'running log' referred to in my statement dated 12 February 2019 was referring to the information detailed in one of the Appendices of the six-monthly ODCB 'Incident Monitoring' reports produced by the Operational Assurance department (see Appendix

1 of exhibit GR/59). In my statement dated 12 February 2019 I stated that the ‘running log’ contained issues that were not chosen for the next Operational News publication. This was incorrect and the ‘running log’ in fact detailed all the articles that had been covered in previous Operational News publications.

13. In respect of paragraph 43, please explain the process by which the ODCB would determine if new, additional or revised training or policy “inputs” were required.

34. The six-monthly ‘Incident Monitoring’ reports detailed the issues arising from analysis of all the data sources used in the production of the report. The list of data sources used in the production of this report is shown in Exhibit (GR/59) within the Summary on page 1.
35. The report made recommendations in relation to the articles to be considered for inclusion in Operational News publications and whether the article would benefit from the development of a station training support package and/or a senior officer CBT module. The Board members discussed these recommendations to determine which articles would be included in the Operational News publication. The Board also discussed and agreed which of the chosen articles would benefit from having an associated training support package and/or CBT module. Factors that influenced these decisions included consideration of the current policy provision for the theme, levels of risk as identified through safety reporting data, what existing training support materials and interventions were already available and the complexity and scope of what the article was aiming to address. This enabled the Board to assess whether a new or revised mandatory training support and/or senior officer CBT package would add value in improving operational performance. The Board were also mindful that the training generated through the Operational News publication needed to be completed within three months and was in addition to all of the core risk critical training that was already mandated through the Development and Maintenance of Operational Professionalism (DaMOP) policy. These factors, along with the recommendations from the report author, enabled the Board to focus on the articles/issues that would benefit most from having additional training materials.

36. The Board was also mindful that the investment in new training materials or solutions should be proportionate to the performance issue identified. This included understanding the resource commitments that would be placed on both the lead Brigade department and on Babcock in terms of producing the article and working to develop the associated training material.

14. In respect of the Operational News publications set out at paragraph 46:

a. Please confirm whether a training support package were produced for:

- i. Briefing and Debriefing of Breathing Apparatus Crews (January 2012);*
- ii. Provision of water supplies (July 2012);*
- iii. Fire Survival Guidance (FSG calls) (March 2013)*
- iv. Weight of Attack- Compartment Firefighting (January 2014);*
- v. Command Roles and Tabards (January 2014);*
- vi. Control Structures (June 2014);*
- vii. Fire Survival Guidance Calls (June 2014); and*
- viii. Ventilation Induced Fire Spread (December 2014).*

37. I understand that the Brigade has already disclosed all of the Operational News publications that were referenced in my statement dated 12 February 2019. My first statement clearly indicates which articles ODCB had instructed to have training support packages produced (please see paragraph 46). However, to assist the Inquiry, I can confirm the following:

- i. Briefing and Debriefing of Breathing Apparatus Crews - there was no training support package produced in connection with this article. However, three senior officer CBT packages were produced covering the topics; 'Firefighting Shafts'; 'Sandwich Panels' and 'On arrival, knowledge and tactics'. It should be noted that this training is an integral part of every acquisition and Maintenance of Skills (MoS) breathing apparatus training course and forms part of watch-based core skills continuation training.
- ii. Provision of water supplies- there was no training support package produced in connection with this article. Similar to i) above this topic forms an integral part of a trainee firefighter's development training programme and would be regularly reinforced and refreshed through watch-based core skills continuation training.

- iii. Fire Survival Guidance (FSG calls) (March 2013) - there was no training support package produced in connection with this article.
- iv. Weight of Attack - Compartment Firefighting - there was no training support package produced in connection with this article. Similar to i) and ii) above this topic forms an integral part of trainee firefighter's development training programme and would be regularly reinforced and refreshed through watch-based continuation training.
- v. Command Roles and Tabards - There was no training support package produced in connection with this article.
- vi. Control Structures - There was no training support package produced in connection with this article.
- vii. Fire Survival Guidance Calls (June 2014) - There was no training support package produced in connection with this article.
- viii. Ventilation Induced Fire Spread - There was no training support package produced in connection with this article.

b. In respect of paragraph (a), if no such training support package was produced, please explain why not.

- 38. Please see paragraphs 34 to 36 above, which set out the Board's considerations in relation to initiating new training solutions.

c. For all publications where a training support package was produced, please provide the name and details of the training support package, whether the package formed a part of mandatory training. Please also provide a copy of each training support package produced.

- 39. My understanding is that this question relates to those articles set out in question 14(a). As set out in my response to question 14(a) training support packages were not produced for those articles. Should the Inquiry require the training support packages for those articles set out in paragraph 46 of my statement dated 12 February 2019, where I have identified a training support package was produced, consideration will need to be given as to the most pragmatic way to provide these training packages as

they are located in the Babcock 'Big Learning' portal and can only be accessed and run within this application.

d. In respect of all of the Operational News publications identified in paragraph 46, please explain whether any new, additional or revised policy inputs were considered to be needed and why. If a new policy was created or an existing policy amended, please set out the details and exhibit documents evidencing the same. If no policy "inputs" arose, please explain why not in respect of each item.

40. The proposed topics in each Operational News publication would be reviewed by the Operational Policy department to ensure that the relevant existing operational procedures were sufficient, whether they needed to be improved or whether new procedures needed to be introduced. As part of the DIOT process, updates would be provided to the ODCB on the actions taken by the Operational Procedures department prior to the publication of each Operational News, for example I produce at exhibit (GR/62) the DIOT, Operational Procedures Update report presented to the ODCB on 4 March 2013. This exhibit correlates with the Operational News articles listed under the heading 'March 2013' on page 14 of my statement dated 12 February 2019. As can be seen from exhibit (GR/62) at section 3, the ODCB would undertake a comprehensive review of actions taken and future actions pertaining to policies, which were relevant to the articles being produced in Operational News publications. This would include:

- i. Whether a Generic Risk Assessments (GRA) relevant to the article theme existed;
- ii. Brigade policies relevant to the article theme and the details of those;
- iii. The reasoning behind the decision to develop or amend a new or existing policy, or the reasoning behind any decision not to develop or amend any existing policy. Where a decision was taken to develop a new policy, details of what would be included in policy;
- iv. The status of any agreed training packages, including extant training and that under formulation by Babcock. The detail of the content of the agreed training packages is reviewed, including a focus on firefighting development training, Computer Based Training and other training methods;

- v. Supplementary actions, including additional communication opportunities, training interventions and audit options, for example recommendations that incidents be monitored by the Monitoring Officer and the Operational Review Team and that trends identified be analysed through the IMP database;
 - vi. A review of future actions including looking at the dates of review for relevant policies as well as any other actions deemed necessary, for example, including the topic as an agenda item on Borough Commander communications day.
41. I have requested the DIOT reports for the period January 2012 to January 2015 from the Brigade, however at the time of submitting this statement I have not obtained all of these.

15. In respect of paragraph 47, you state that the reports on Operational Risk Assessment Policy (ORA) and the High Rise Pre-Determined Attendance were agreed by the ODCB and placed on the agenda for consideration by the Corporate Management Board (CMB) to be considered at meetings in December 2013 and early 2015 respectively. Regarding such:

a. Please explain who sat on the Corporate Management Board, it's role and remit, and the purpose of putting these reports to the CMB;

42. I produce at exhibit (**GR/63**) the Terms of Reference of the Corporate Management Board (CMB) which sets out its role and remit. I produce at exhibit (**GR/64**) the notes of the CMB meeting held on 18 December 2013 which confirm who sat on the Board that considered the ORA Policy. I produce at exhibit (**GR/65**) the notes of the CMB meeting held on 18 February 2015 which confirm who sat on the Board that considered the 'Firefighting in High Rise Buildings' reports which are exhibited to my first statement as GR/20 and GR/21.
43. The purpose of the ORA policy was to bring the concept of Operational Discretion into the Brigade's existing Risk Assessment policy (PN 342 – 'Dynamic Risk Assessment' (DRA). It was following consultation with the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) where it had been agreed that as part of the update of the existing PN 342 the name of the policy should be changed from 'Dynamic' to 'Operational' Risk Assessment (i.e. from DRA to ORA). The draft ORA policy along with the associated proposed training

dependencies were first considered by the CMB in September 2013. The reason for taking this draft policy to CMB for a decision reflected the significant health and safety implications associated with empowering staff to move outside of standard operating procedures where this is necessary to achieve a key objective, such as saving life and where a risk/benefit assessment indicates that the additional risk being taken is reasonable in the circumstances. The consideration of DRA by CMB was also recognition of the considerable investment in the training dependencies that this new policy would require, noting that it was not standard practise for CMB to generally become directly involved in the promulgation of new or revised operational policy.

44. The purpose of bringing the new draft Policy Note 633 (High Rise Firefighting) to the attention of CMB was that one of the key effects of amending the policy, in line with, what was at the time, the newly revised Version 3 of GRA 3.2, was a proposed increase to the Brigade's Pre-Determined Attendance (PDA) to a fire in a high-rise building. I have been advised that a more detailed explanation covering the development of both PN 342 and PN 633 has been provided by Peter Cowup in a statement provided to the Inquiry.

b. In respect of the ORA, please confirm when it was considered by the ODCB and agreed and please provide the agenda and minutes of that ODCB meeting;

45. I can confirm that the ORA policy report was considered at the ODCB meeting held on 14 October 2013. The agenda and minutes for this ODCB are produced at exhibit (GR/66:).

c. Further in respect of the ORA, please confirm whether it was considered by the CMB in December 2013 and please provide the agenda and minutes of that meeting. If it was not considered at that meeting, please explain why and please provide information as to when it was considered, if at all. If it was not considered, please explain why.

46. The ORA policy report was presented to the December 2013 CMB meeting. The agenda and minutes for this meeting are produced at exhibit (GR/64).

d. In respect of the High Rise Pre-Determined Attendance report, please provide the agenda and minutes for the meetings of the ODCB in September and December 2014.

47. I produce the agenda and minutes of the meeting of the ODCB on 17 September 2014 at exhibit (GR/67:). I produce the agenda and minutes of the meeting of the ODCB on 8 December 2014 at exhibit (GR/68:).

e. Further in respect of the High Rise Pre-Determined Attendance Report, please explain whether it was considered by the CMB in early 2015 and if so when. Please provide the agenda and minutes of that meeting. If it was not considered at that meeting, please explain why and please provide information as to when it was considered, if at all. If it was not considered, please explain why.

48. I can confirm that the High Rise Pre-Determined Attendance Report was presented to the Corporate Management Board (CMB) meeting held on 18 February 2015. I produce the agenda and minutes of the meeting as exhibit (GR/65). Please note that I did not attend this CMB meeting as I retired on 2 January 2015.

f. In respect of both reports please explain whether any new policies were drafted or existing policies amended and whether any new training was produced or existing training revised as a result of the CMB's decision on each.

49. As detailed in paragraph 43 above, the ORA policy was an update to an existing policy note (PN 342) to include the concept of Operational Discretion. In respect of the High Rise PDA Report, the Inquiry will see that one of the recommendations the report author was seeking CMB's approval for was to submit the revised version of PN 633 ('High Rise Firefighting') to BJCHSW for formal consultation and agreement. Even though I had retired in January 2015 I believe that, subject to some minor revisions to the report, the CMB meeting held in February 2015 approved this recommendation and the updated PN 633 was published in June 2015.

16. Further in respect of paragraph 47, a draft version of GR/18 has been exhibited. Please provide the final version as the exhibit, if such document exists.

50. I produce a final version of GR/18 as exhibit (GR/69).

17. In respect of paragraphs 49 to 51, please explain and provide documents evidencing the same:

a. Which individual, committee, or board approved the creation of the Lakanal House Case Study training package;

51. The Lakanal House Case Study training package formed part of the Brigade's response to the Coroner's Rule 43 recommendations (Rule 43 Action Point 3). As detailed in my response to question 5 the Brigade's Rule 43 action plan was signed off by the Commissioners Group and then presented to the LFEPA 20 June 2013 meeting (GR/73:) (see Appendix 3). The commissioning officer for this case study was AC Cotton. The scope and full details covering this issue are included in the Lakanal House Case Study TCAP report. I produce at Exhibit (GR/71:) the TCAP Form dated June 2013 which is the formal commissioning document for the Lakanal House Case Study.

b. The subject matter that it was intended to cover;

52. The case study detailed all of the learning and issues that the Brigade had identified from its own internal investigations and review of the incident and those arising from the Lakanal House inquest.

c. Who in the LFB and in Babcock worked on the training package;

53. DAC Cutbill was the Brigade lead on developing the content of the Lakanal House Case Study as he had detailed knowledge of the incident. Tim Cutbill had led the Brigade team that reviewed all aspects of the Lakanal House incident. I believe that Cara Kelly was the Babcock lead for producing the Case Study.

d. The feedback that was received from the test group and what changes were incorporated into the final training package.

54. I believe that a stakeholder pilot session was run on 9 May 2014. This was delivered by Cara Kelly from Babcock to the TCAP stakeholder group and all of the Brigade staff who were videoed for the Case Study content. I believe a number of very minor revisions were made following feedback from this group, but as I did not attend this pilot session, I do not have the relevant information or a definitive list of who attended the session from Babcock or the Brigade.
55. In addition to the above, over a two week period, between 20-30 May 2014, the Watch Managers who were filmed and appeared in the Case Study delivered the case study package to their respective Watches. I am not aware that any further revisions to the Case Study were made as a result of these sessions. However, I believe that prior to its' release Tim Cutbill also delivered the Case Study package to the Senior Management Team, which included the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Directors. I would have been in attendance for this presentation, but cannot recall the exact date.

e. Which individual, committee, or board approved the final version of the training package;

56. As can be seen from the TCAP Form at Exhibit (GR/71) AC Tim Cutbill, DAC Fenton and Peter Groves signed the 'Final sign off' section of the Form.

f. How was the training package delivered to operational staff;

57. For station based staff the Case Study was delivered by the Watch Manager who was provided with a separate support guide detailing how the Case Study material should be delivered and used. The Case Study and the Watch Manager guide have already been disclosed to the GTI.
58. For senior officers a number of presentation training sessions were scheduled through Babcock and DAC Tim Cutbill assisted by DAC Graham Ellis delivered the version of the Case Study designed for this audience.

g. Whether the training package delivered to Control room staff

59. I am unable to answer this question. I was not responsible for the training of Control room staff.

h. Whether there was any process implemented to ensure that operational staff had undertaken the training;

60. To ensure all fire station based staff completed the Case Study the same assurance system, as detailed for the Operational News publication, was employed.

i. Whether the training was evaluated and if so, when;

61. Beyond the business as usual training processes that I have detailed in paragraph 30 and 31 I don't recall this case study training package being specifically evaluated prior to my retirement in January 2015. However, any under performance in relation to high rise incidents and training involving high rise scenarios would have been picked up in the six-monthly ODCB reports produced by the Operational Assurance department. High rise incidents and high rise related training scenarios were not uncommon so any underperformance would have been picked up through the ODCB monitoring process.

j. How often it was intended to be carried out by operational staff;

62. As with all the Brigade's training support materials the Lakanal House Case Study remained available on the 'Big Learning' training portal. As this Case Study was first delivered during 2014 and I retired from the Brigade in January 2015 it was the Brigade's focus during my last year of service to ensure that all staff received the Case Study training input. I am not aware if operational staff were required to re-visit this case study following my retirement.

18. In respect of paragraphs 55 to 58, please provide the following information:

a. Please explain why you were tasked to review the first draft of the Lakanal House Action Plan Review Report ("the Report");

63. At paragraph 55 of my statement dated 12 February 2019 I stated that I remember reviewing the first draft of Group Manager (GM) Lindridge's report, entitled the

‘Review of the Lakanal Action Plan’ around the end of 2012. I wasn’t ‘tasked’ to review the report, I was sent a draft copy of the report by GM Lindridge at the end of 2012. I recall only making some minor grammatical and presentational revisions to the draft report before sending it back to AC Cotton and GM Lindridge to be finalised. I produce at exhibit (GR/72:) the version of the report on which I provided those minor revisions. I produce at exhibit (GR/73:) an email to GM Lindridge and AC Cotton dated 31 December 2012 which had the file attached detailing my comments and track changes.

b. Please provide a copy of the first draft report of the Report and the email forwarding the completed report to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Director of Contractual Services on 4 January 2013;

64. The first draft of the report has been exhibited in my response to question 18(a) (please see paragraph 63 above). However, the final draft of the Review Report (dated 4 January 2013) that I emailed to Ron Dobson, Rita Dexter and Sue Budden is the version exhibited to my statement dated 12 February 2019 at exhibit (GR/22). I have also attached to this statement as exhibit (GR/74:), a copy of the email forwarding the completed report to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Director of Contractual Services, dated 4 January 2013.

c. To your knowledge, did the Commissioner’s Group consider the Report before the Report was updated in November 2014. If yes, please provide further details and documents evidencing the same;

65. I don’t recall if the Review Report was presented to or considered by the Commissioner’s Group prior to the Commissioner asking me to arrange for the 4 January 2013 version of the report to be updated. However, I note that after December 2012 the review report was not detailed in the minutes of the Lakanal House Board meetings, which would indicate that it had already been considered at a different Board or meeting, most likely to be the Commissioner’s Group. Although I have not been provided with any documentation to confirm where the Review report was considered I can confirm that it would be very unusual and untypical for the Brigade not to have considered and signed off this type report during this period, especially given the

scrutiny that senior officers and the Fire Authority Members undertook in relation to the lessons identified from the Lakanal House fire.

d. Please provide the agenda and minutes of the meeting of the September 2013 Lakanal House Board;

66. I produce the agenda and minutes of the meeting of the September 2013 Lakanal House Board as exhibit (GR/75:).

e. Please provide any further details you can remember in respect of the discussion of the Report at the Commissioner's Group meeting held at the end of 2013;

67. I cannot recall the specific date of the Commissioner's meeting where the updated 'Review of the Lakanal House Action Plan' report was discussed. However, it is possible that I may not have attended the meeting when it was presented and discussed.

f. When the report was signed off;

68. I am unable to recall when the report was signed off. I have requested further documentation in relation to this topic from the Brigade, but I have not obtained this at the time of submitting my statement.

g. Whether any further action was taken in respect of the Report after the Commissioner's Group meeting held at the end of 2013.

69. I am unable to recall what further action was taken in respect of the Report after the Commissioner's Group meeting held at the end of 2013, as indicated in my statement dated 12 February 2019, the Commissioner's Group meeting was un-minuted. I have requested further documentation from the LFB in relation to this topic but have not obtained this at the time of submitting my statement.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I confirm that I am willing for the statement to form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website, save for redactions indicated in the text and those applied by the Inquiry.

Signed:



Print Name: Gary Reason

Dated: 2 December 2019