

Witness Statement of: Peter Groves

No. of statement: 2

Exhibits: 8 to 112

Date of statement: 5 March 2020

GRENFELL TOWER PUBLIC INQUIRY

WITNESS STATEMENT OF PETER GROVES

I, Peter Groves will say as follows:

1. This is my second statement to the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry ("the Inquiry"). I make this statement in response to the Inquiry's request for evidence dated 7 October 2019.
2. I refer to my first statement dated 18 April 2019 which sets out my career at the London Fire Brigade ("The Brigade").
3. In accordance with the Inquiry's request I exhibit the following documents:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	Rule 9 Question	GTI Reference
PG/8	Record of Peter Groves' objectives from 2016/17 period	1	
PG/9	TCAP number 0153 'Lakanal Training Case Study'	4/5	

PG/10	TCAP number 0124 <i>'Enhanced Incident Command Training based on Lakanal Inquests Rule 43 recommendations'</i>	4/5	
PG/11	ADDIE Instructional Design Process	6	
PG/12	Report submitted to the Corporate Management Board and the Resources Committee by the Head of Human Resources and Development, James Dalgliesh on 1 August 2012 and 17 September 2012, <i>'Training Contract-Babcock's performance'</i>	8	
PG/13	Report presented to CMB by the Head of Human Resources and Development on 5 September 2010 <i>'Proposed Training Delivery Plan 2013/14'</i>	8	
PG/14	Diagram outlining the IPCR Process	8	
PG/15	Details of recommendations made	8	
PG/16	Report on IEC and First Aid dated July 2014	8	
PG/17	Report on FFD Programme dated November 2013	8	
PG/18	Report on Transport Training dated July 2013	8	
PG/19	Report on Incident Management dated July 2013	8	

PG/20	Report on IT Training dated July 2014	8	
PG/21	Report on Management Development dated July 2014	8	
PG/22	Report on Project Management dated July 2014	8	
PG/23	Report on Personal Skills dated November 2014	8	
PG/24	Report on Urban Search and Rescue dated March 2014	8	
PG/25	Report on Breathing Apparatus dated July 2013	8	
PG/26	Report on Technical Rescue dated November 2014	8	
PG/27	Report on Specialist Skills dated July 2014	8	
PG/28	Report on Equality & Diversity dated November 2014	8	
PG/29	Report on Fire Safety dated October 2014	8	
PG/30	Table of changes to courses	8	
PG/31	TCAP number 0023 ' <i>Timber Framed Buildings</i> '	10d	
PG/32	TCAP number 0212 ' <i>Ops News 30 – Highly Insulated Buildings</i> '	10d	
PG/33	TCAP number 0055b ' <i>Ops News 24, Fire Survival Guidance Policy</i> '	10f	
PG/34	TCAP number 0055e ' <i>Ops News 24, 7(2)(d) visits (changes to existing training)</i> '	10h	

PG/35	TCAP number 0124 <i>'Enhanced Incident Command Training based on Lakanal Inquests Rule 43 recommendations'</i>	10i	
PG/36	Document produced by Babcock Training Limited entitled <i>'Training design Organisational Structures from 2012 to 2017'</i>	12	
PG/37	USB containing spreadsheet showing the gap analysis completed by Babcock Training Limited which identifies all courses against all NOG learning outcomes	15	
PG/38	A list of all TCAPs progressed since 2012 to date	16	
PG/39	List of Brigade personnel we wanted to participate in the pilot process	17b	
PG/40	Email entitled <i>'Lakanal post Pilot changes.docx'</i> and the associated attachment	17b	
PG/41	Feedback received on pilot of TCAP 124	17b	
PG/42	Spreadsheet setting out the costs and approvals for all TCAPs	18	
PG/43	Course guide as it existed on 14 June 2017	21	
PG/44	Example spreadsheets from 2016	21	
PG/45	Internal audit of DaMOP dated February 2018	22	

PG/46	Policy Number 620 'Best Practice Assessments'	23	
PG/47	Current Level 1 Incident Command Training Materials Information	27a	
PG/48	Operational Command Skills Training Guide D	27a	
PG/49	Operational Command Skills Training Guide M	27a	
PG/50	Operational Command Skills Training – WM	27a	
PG/51	TCAP number 0217B 'Operational Command Skills Training Maintenance-Level 1'	27a	
PG/52	TCAP number 0216B 'Operational Command Skills Training Development- Level 1'	27a	
PG/53	TCAP number 0218 'Operational Command Skills Training Watch Manager- Level 1'	27a	
PG/54	Current Level 2 Incident Command Training Materials Information	27a	
PG/55	Tactical Command Skills - Training Guide D	27a	
PG/56	Tactical Command Skills - Maintenance Training Guide	27a	
PG/57	Tactical Command Skills - GM Training Guide	27a	
PG/58	TCAP number 0268B 'Tactical Command Skills Training Maintenance-	27a	

	<i>Level 2'</i>		
PG/59	<i>TCAP number 0269 'Level 2 Intermediate Incident Command (Group Manager) TFCSTG- Tactical Fire Command Skills Training GM'</i>	27a	
PG/60	<i>TCAP number 0219 'Level 2 Incident Command Booster Course'</i>	27a	
PG/61	<i>TCAP number 0270 'Strategic command skills training: Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (development)</i>	27a	
PG/62	<i>TCAP number 0271 'Strategic Command Skills Training MoS: Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (Maintenance)</i>	27a	
PG/63	<i>TCAP number 0222 'Strategic Fire Command Skills Training Maintenance of Skills'</i>	27a	
PG/64	<i>TCAP number 0222a 'Strategic Fire Command Skills Training Development and Maintenance of Skills'</i>	27a	
PG/65	<i>Brigade policy note 954 Revalidation of incident command</i>	27b	
PG/66	<i>Shout Issue 09 November-December 2019</i>	27b	
PG/67	<i>Briefing Note for the Strategic Training Oversight Board entitled 'Incident</i>	27b	

	<i>Command Level One & Two Training Course Review'</i>		
PG/68	Project Initiation Document 'Revalidation of Incident Command' dated 2 April 2019.	27b	
PG/69	Spreadsheet containing data showing the quality assurance of specified courses	28b	
PG/70	Spreadsheet setting out the list of the 80 CBT modules and the dates for when each was first made available on the Learning Management System	31	
PG/71	Table showing the current frequency of Incident Command maintenance of skills training	31	
PG/72	Index to Quarterly Training Update reports	33	
PG/73	12-CMB11 – Training contract Babcock performance Q1 2012-13	33	
PG/74	FEP 1967 – Training contract – Babcock performance Q1 2012-13	33	
PG/75	FEP1994 – Training contract Babcock performance Q2 2012-13	33	
PG/76	13-CMB013 – Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2012-13	33	
PG/77	FEP2047 – Training Contract – Babcock	33	

	performance Q3 2012-13		
PG/78	13-CMB084 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2012-13	33	
PG/79	FEP2102 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2012-13	33	
PG/80	13-CMB116 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2013-14	33	
PG/81	FEP2140 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2013-14	33	
PG/82	13-CMB144 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2013-14	33	
PG/83	FEP2154 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2013-14	33	
PG/84	14-CMB032 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2013-14	33	
PG/85	FEP2232 - Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2013-14	33	
PG/86	14-CMB107 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2013-14	33	
PG/87	FEP2284 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2013-14	33	
PG/88	14-CMB130 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2014-15	33	
PG/89	FEP2320 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1	33	

	2014-15		
PG/90	14-CMB156 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2014-15	33	
PG/91	FEP2346 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2014-15	33	
PG/92	15-CMB041 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2014-15	33	
PG/93	FEP2422 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2014-15	33	
PG/94	15-CMB077 - Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2014-15	33	
PG/95	FEP2473 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2014-15	33	
PG/96	15-CMB114 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2015-16	33	
PG/97	FEP2507 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2015-16	33	
PG/98	Training contract: Babcock's performance – Quarters 1 and 2 2015/16	33	
PG/99	Training Contract: Babcock's performance – Quarters 1 and 2 2015/16	33	
PG/100	Training contract: Babcock's performance – second half 2015-16	33	
PG/101	Training contract: Babcock's performance –	33	

	Second half of 2015/16		
PG/102	Training contract: Babcock's performance – first half of 2016/17	33	
PG/103	Training contract: Babcock's performance – first half of 2016/17	33	
PG/104	Training contract: Babcock's performance – second half of 2016/17	33	
PG/105	Version of Policy Note 698 in force on 14 June 2017	39	
PG/106	Version of Policy Note 812 in force on 14 June 2017	39	
PG/107	Report entitled ' <i>Future Options for Training (FoFT) – Project Closure Report</i> ' presented to CMB on 6 March 2013	Gary Reason R 9, Question 2	
PG/108	Project Initiation Document dated 1 September 2009	Gary Reason R 9, Q 2	
PG/109	TCAP 0143 ' <i>Awareness of Brigade Control's FSG procedures and practices</i> '	Dave Brown R 9, Q 6(c)(i)	
PG/110	Computer Based Training package ' <i>Brigade Control FSG Practices and Procedures, Senior Officers</i> '	Dave Brown R 9, Q 6(c)(iii)	
PG/111	Computer Based Training package ' <i>Brigade Control FSG Practices and Procedures, Watch-based staff</i> '	Dave Brown R 9, Q 6(c)(iii)	
PG/112	Spreadsheet showing when individuals completed the training package	Dave Brown R 9, Q 6(c)(vi)	

4. I am willing to attend the Inquiry and answer any questions arising from this statement.
I am willing to provide any further assistance that may help deliver the outcomes intended by the Inquiry.

Roles and Responsibilities

5. The Inquiry seeks the following information in relation to my first statement dated 18 April 2019:

1. *At paragraph 2 of your witness statement, you explain that you have had corporate responsibility for development and training since April 2016. Please provide further details regarding:*

- a. *your role;*
- b. *to whom you reported;*
- c. *for whom you were responsible and/or those who reported to you;*
- d. *the tasks and/or projects for which you were responsible between April 2016 and June 2017; and*
- e. *your involvement, if any, with Babcock Training Limited (BTI).*

2. *Please provide details regarding your role/s and to whom you reported in the LFB between 2009 and 2016.*

3. *In the period 2009-2016, please set out who had responsibility for development and training and to whom did they report.*

6. As set out in paragraph 2 of my statement dated 18 April 2019 I am the Assistant Director of Training and Professional Development. I report to the Director of Corporate Services, Sue Budden. I have been in this role since April 2018. Five people directly report to me including a Deputy Assistant Commissioner; Head of Training Delivery; Training Commissioning Manager; Training Assurance Manager and a Training Performance, Compliance and Improvement Manager. In my role I am responsible for the day to day management of the contract with Babcock Training Limited ("Babcock").

7. From 2009 to 2012 I was the Project Manager for the Future Options for Training project and reported to the Director of Operational Resilience and Training. During this period the Assistant Commissioner for Training and Development had corporate responsibility for training and development and reported to the Director of Operational Resilience and Training. From 2012 to 2014 I was the Head of Training Assurance and Business Relationships and reported to the Head of Human Resources. Between 2012 and 2016 the Head of Human Resources had corporate responsibility for training and development and reported to the Director of Operational Resilience and Training. Between 2015 and 2016 I was the Head of Learning and Development and HR Strategy and reported to the Head of Human Resources.
8. From January 2016 to April 2018 my role was Head of Development and Training. I reported to the Director of Safety and Assurance. Five people reported to me during this time including the Organisational Development Manager; Head of Training Delivery; Training Commissioning Manager; Training Assurance Manager and a Training Performance, Compliance and Improvement Manager. I produce at exhibit (PG/8;) a record of my objectives from the 2016/2017 period. These reflect the tasks and projects for which I was responsible between April 2016 and June 2017. In this role I was responsible for the day to day management of the contract with Babcock.

Lakanal House Fire

9. The Inquiry seeks the following information in relation to the Lakanal House inquest:
 4. *In the period of 2009 and 2016, please explain whether you were involved with the Lakanal House Inquest and/or the action points that arose from the LFB's investigation into the Lakanal House incident prior to or after the inquest? If yes, please explain in detail your role and what action/s you took.*
 5. *In the period of 2009 to June 2017, please explain whether you were tasked to carry out any role in relation to the action points set out in the Lakanal Assurance report (dated 7 August 2018)? If yes, please set out which actions you were tasked to undertake and what you did in relation to each action point.*

10. In my role I had oversight of the Training and Development department's involvement in the action points that arose from the Brigade's investigation into the Lakanal House incident. I refer below to the department's involvement in respect of actions taken in response to the Coroner's recommendation 3 *'Incident commanders'*. As referred to at page 29 of the Lakanal House Incident Assurance Review, a report prepared for the Grenfell Tower Investigation and Review Team ("GTIRT") by Adrian Bevan dated 7 August 2018, the Brigade identified the following actions in response to recommendation 3:

- 3(b) *'Review incident command training to ensure the 7 points are adequately covered.'*
- 3(c) *'Introduce a case study training package incorporating learning outcomes from inquests'.*

11. In line with the training, commissioning and alteration process ("TCAP") the Training and Development department were involved in working with the Operational Policy and Assurance department and Babcock to create the Lakanal House case study computer based training solution (inquest action 3(c)). I produce at exhibit (PG/9:) TCAP number 0153 *'Lakanal Training Case Study'* which sets out the proposal for the training solution.

12. The department was also involved in project managing (between Babcock and the Operational Policy and Assurance department) the development of a new suite of incident command courses, including Level 1 and Level 2 development and maintenance courses (inquest action 3(b)). The Operational Policy and Assurance department specified the required training and members of the Training Commissioning team, which resided in the Training and Development department, managed the TCAP, involving Babcock, who developed and designed the training packages. I produce at exhibit (PG/10:) TCAP number 0124 *'Enhanced Incident Command Training based on Lakanal Inquests Rule 43 recommendations.'*

13. In addition to the actions outlined at paragraph 10 above, the Training and Development department was required to submit updates to the Health and Safety team of the Operational Assurance Department in conjunction with the relevant commissioning department on the Rule 43 action points. These updates were presented quarterly by the Health and Safety Department to the Operational Directorates Co-ordination Board ("ODCB") in a monitoring report. The Head of HR and Development at the time and subsequently the Head of Training and Development attended these meetings.

Exhibit PG1- 'How Training Works'

14. The Inquiry have made the following request:

6. In respect of paragraph 1.2, please provide a document or documents that explains the 'ADDIE model' used by the LFB.

15. I produce at exhibit (PG/11:) a document that explains the ADDIE Instructional Design Process.

Babcock Training Limited ("BTL")

16. The Inquiry seeks the following information:

7. At paragraph 2.7, you state that the training of staff in Brigade Control was excluded from the BTL contract and remained an in-house function because the whole of the Brigade Control function was being considered as part of a separate outsourcing process. As to that, please explain:

- a) The details and the outcome of the separate outsourcing process;*
- b) Who in the LFB developed training for Control staff;*
- c) Who trained Control staff;*
- d) How training courses for Control staff were developed, implemented and evaluated and reviewed;*
- e) What role your department, if any, took in the training of Control staff.*

17. I did not have any direct involvement in the project considering the outsourcing of control and mobilisation function. Further, the Training and Professional Development department had no involvement in the training of Control staff. Historically, training for Control has been developed within the Brigade by the Control Operations Support Team (see paragraph 143) who also provide training to Control staff.

8. *At paragraph 2.8, you state that a component of the contract with BTL is a review of all training courses within the first three years of the contract. In respect of which please provide:*

a) Details regarding how courses are reviewed and whether there is a programme of 'course review' that takes place. Such details should include the names of those who review the courses within the LFB and BTL, the names of any groups, committees or boards which take a part in the review process, the process by which the courses are reviewed, which courses are reviewed, the timescale for the review, how training courses are amended and how amended training courses are disseminated to the LFB staff;

b) It is understood that a course review was completed in 2015. As to which, please provide all documents regarding the course review and please set out the following:

i) Which courses were reviewed

ii) Which individuals and or groups and or departments in the LFB contributed to the course review;

iii) The materials considered in the course review

iv) The outcome of the course review;

v) Whether any courses were amended as a result of the review and if so, the reasons for the amendments.

18. An Initial Programme of Course Reviews ("IPCR") was established in April 2013 and course reviews took place throughout 2013 and 2014 as set out in the table at paragraph 23 below. I produce at exhibit (PG/12:) a report submitted to the CMB and the Resources Committee by the Head of Human Resources and Development, James Dalglish, on 1 August 2012 and 17 September 2012, 'Training Contract- Babcock's

performance'. The Terms of Reference for the Course Review and Design Working Group ("CR&DWG") are set out at page 28 of the report which states:

'The Course Review and Design Working Group (CR&DWG) ensures that the LFB's learning and development strategy is delivered through the training provision contract. The CR&DWG will manage and direct the processes for making changes to training, commissioning new training and reviewing training to ensure the LFB's learning and development needs are being met.'

19. The initial planned governance structure changed and the CR&DWG was divided to form the Course Review Board and the Design Working Group, which was the precursor to the Training Commissioning team. I produce at exhibit (PG/13:) a report presented to the Corporate Management Board ("CMB") by the Head of Human Resources and Development on 5 September 2012 'Proposed Training Delivery Plan 2013/14'. The report provides a brief overview of the Course Review Programme as follows:

Course Review Process

1. *Babcock have committed to a review of all of the current training courses within the first three years of the contract. The LFB identified three factors which should be considered when identifying courses for review. These include:*
 - *Utilising the "combined" risk-rating as a categorisation system for the courses on the TDP. This rating was developed to combine the "cancellation risk rating" and the more current "revised rating", the latter of which was developed during the FOFT project.*
 - *The status of any courses which are currently subject to change. These may be identified through their inclusion on the Corporate project list, or through the Training Commissioning and Alteration Process (TCAP).*
 - *Those courses identified as being non-tradable. This classification has been assigned to those courses requiring specific commitment and investment from Babcock and provides a level of inflexibility in the TDP.*

2. *Babcock considerations for prioritisation include:*

- *The development of a Learner Map (guiding an individual's development through their career);*
- *Maximising course synergies;*
- *Identifying potential course efficiencies;*
- *Realising opportunities for quality improvements;*
- *The inclusion of accreditation, recognition or approval for delegates.*

3. *Through discussion with Babcock and key stakeholders, taking into consideration the issues detailed above, a number of subject areas were identified as suitable for early consideration in the review process. This proposal was shared with Performance and Commissioning board and the selection of course review priorities was agreed.*

4. *Driver Training, Breathing Apparatus and Real Fire Training and Incident Management Training are the first three areas to be reviewed. Work has already begun on reviewing these areas.*

5. *The LDS team will be working closely with Babcock throughout this review process to ensure that any changes Babcock propose are subjected to the Training Commissioning and Alteration Process. This will ensure that the Commissioning Departments agree any changes to courses and that any agreed changes are clearly documented and auditable.*

20. The Learning Development and Strategy ("LDS") team was led and managed by DAC Kevin Hughes. Governance of course review was provided at two levels:

- Tactical- by the Brigade subject matter advisers who considered all of the Brigade course proposals to ensure they met or exceeded current service provision. The subject matter advisers would have been a member of the commissioning department with subject expertise;

- Strategic- by the Course Review Board chaired by Director of Operational Resilience and Training (“DoORT”), Gary Reason. The Course Review Board was responsible for agreeing and signing off Babcock’s proposals.
21. As part of the Course Review, courses were grouped together into the following fourteen skill areas:
- 30.1 IPCR Immediate Emergency Care and First Aid Training
 - 30.2 IPCR Firefighter Development Programme
 - 30.3 IPCR Transport Training
 - 30.4 IPCR Incident Management Training
 - 30.5 IPCR IT Training
 - 30.6 IPCR Management Development Programmes
 - 30.7 IPCR Project Management
 - 30.8 IPCR Personal Skills and Specialist Roles
 - 30.9 IPCR Urban Search and Rescue Training
 - 30.10 IPCR Breathing Apparatus Refresher Training
 - 30.11 IPCR Technical Rescue Training
 - 30.12 IPCR Specialist Skills Training
 - 30.13 IPCR Equality and Diversity Training
 - 30.14 IPCR Fire Safety Training
22. Each skill area had its own project plan with associated timelines which also formed part of a composite course review plan for all of the course reviews.
23. I produce at exhibit (PG/14:) a diagram outlining the IPCR process. The process of course review resulted in a report which was submitted to the Course Review Board for consideration for each of the skill areas. Each report detailed the process of the review. The IPCR produced 14 reports which included 185 recommendations. The table below summarises the report dates and number of recommendations made within each report:

Review	Date	No of Recommendations
1. IEC and First Aid	July 2014	16
2. FFD Programme	November 2013	19
3. Transport Training	July 2013	12
4. Incident Management	July 2013	30
5. IT Training	July 2014	7
6. Management Development	July 2014	5
7. Project Management	July 2014	5
8. Personal Skills	November 2014	13
9. Urban Search and Rescue	March 2014	11
10. Breathing Apparatus	July 2013	7
11. Technical Rescue	November 2014	16
12. Specialist Skills	July 2014	21
13. Equality & Diversity	November 2014	3
14. Fire Safety	October 2014	20
	Total	185

24. The details of the recommendations made are set out in the spreadsheet I produce at exhibit (PG/15). I produce the following reports that were produced in relation to the 14 courses outlined in the table above:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
PG/16	Report on IEC and First Aid dated July 2014	
PG/17	Report on FFD Programme dated November 2013	
PG/18	Report on Transport Training dated July 2013	
PG/19	Report on Incident Management dated July 2013	
PG/20	Report on IT Training dated July 2014	
PG/21	Report on Management Development dated July 2014	
PG/22	Report on Project Management dated July 2014	
PG/23	Report on Personal Skills dated November 2014	
PG/24	Report on Urban Search and Rescue dated March 2014	

PG/25	Report on Breathing Apparatus dated July 2013	
PG/26	Report on Technical Rescue dated November 2014	
PG/27	Report on Specialist Skills dated July 2014	
PG/28	Report on Equality & Diversity dated November 2014	
PG/29	Report on Fire Safety dated October 2014	

25. All training materials (including trainer guides, timetables and presentations) would be considered in the course review alongside delegate feedback. Materials considered are detailed in the Course Review Report for each skill report. Recommendations would be considered at the Course Review Board and any recommendations taken forward would be through a TCAP and governed and assured through the TCAP. As part of the course review Babcock made recommendations to the Brigade Course Review Board, albeit it was the Brigade's decision as to any changes made to courses.
26. I attended a number of Course Review Board meetings. I understand the Inquiry have already been provided with the minutes, agendas and supporting documentation from the Course Review Board meetings. The following individuals would also have attended such meetings on occasion:
- Director Operational Resilience and Training- Gary Reason;
 - Third Officer Operations, Prevention and Response- Dave Brown;
 - Head of HR and Development-James Dalglish;
 - Learning and Development Manager- Angela Hale;
 - Group Manager, Learning and Development- Andy Worsam;
 - Group Manager, Learning and Development- Steve Green;
 - Career Development Manager- Milo Bodrozic;
 - Learning and Development Project Officer- Deborah Riviere;
 - Assistant Commissioner Operational Procedures- Peter Cowup;
 - Assistant Commissioner Operational Assurance- Dany Cotton;

- Assistant Commissioner Head of Technical and Service Support- Dominic Ellis;
 - Assistant Commissioner Operational Resilience- Steve Hamm;
 - Head of Strategy and Performance- Susan Ellison Bunce;
 - Strategic Advisor to the Commissioner- Pat Oakley;
 - Deputy Assistant Commissioner Operations, Prevention and Response- Mick Ellis;
 - Deputy Assistant Commissioner Fire Safety- Neil Orbell;
 - Deputy Assistant Commissioner Operational Assurance- Graham Ellis;
 - Deputy Assistant Commissioner- Sabrina Cohen Hatton;
 - Group Manager Operational Procedures- Jim A'Court
27. The individuals named at paragraph 26 above were involved in the course reviews. In addition, subject matter policy advisers from the Brigade's department responsible for commissioning training were involved.
28. The Course Review Board would decide which recommendations they wished Babcock to pursue which would then be actioned as part of the Training, Commissioning and Alteration Process (minor amendments such as updating a slide in a PowerPoint would not require a TCAP). A TCAP number would be generated and the changes documented in the relevant TCAP form. Amended training would then be disseminated to staff based on the eligibility rules for each course.
29. I produce at (exhibit PG/30:) a table setting out the relevant changes to courses.
30. As part of the Course Review one significant course change implemented in 2015 and made without TCAP governance was to the Firefighter Development ("FFD") Programme. The entire development Programme was re-written including new learning methods. As this was a substantial project it was managed and approved directly by the Brigade's Head of Learning and Development and HR Strategy, rather than via the TCAP process.

31. The Inquiry seeks the following information:

9. *Please set out your understanding of the stages taken by the LFB in creating and approving a new training requirement and/or a new training package with BTL. Your response should include details regarding the name and roles of the decision-makers within the LFB, any groups boards and/or departments involved in this process, how the package of options are decided upon and the extent to which cost is a factor in dictating the detail, distribution and quality of the individual training package.*

32. A training requirement could be identified by a commissioning department within the Brigade or by Babcock. Regardless of who identifies the training requirement, the TCAP is followed. Up to and including June 2017, once a training requirement had been identified, a TCAP form was completed. This would then have been approved to be taken forward by the TCAP working group which included members of the Training and Development department, Contract Management Group and Babcock. The request was then submitted to the Contract Performance Monitoring Board ("CPMB") for approval. Upon agreement by the CPMB to proceed, stakeholder group meetings would be held involving Babcock, subject policy advisers from the commissioning department and wider Brigade stakeholders (such as a representative from the Central Operations department or other departments that may be impacted by the training). Once the training requirement was fully specified and Babcock had a good understanding of the Brigade requirement Babcock would usually produce three options for the delivery of the training to be considered by the Brigade. Occasionally fewer options were provided by Babcock on agreement with the Brigade. This may happen if the commissioning department, in agreement with Babcock, had already decided on the best training option, e.g. a CBT package. The stakeholder group would then consider the options (where applicable) and choose their preferred training solution. If this had a cost implication this was submitted to CPMB for approval. Any cost implications would have been considered against the training requirements and the outcomes set by the commissioning department. Cost and quality were the key factors. This process was undertaken to ensure that there was a sufficient training budget to be able to deliver the training solution proposed. Where cost was an issue a paper was presented to a meeting of the Corporate Management Team with a recommendation for course classes to either

be reduced or deferred to the subsequent training year. Cost is not a factor for risk critical training and such training would not be reduced or deferred.

33. On agreement to proceed with developing the recommended training solution, Babcock would be instructed by the Brigade to develop the training materials. All training materials were signed off by the subject policy advisor from the department commissioning the training and the training solution would then be piloted. The relevant commissioning department would identify individuals to attend the pilot to ensure effective feedback on the pilot. The attendees would be personnel with knowledge of the subject matter of the pilot. Once the pilot had taken place, feedback was sought from all delegates attending the pilot, a Brigade Quality Assurer if they had attended (Brigade Quality Assurers attended classroom or practical training) and Babcock trainers. The stakeholder group would then assess the feedback and decide if any changes were required to the training solution or if they were satisfied that the course could go live. If changes were required a decision would be made with advice from the TCAP project manager as to whether the training solution needed to be re-piloted, or if the changes were minor the training could be rolled out without further pilot.
34. Once the training solution was agreed as meeting the requirements of the TCAP, the TCAP would be closed and signed off by the following people:
- Head of Service for the commissioning department;
 - Personal Development Manager (in 2017 known as Learning and Development Manager);
 - Babcock Head of Training Design;
 - Babcock Head of Business Support, Brigade Training.
35. The training solution would then be added to the course guide, or if it was a computer based training package, loaded to Big Learning.

Training Requirements

36. The Inquiry seeks the following information in relation to training requirements:

10. In your role as Head of Department and Training, or in any previous role within the LFB if relevant, please set out your understanding and knowledge of training requirements identified between 2009 and June 2017 regarding the issues set out below. Your response should include requirements that were considered and not taken forward to development. It should also include how the training requirement was identified with reference to paragraphs 3.5 to 3.9 of exhibit 1:

- c. High-rise firefighting including, but not limited to, a fire breaching compartmentation and spreading and the stay put policy;
- d. Flammable and/or combustible building materials;
- e. Other incidents of high-rise fires with spread of fire and breach of compartmentation;
- f. Fire survival guidance;
- g. Evacuation;
- h. Section 7(2)(d) and familiarisation visits;
- i. Lessons learned from the Lakanal House incident.

37. Training requirements that had been through the Operational Improvement Process were identified as follows. Each of the TCAPs referred to below would have been raised by the relevant commissioning department and assigned a lead in the Training and Policy Development department, who would have managed the TCAP process from the training commissioning team through to sign off once the training solution had been identified, produced and piloted.

- d. Flammable and/or combustible building materials;

38. I produce at (exhibit PG/31:) TCAP number 0023 'Timber Framed Buildings' which sets out the training requirements around such buildings. This TCAP was raised in July 2012 but was not signed off, however it was relevant to the development of PN 818 'fires in timber framed buildings under construction'. I produce at (exhibit PG/32:) TCAP number 0212 'Ops News 30- Highly Insulated Buildings'. This TCAP was raised in October 2015 and related to a CBT package linked to 'Operational News 30'. I understand that the Inquiry has already been provided with 'Operational News 30' dated January 2016 which sets out the

mandatory training arising out of this training requirement. This package was developed but due to IT issues has since been withdrawn as set out within the TCAP. It is intended that this package will be relaunched in Ops News 40.

f. Fire survival guidance;

39. I produce at (exhibit PG/33:) TCAP number 0055b '*Ops News 24, Fire Survival Guidance Policy*' which sets out the training requirement identified in December 2012, this training requirement was not formally signed off by the commissioning officer, however, the commissioning officer for '*Operational News 24*' confirmed by email on 23 April 2013 that he was happy for the TCAP to be signed off therefore the training was developed in accordance with the TCAP. I understand the Inquiry have already been provided with '*Operational News 24*' dated March 2013 which sets out the mandatory training linked to this training requirement. The mandatory training focused upon PN790 and FSG procedures.

40. I produce at (exhibit PG/106:) TCAP 0143, '*Awareness of Brigade Control's FSG procedures and practices.*' This TCAP included the requirement for the development of a new training solution aimed at raising awareness of Brigade Control practices and procedures. A computer-based training package '*Brigade Control Fire Survival Guidance*' (exhibits PG/110 and PG/111 referred to at paragraph 142 below) was developed with two distinct pathways for Senior Officers and station-based staff (firefighter to watch manager) and all watches were required to complete the training package. In addition to the training developed from these TCAPs, from August 2015, during Week 6 of the Firefighter Development Programme, recruits have received training on Firefighting in Buildings which addresses the relevance of fire survival guidance calls to operational firefighting.

h. Section 7(2)(d) and familiarisation visits;

41. '*Operational News 12*' dated May 2009, included reference to s.7(2)(d) visits as part of an article entitled '*On arrival planning and tactics*'. There was a mandatory training requirement for all watches to familiarise themselves with the article and associated training package. '*Operational News 20*' dated November 2011 included an article

titled '*High rise firefighting*' which included a reference to s.7(2)(d) visits. There was a mandatory requirement for crews to familiarise themselves with the high rise article and view the associated package. Once training is identified as mandatory for staff, whether it is an article in Ops News or a CBT package or other form of training, it will be included on Individual Training Records ('ITRs') for each individual who is required to complete the training. Ordinarily watches will complete their training together and their completion will be checked off on their ITRs. To ensure all staff receive the mandatory training, mop up sessions will be run at stations and performance reports are monitored by the DACs to ensure compliance at an individual level. I produce at (exhibit PG/34:) TCAP number 0055e '*Ops News 24, 7(2)d visits (changes to existing training)*'. As set out at paragraph 39 above, I understand the Inquiry have already been provided with '*Operational News 24*' which sets out the mandatory training arising from this training requirement. Section 7(2)(d) visits also featured in TCAP 0153 referred to in paragraph 42 below.

- c. *High-rise firefighting including, but not limited to, a fire breaching compartmentation and spreading and the stay put policy;*
- e. *Other incidents of high-rise fires with spread of fire and breach of compartmentation;*
- g. *Evacuation*
- i. *Lessons learned from the Lakanal House incident.*

42. As set out at paragraph 11, in line with TCAP 0153, the Training and Development department were involved in working with the Operational Policy and Assurance department and Babcock to create the Lakanal House case study computer based training solution. The TCAP for this training requirement is at exhibit PG/9. The Case Study was developed and issued as mandatory training for all operational staff in 2014. As set out at paragraph 50 below, the training was delivered through a series of face to face sessions to senior officers and as a stand-alone package for use by station based staff with two distinct packages available, applicable to role. The relevant training materials were uploaded to Big Learning as set out in paragraph 64 below. Additionally, from August 2015, the Lakanal House case study was included in Week 7 of the 11 Week Firefighter Development Programme which is delivered to all new recruits. From July 2019, the Lakanal Case study was also introduced into the new

Developing and Maintaining Operational Professionalism (“DaMOP”) framework. I also produce at (exhibit PG/35:) TCAP number 0124 ‘Enhanced Incident Command Training based on Lakanal Inquests Rule 43 recommendations’. This TCAP was raised in June 2013 and implemented the recommendations set out at inquest action 3(b) in the Lakanal House Assurance Review.

11. In paragraph 3.10, you state that the Statement of Training Requirements is assessed for affordability. Please explain how many of the courses you have identified in the paragraph above were assessed for affordability and the outcome of those assessments.

43. All the above courses would have been assessed for affordability. The two courses identified in paragraph 40 were deemed affordable. There are 52,000 TU’s available each year for training and development. Affordability is determined on the basis of what training is required during the year, and the amount of TU’s which apply to each item of training required. Within the yearly allocation, there is a 20% flex within the contract with Babcock to allow for additional training above the total amount of TU’s available. The ability to go over the total TU’s does however depend on funding approval external to the Brigade. In practice the Brigade have not exceeded the 52,000 TU’s available as non-operational training, for example IT courses, will be deferred to another training year to ensure the total TU’s are not exceeded.

Training Commissioning

44. The Inquiry seeks the following information:

12. In paragraphs 4.1 to 4.12 you explain the process of training commissioning. Please explain which individual/s have been involved in this process between 2009 and June 2017.

45. I have been unable to locate records of who was involved in the training commissioning process prior to April 2012. Prior to 2012 the process for managing new or amended training across the Brigade was known as Contract of Understanding (“COFU”). As

part of a joint Training Projects Team the COFU was developed to provide a robust process to manage the training changes and the Training Projects Team worked with the Training Design Team to provide a solution. Governance of the COFU was through the Training Projects Board which was attended by Heads of Training on a fortnightly basis. The COFU was then presented to the Client Group, chaired by the former Commissioner, Ron Dobson, for agreement. A course would then be created and the COFU signed off.

46. From April 2012 the process moved to the TCAP. Between April 2012 and June 2017 the following people in the HR and Development/Training and Development departments have been involved in addition to myself:

- Head of HR and Development- James Dalglish
- Head of Development- Sabrina Cohen-Hatton
- Head of Learning and Development Strategy- Kevin Hughes
- Personal Development Manager- Angela Hale
- Personal Development Manager- Rachel Wetheridge
- Learning & Development Project Manager- Steve Green
- TCAP Programme Manager- John Elwell
- TCAP Programme Manager- Laurie Kenny
- TCAP Programme Manager- Andrew Worsam
- Compliance Manager-Peter Curtin
- Compliance Manager- Gary Pratt
- Compliance Manager- Peter Rickard
- TCAP Project Manager- Damian Candish
- TCAP Project Manager- Nicholas Markwell
- TCAP Project Manager- Sarah McLeggan
- TCAP Project Manager- Michelle Remedios
- TCAP Project Manager- Deborah Riviere-Williams
- TCAP Project Manager- Arti Shah
- TCAP Project Manager- Louise Walker

47. Each TCAP form records other stakeholders involved in the commissioning process.

48. I produce at (exhibit PG/36:) a document produced by Babcock entitled 'Training Design Organisational Structures from 2012 to 2017' which sets out the team structure of those involved in the Training Design team from Babcock.

13. Please explain who or which group, board, committee and/or department within the LFB determines the course content and who approves the course content. Please set out your understanding of the role that BTL take in this part of the process.

49. The commissioning department specify the training content by setting the learning objectives and aims. Babcock proposes and designs the content and training solution to meet these learning objectives. The training content and training solution is approved by the commissioning department. I set out at paragraphs 32 and 33 the process for determining and approving the course content.

14. In respect of the answer you have provided in response to paragraph 10, please set out which training requirements led to training courses and/or packages being developed and the names and details of the respective training courses and/or packages. If certain training requirements that were identified did not lead to a training course or package being commissioned, please specify to which training requirement that applies and the reason why a training course or package was not commissioned. With reference to paragraphs 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4 of exhibit 1, please set out in your answer whether each training course and/or package was categorised as an "initial acquisition" course, a "refresher" course, "confirmation of skills, "assessment" and/or "multi-agency training", whether any courses had a pass or fail assessment associated with them and whether any of them recorded provided delegation performance as a 'report by exception'.

50. TCAP 0153 'Lakanal Training Case Study' and TCAP 0212 'Ops News 30- Highly Insulated Buildings' resulted in specific Computer Based Training packages being developed although the CBT package in relation to TCAP 0212 was subsequently removed as outlined above at paragraph 38. As set out at paragraph 42 the 'Lakanal Training Case Study' CBT package was developed and issued as mandatory training

for all operational staff in 2014 and delivered through a series of face to face sessions to senior officers, under course code OLHICS and as a stand-alone package for use by station based staff. The package was made available with two distinct pathways and delegates were required to choose the package applicable to their role (i.e. station based staff or senior officer) and to complete the relevant package.

51. As explained at paragraph 40 above, TCAP 0143, *'Awareness of Brigade Control's FSG procedures and practices'* resulted in two distinct computer-based training packages both titled *'Brigade Control FSG Procedures and Practices'* being developed for Senior Officers and station-based staff (firefighter to watch manager) and all watches were required to complete the training package.
52. TCAP 0055 related to *'Operational News 24'* and referred to CBT packages that were already available through the Station Training Support Packages ("STSP") which were developed internally prior to the contract with Babcock in 2012. Packages commissioned through the STSP team were provided to Babcock as part of the transition to BTL. They have since been re-branded and are available on the Big Learning system. The relevant packages are:
 - OP007 High Rise Procedures- this package was previously a STSP package, developed in 2005 to support *'Operational News 5'* and was reworked in 2011 to support *'Operational News 20'*
 - Brigade Control's FSG Procedure and Practices (as mentioned above in paragraphs 40 and 51)
53. TCAP 0023 was as a result of the introduction of PN 818 and did not lead to any training package or course.
54. CBT packages are classed as maintenance of skills training, most packages have a knowledge test at the end of the training which records the result on Big Learning and confirms completion for Individual Training Records. Where a package does not have a knowledge test, once an individual has completed the content of the package by completing the CBT package, their completion of that training package will be recorded on the Individual Training Records.

55. TCAP 0124 resulted in changes to course content and incorporated the seven actions identified in inquest action 3b. The following courses were updated with the necessary content to support the recommendations:

- OFCSTM - Level 1 Maintenance (Refresher, Not Assessable, Report by Exception)
- OFCSTW – Level 1 – Watch Manager (Initial Acquisition, Not Assessable, Report by Exception)
- OFCSTD – Level 1 Development (Initial Acquisition, Assessable, Report by Exception)
- TFCSTM - Level 2 Maintenance (Refresher, Not Assessable, Report by Exception)
- TFCSTD – Level 2 Development (Initial Acquisition, Not Assessable, Report by Exception)
- TFCSTG– Level 2 – Group Manager (Initial Acquisition, Not Assessable, Report by Exception)
- TFCSTC – Level 2 Confirmation of Skills (Confirmation of Skills, Report by Exception)

Only the “OFCSTD – Level 1 Development” training is assessable as it is the entry point to placing Level 1 Officers into the field. The other courses listed are maintenance and development training (from Level 1 to a more senior officer level) and therefore do not have formal assessments. In practice however, when officers are receiving maintenance or further development training their conduct and performance during the course is continually monitored. This means that if a risk critical behaviour is identified during one of these courses, the individual concerned may be taken out of the field until such a time that the Brigade is satisfied they are competent to perform at the required level. The above changes were made as part of the Course Review outlined in paragraph 18.

15. In paragraph 4.6, you explain that BTL is currently carrying out a comparison of training specifications with the Brigade's extant training to ensure National

Operational Guidance (NOG) compliance and that the analysis was expected to be completed by October 2019. Please provide an update on the analysis and any documentation that has been produced by BTL. If it has not yet been completed, please confirm the expected date of completion.

56. I produce at (exhibit PG/37:) a spreadsheet which shows the gap analysis completed by Babcock which identifies all courses against all NOG learning outcomes. Given the scale of the task, it was always intended that the Babcock gap analysis (exhibit PG/37) would be a first cut only as it is recognised that proper scrutiny of the gap analysis needs to be conducted by subject matter experts. It is therefore important to note that the spreadsheet was not produced by trainers or subject matter experts and this, in part, explains why there was 30% identified as not being met. The 30% not met figure can also be explained by the fact that the gap analysis was undertaken against all courses, not just operational courses. Some areas that are highlighted as not being met are not in context. For example, Learning Outcomes relating to firefighting courses would not be expected to be achieved in water rescue or USAR courses, these would be flagged as not met on the spreadsheet when in reality they are not applicable. In similar fashion a Word course would be marked as not meeting NOG when in fact it was not applicable. Station Based Training in the form of DAMOP packages also achieve some NOG learning outcomes, however, these materials were not compared to the learning outcomes in the analysis carried out by Babcock. The gap analysis also uses different terminology to the Brigade.
57. As the Babcock gap analysis is now complete, the Brigade's Operational Policy and Assurance department's subject matter experts are now scrutinising the gap analysis and determining any required actions. An action plan will be produced by the Operational Policy and Assurance department showing compliance and non-compliance and providing rationale for any non-compliance identified. The spreadsheet completed by Babcock has assisted in the process of reviewing current courses against the NOG learning outcomes. This work is being completed in conjunction with the relevant subject matter experts who are reviewing the content of current and planned training courses and aligning them to the NOG learning outcomes stipulated in the NOG Training Specifications. Where any areas of non or partial compliance are identified, appropriate interventions in the form of TCAPs to achieve

compliance or a narrative as to why compliance is not appropriate will be produced. This work should be completed by the end of March 2020.

16. In respect of paragraph 4.7, please provide a list of the 347 TCAPs.

58. At the time of writing 'How Training Works' 347 TCAPS had been progressed since April 2012. Since then further TCAPs have been progressed. I exhibit at (PG/38:) a list of all TCAPs progressed since 2012 to date.

59. The Inquiry seeks the following information:

17. In paragraph 4.9 you say that once the Brigade is satisfied that a course is ready for delivery, at least one pilot course is run and pilot courses are quality assured by both the Brigade and BTL with feedback sought. Please set out:

a. Who in the LFB would be involved in running a pilot course

60. Packages are piloted via a test group agreed between the commissioning department, Training and Development and Babcock. A member of the Brigade's Quality Assurance team would attend classroom based and practical training inputs. Feedback from the pilot is then fed into the TCAP process.

b. In respect of the courses you have set out in your response at paragraph 14 above, please set out who undertook the pilot course for each training course, what feedback was provided from the trainers and delegates, any details and/or agendas, minutes and notes of the post-pilot meetings that were held with the LFB and BTL.

61. In respect of the training package related to TCAP 0153 the Brigade administered the pilot process. I exhibit at (PG/39:) the list of Brigade personnel we wanted to participate in the pilot process. A number of the Brigade delegates then delivered the packages to various groups in Brigade workplaces whilst the remainder of the Brigade delegates reviewed the packages individually. I produce at (exhibit PG/40:) an email entitled 'Lakanal post Pilot changes.docx' and the associated attachment which detail the changes requested by the Brigade post pilot which were identified

through stakeholder engagement and the TCAP pilot process. The changes were subsequently prepared by Babcock and agreed and approved by the Brigade.

62. In respect of the training associated with TCAP 0124, the pilot was delivered within existing training courses where appropriate on a number of occasions between 2014 and 2016 rather than as a stand-alone course. The content of the pilot training materials was prepared by Babcock in line with the Brigade's requirements and approved by the Brigade through the TCAP process. As the pilot was subsumed into certain existing training courses as a case study or exercise, there was no record of which individual delegates undertook this new pilot as part of their planned training courses. This operating practice has since been updated to record this level of detailed information.
63. Brigade and Babcock representatives attended the courses where the revised materials were piloted. The Brigade's subject matter advisors collected the feedback directly from Babcock trainers and Brigade delegates. I produce at (exhibit PG/41:) the feedback received. In summary the feedback was positive and constructive and provided recommendations around the use of photographs in relation to attendance and position on the incident ground, around expediting discussions throughout the training, to clarify desired outcomes and shorten the overall time spent on the training package. This feedback was provided to Babcock and used to make further amendments requested by the Brigade to the training materials.

c. In respect of the training courses identified in paragraph 14 of your response, please set out the dates as to when the training courses were added to the course guide and when the training materials were uploaded to SharePoint.

64. The relevant training materials resulting from TCAP 0153 were uploaded to Big Learning, the Learning Management System ("LMS") on the following dates:
- Lakanal House Case Study and Online Learning Module – 8 April 2014
 - Training Guide- 4 June 2014
 - Timeline, Script and E-learning script- 4 June 2014

65. In relation to TCAP 0124, these materials were piloted on numerous occasions between 2014 and 2016. The Level 1 IC courses that these materials were intended for were superseded by the following courses introduced through TCAPs as set out below:

TCAP No	Course Code	Date TCAP created	Date sent to Brigade or Babcock	Date TCAP signed off
0216b	OFCSTD	14.12.15	16.12.15 (sent to Brigade)	21.06.17
0217b	OFCSTM	02.12.15	10.12.15 (sent to Brigade)	14.03.18
0218	OFCSTW	20.11.15	14.12.15 (sent to Babcock)	21.06.17

66. The above referenced courses were first delivered by Babcock to Brigade staff on the following dates:

- OFCSTD- 17 May 2016
- OFCSTM- 15 February 2016
- OFCSTW- 20 August 2016

67. New exercises for these three courses were created by Babcock and approved in line with the prioritised incident types supplied by the Brigade.

18. In respect of paragraph 4.12, please provide the audit trail of training requirements, resources, costs and approvals for completed and closed TCAPS as it existed at June 2017.

68. The audit trail of training requirements, resources, costs and approvals is provided in each individual TCAP. Each individual TCAP can be provided on request. I produce at (exhibit PG/42:) a spreadsheet which shows the status of and key dates in each TCAP's process. Depending upon the agreed training solution there is an agreed cost which is denoted in Training Units ("TUs"). The development cost is normally for the production of a package, where there is a per course cost, this is the

TU cost for each course run against the delegate numbers stipulated in the TCAP document, for example, if a course is for 12 students and is 4 TUs it will cost the Brigade 4 x TUs regardless of the number of students on the course. The TCAP stipulates minimum and maximum numbers. The total number of courses required is dependent either on the number requiring training (i.e. all operational staff); or a set amount (i.e. a one off course for fire engineers) as denoted in the TCAP or dependent on the SOTR,

69. At the commencement of the contract with Babcock, the TU was set for years 1 – 3 of the contract and then for years 4 – 25. The initial value was higher with the subsequent value from year 4 onwards modelled on an expectation that Babcock would find efficiencies following the course review I noted above at paragraphs 18 to 30. Each incremental yearly rise from year 4 onwards is linked to the Retail Price Index ('RPI' excluding mortgage interest payments) which is built into the contract with Babcock. Those yearly TU amounts are set out below:

• 2012/13	73.38
• 2013/14	75.77
• 2014/15	77.69
• 2015/16	62.76
• 2016/17	63.79
• 2017/18	65.97
• 2018/19	68.19
• 2019/20	69.83

Training Delivery

70. I have been asked to produce the following documentation:

19. In respect of paragraph 5.2, please provide the course guide as it existed on 14 June 2017.

71. I produce at (exhibit PG/43:) the course guide as it existed on 14 June 2017.

20. In respect of paragraph 5.8, please provide documentary evidence of the set of rules used when allocating delegates to courses.

72. I produce at (exhibit PG/44:) example spreadsheets from 2016 which indicate in the column 'Filling Rules' what the eligibility criteria is for each course in the period covered by the spreadsheet. For every course there are eligibility rules and filling rules. Eligibility rules relate to when a TCAP process is started which is when we will ask the commissioning department who they want trained and they will identify the individuals or groups of individuals. The eligibility criteria is checked on an annual basis with Central Operations. The criteria is then sent to Babcock as part of the annual training plan. The filling rules relate to the allocation of individuals to a course, for example, we may only take two individuals from a particular watch so as not to deplete front line services. The filling rules could be that there should be a mix of operational and non-operational staff. In summary, the filling rules relate to the composition of the course, the eligibility rules relate to having the appropriate people on the course.

21. In respect of paragraph 5.14, please provide the Incident Command Exercise as it existed on 14 June 2017.

73. There are a vast number of Incident Command Exercises that were in existence as at 14 June 2017. I would be able to provide individual Incident Command Exercises on request.

Training delivered outside of the Brigade/BTL contract

22. In respect of paragraph 6.7, please exhibit the internal audit of DaMOP conducted by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and finalised in February 2018.

74. I produce at (exhibit PG/45:) the internal audit of DaMOP dated February 2018.

23. In paragraph 6.14, you state that CBT packages are created to support the development of staff who do not work within a team (usually Station Managers and above). If not already covered in your response to the questions above, please set out the names and details of any CBT packages that had been created by 14 June 2017 in respect of the issues identified below and please confirm that these were available for use by the relevant staff members:

- a. High-rise firefighting including but not limited to a fire breaching compartmentation and/or spreading and the stay put policy;
- b. Flammable and/or combustible building materials;
- c. Other incidents of high-rise fires with spread of fire and breach of compartmentation;
- d. Fire survival guidance;
- e. Evacuation;
- f. Section 7(2)(d) and familiarisation visits;
- g. Lessons learned from the Lakanal House incident.

75. I set out at paragraphs 37 to 43 the names and details of the CBT packages in respect of the issues identified above.

24. In regards to paragraph 6.15, please provide a copy of the Dynamic Risk Assessment (policy familiarisation) training support BPA.

76. Historically there has been no specific training support Best Practice Assessment ("BPA") for Dynamic Risk Assessment. The requirement is simply to familiarise crews with Policy Note 342 'Dynamic Risk Assessment'. I understand the Inquiry have a copy of this policy. I produce at (exhibit PG/46:) Policy Number 620 'Best Practice Assessments', which explains at Appendix 2 that no BPA has been created for Dynamic Risk Assessment and refers watch officers to the guidance within Policy Note 342. However, in accordance with updated PN633, approved on 12 February 2020, new training will be introduced to support dynamic risk assessments on evacuation and mass rescue.

25. *In regards to paragraph 6.16, please set out the dates and details of any of the 12 pump exercises carried out between 2009 and June 2017 which covered high-rise fires and/or multiple FSG and/or evacuation.*
26. *Further, please provide details regarding any 12+ pump exercises that were carried out between 2009 and June 2017 which covered high-rise fires and/or multiple FSG and/or evacuation.*
77. In my role as Assistant Director for Training and Professional Development, I am not responsible for Borough and Service wide exercises and am unable to assist with these requests.
27. *In respect of paragraph 6.26, please provide the following:*
- a. a copy of the initial acquisition training and the annual maintenance training in incident command which is provided to those in the role of crew manager and above as it existed on 14 June 2017;*
78. This is not within my remit as Assistant Director for Training and Professional Development and sits within the Operational Policy and Assurance department. However, in order to assist the Inquiry I produce the following documents at (exhibits PG/47: to PG/64). These documents relate to levels 1 to 4 Incident Command courses for both initial acquisition and maintenance training and include Training Guides which set out the acquisition training for each role. The Materials Information documents for Levels 1 and 2 set out which policies the training covers and which exercises are used. The full set of training materials is voluminous and can be provided on request:

Level 1:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
(PG/47)	Current Level 1 Incident Command Training Materials Information	
(PG/48)	Operational Command Skills Training Guide D	

(PG/49)	Operational Command Skills Training Guide M	
(PG/50)	Operational Command Skills Training Guide – WM	
(PG/51)	TCAP number 0217B 'Operational Command Skills Training Maintenance-Level 1'	
(PG/52)	TCAP number 0216B 'Operational Command Skills Training Development- Level 1'	
(PG/53)	TCAP number 0218 'Operational Command Skills Training Watch Manager- Level 1'	

Level 2:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
(PG/54)	Current Level 2 Incident Command Training Materials Information	
(PG/55)	Tactical Command Skills - Training Guide D	
(PG/56)	Tactical Command Skills - Maintenance Training Guide	
(PG/57)	Tactical Command Skills -	

	GM Training Guide	
(PG/58)	TCAP number 0268B 'Tactical Command Skills Training Maintenance- Level 2'	
(PG/59)	TCAP number 0269 'Level 2 Intermediate Incident Command (Group Manager) TFCSTG- Tactical Fire Command Skills Training GM'	
(PG/60)	TCAP number 0219 'Level 2 Incident Command Booster Course'	

Level 3:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
(PG/61)	TCAP number 0270 'Strategic command skills training: Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (development)	
(PG/62)	TCAP number 0271 'Strategic Command Skills Training MoS: Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (Maintenance)	

Level 4:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
----------------	---------------	---------------

(PG/63)	TCAP number 0222 'Strategic Fire Command Skills Training Maintenance of Skills'	
(PG/64)	TCAP number 0222a 'Strategic Fire Command Skills Training Development and Maintenance of Skills'	

b. documents that explain and detail the progress of the corporate project established in August 2018 to develop a formalised and recognised process to revalidate individuals' competency in incident command skills.

79. The revalidation of Incident Command is a phased approach. In December 2015, the CMB approved a decision to introduce a revalidation process. I understand that the process of this approval, the relevant reports and the phases of the revalidation project will be addressed in a statement provided to the Inquiry by Sabrina Cohen-Hatton. I produce at (exhibit PG/65:) Brigade policy note 954 ("PN954") 'Revalidation of incident command'. The introduction of the revalidation project was disseminated to staff through Managers Update and briefings to all Level 2 officers. On 2 January 2020 a notice was published on the Brigade's Intranet 'Hotwire' in relation to the introduction of revalidation of Incident Command ("RoIC"), accompanied by an explanatory video. The notice contained a reference to PN954 and detailed the following:

'We're introducing Revalidation of Incident Command (RoIC) in January 2020 to provide reassurance that everyone with incident command responsibilities has the required technical and procedural knowledge, along with command skills. This will alternate with refresher training currently in placeRevalidation will be undertaken by all operational staff who have incident command responsibilities:

Level 1 officers- *Leading Firefighter (LFF), Sub Officer (Sub.O), Station Officer (Stn.O)*

Level 2 officers- Station Commander (SC), Group Commander (GC).

Level 3 officers- Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC), and Assistant Commissioner (AC).

It will also apply to those firefighters and officers that have been formally assessed to perform to a higher role.

Revalidation is comprised of:

-A knowledge check, to ensure an officer's technical and procedural knowledge is current and at the appropriate level for the role. This will be in the form of a multiple choice check of 20 questions every two years.

-An incident command exercise (ICE) every two years

- A minimum number of hours spent practising incident command every year (level 2 officers and above) which is to be recorded in the incident command log (ICL).

80. In addition, an article was included in Brigade newsletter 'Shout' (issue 9, November/December 2019) on 'Revalidation of incident command in January'. I produce a copy of 'Shout' at (exhibit PG/66;). The first pilot of the Level 1 revalidation project took place on 27 January 2020. The pilot for Level 2 revalidation is planned to take place in June 2020, with the first course due for delivery in September 2020. The Brigade is in the process of reviewing the revalidation process for levels 3 and 4. I produce the following documents:

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
(PG/67)	Briefing Note for the Strategic Training Oversight Board entitled ' <i>Incident Command Level One & Two Training Course Review</i> '.	
(PG/68)	Project Initiation Document ' <i>Revalidation of Incident Command</i> ' dated 2 April 2019.	

Training Evaluation and Assurance

28. In respect of paragraph 7.1, please provide the following:

a. please detail the training quality assurance and evaluation processes of the training delivery via BTL that were in place between 2012 and June 2017.

81. As explained at paragraph 7.1 of 'How Training Works' all courses in the annual statement of training requirements are audited separately at least once a year by the Brigade and Babcock. Babcock's Quality Assurance team meets with the Brigade's Quality Assurance team on a monthly basis to discuss the results from their internal quality assurance of course content. The Brigade provides data from their audits to Babcock and actions are agreed and closed when deemed completed. The Brigade also has a schedule of unannounced audits for training conducted by Babcock. These unannounced audits are carried out by an auditor within the Brigade's Quality Assurance Team. If the auditor identifies any action required arising from the unannounced audit or from an announced audit, the Brigade will consider what steps are required to ensure the training is fit for purpose. This may result in remedial action to improve areas of identified underperformance or a TCAP where changes to the training are required, including a change of venue. Under the contract with Babcock, Babcock is required to:

- Deploy an evaluation system that enables Level 1 and 2 evaluation to be carried out by sector competent personnel;
- Pass evaluation information to the Brigade upon request and make information available 24 hours after evaluation;
- Ensure the evaluation recording system interfaces with existing ICT infrastructure; and
- Ensure there is a clear feedback loop to the revision of training.

The Brigade is required to:

- Provide feedback on audits carried out by Babcock and undertake second party audits, i.e. sampling the audits carried out by Babcock;
- Observe third party audits, i.e. those done by London Ambulance Service; and
- Approve design updates and attend pilot courses.

82. Again, as set out at paragraph 7.1 of 'How Training Works' the majority of Babcock led training delivery is subject to a formal Level 1 evaluation. Level 1 evaluations are automatically generated by the Learning Management System when a delegate is allocated to a course. The delegate is required to answer a number of questions and the performance data is reviewed by the Brigade and Babcock Quality Assurance teams on a monthly basis and remedial action is taken to improve areas of identified under-performance. The review questions were reviewed in July 2017 with the aim of improving staff engagement and quality of information.
83. The Brigade provide feedback to Babcock from internal quality assurance personnel. I understand that Babcock then add any 'items for concern' to a log which is investigated by the Training Manager at Babcock. Babcock then share any actions and resolutions with the Brigade.
84. Babcock submit a continuous operational improvement plan yearly to the Brigade covering areas for operational improvement for the coming year. The areas are broken down into five sub-areas: Equality & Diversity; Health and Safety; Quality; Risk Management and Environmental Management System ("EMS").

b. In respect of the courses you have identified at paragraph 14 above, please provide the audits and/or evaluations of these courses that were carried out between 2012 and June 2017. Please identify any areas of under-performance that were discovered and please set out any remedial actions that were taken by the Quality Assurance teams of LFB and/or BTL when the performance data for these courses was reviewed.

85. As set out at paragraph 50 the 'Lakanal Training Case Study' CBT package was delivered through a series of face to face sessions to senior officers, under course code OLHICS and as a stand-alone package for use by station based staff. As this was a CBT package, it would not form part of the audit process, instead the course itself would have been subject to quality assurance during development. Operational Assurance Officers would undertake station audits which focused on the Brigade's service standards. This would include a holistic review of training as opposed to a focused audit on an individual training subject.

86. As set out at paragraph 54 above, CBT packages are classed as maintenance of skills training and most have a knowledge test at the end of the training package which records the result on Big Learning and confirms completion for Individual Training Records. Completion of CBT packages was monitored through Area Teams and non-completion was highlighted to Station Managers.

87. In relation to the courses identified at paragraph 55 above, I produce at (exhibit PG/69:) a spreadsheet containing data showing the quality assurance of these courses. The data covers the period 2016 to 2018 as the Incident command courses identified in my response to paragraph 14 of the request commenced in 2016.

29. In respect of paragraph 7.3, please set out:

a. whether any of the Quality Assurance audits undertaken between 2009 and June 2017 identified any issues or need for future improvement in respect of:

vi. High-rise firefighting including but not limited to a fire breaching compartmentation and/or spreading and the stay put policy;

vii. Flammable and/or combustible building materials;

viii. Other incidents of high-rise fires with spread of fire and breach of compartmentation;

ix. Fire survival guidance;

x. Evacuation;

xi. Section 7(2)(d) and familiarisation visits;

xii. Lessons learned from the Lakanal House incident.

b. If the above question is answered in the affirmative, please set out the recommendations that were made for future improvement and to whom and/or which governance board the recommendations were made.

88. I have addressed the response to this question in paragraphs 81 to 84.

30. Please confirm how the LFB appraises officers and where the records of such appraisals are kept.

89. The appraisal process for officers is outside of the remit of my role and sits with People Services.

Continuous Improvement

31. In respect of paragraph 9.4, please provide the following further detail:

- a. A list of the 80 CBT modules that have been created to support firefighting theory and knowledge acquisition and the dates for when each CBT module was available for use;*
- b. Details of how and when the Incident Command training curriculum was aligned with the National Operational Guidance and in what ways it was aligned;*
- c. When was the frequency of Incident Command maintenance of skills training increased and the levels of frequency before it was increased and after it was increased, and to whom did it apply;*
- d. In respect of the last bullet point, please explain:*
 - xiii. what London-specific risks were identified*
 - xiv. what simulation in training has been introduced and when; and*
 - xv. whether any of the simulation in training covers any of the issues regarding high rise firefighting and/or Fire Survival Guidance and/or evacuation.*

90. I produce at (exhibit PG/70:) a spreadsheet setting out the list of the 80 CBT modules and the dates for when each was first made available on the Learning Management System.
91. For clarification the learning types identify the content type. 'Online' refers to the Computer Based Training package; 'Task' refers to a supporting document, for example the training notes or policy document. It should be noted that the Computer Based Training is live and evolving and a number of modules have been updated since first becoming available. All material amendments to modules are requested and approved by the Brigade through the Training Commissioning and Alteration Process. In cases where alterations clearly make no material change to training objectives or processes, an agreed process for course maintenance is followed where Babcock seeks approval from the Brigade and the changes are then made.

92. Requests 31(b) to (d) are outside of my remit and would fall within the remit of the Operational Policy and Assurance department, however in order to assist the Inquiry I set out the information below.
93. Further details as to how the training curriculum was aligned with National Operational Guidance can be found within the individual TCAPs below:
- TCAP216B- Level 1 IC Development
 - TCAP 217B- Level 1 IC Maintenance
 - TCAP218- Level 1 IC Booster
 - TCAP248B- Level 2 SM IC Development
 - TCAP268- Level 2 IC Maintenance
 - TCAP269- Level 2 GM IC
 - TCAP270- Level 3 Strategic Development
 - TCAP271- Level 3 Strategic Maintenance
94. The changes to existing Incident Command courses commenced from late 2015, exact dates for each Incident Command course are found in the relevant TCAPs listed above. Following the changes to the courses the current maintenance of skills is provided by the following courses.
- OFCSTM- Level 1 Maintenance (Crew Manager/Watch Manager)- annually
 - TFCSTM- Level 2 Maintenance (Station Commander/Group Commander)- annually
95. A level 3 course is also now in development, identified as TCAPs 270 and 271 above.
- SFCSTM- Level 3 Maintenance (DAC and above) - this course is still in development and at pilot stage. It is intended that the course be provided annually.
96. A review of the level 3 and level 4 training provision began in December 2019 and was completed in February 2020, with a report on the findings of the review and recommendations for future acquisition training to be completed in March 2020. The delivery of level 3 and level 4 Incident Command and Strategic Response

Arrangements workshops to all level 3 and level 4 officers is planned to be completed over 2020/2021. The delivery of quarterly one day level 3 and level 4 CPD training is due to commence in Q2 as scheduled and will continue from then on in each quarter.

97. I produce at (exhibit PG/71:) a table showing the prior frequency of Incident Command maintenance of skills training. The TCAPs listed in paragraph 93 of this statement identify when frequency changes took place. Prior to the change, the expectation for the frequency of maintenance courses was as follows:

- FCSKTD – Level 1 every two years (CM & WM)
- OISEOT – Level 2 every two years (Station & Group Managers) delivered with;
- OIICAS – Level 2 every two years (Station & Group Managers)
- OIMICE – Every two years alternate to above two for all Level 2 every two years (Station & Group Managers)
- OIPOEX – All DAC and above every two years

98. In response to request 31(d), the simulation exercises are based on addresses and locations across London. The exercises serve an incident type and would simulate common hazards, risks and planning considerations. I have produced at exhibit PG/47 and PG/54 two spreadsheets which identify all simulation exercises and the policies they relate to with regard to high-rise firefighting and fire survival guidance. There is no definitive evacuation simulation exercise.

Governance

32. In respect of paragraph 10.3, please explain which relevant representatives from the LFB and BTL meet regularly and how often meetings are held. Further, please provide the minutes of these meetings between 2012 and June 2017.

99. I understand that the minutes of the meetings have already been provided to the Inquiry (reference GTIRT19-03733 to GTIRT19-03762).

100. These meetings were held by the Contract Strategy Board (“CSB”). I understand the Terms of Reference for the CSB have previously been provided to the Inquiry

(reference GTIRT19-03732). Membership of the Board was a mix of Brigade and Babcock staff as follows:

Brigade

- Head of Learning and Development & HR Strategy (Chair)- Peter Groves. The title of this post changed to Head of Learning & Development & HR strategy between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2016.) DAC Kevin Hughes was Head of Learning & Development Strategy (1 February 2012 to 31 December 2014)
- Head of Training Assurance- Peter Groves (1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013); Jackie Adams- Bonitto (from 1 April 2014)
- Personal Development Manager- Angela Hale (11 April 2011 to 31 March 2017). The title changed to Learning & Development Manager and then back to Personal Development Manager during this time
- Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Central Operations- Mick Ellis (a April 2012 to 12 February 2016); Adrian Fenton (from 1 March 2016)
- Contracts Administration & Finance Manager- Jonathan Reid (from 5 March 2012), This post was regarded and renamed Head of Commercial Contracts Management on 1 July 2017

Babcock

- Brigade Contract Director
- Head of Delivery
- Head of Training Design and Development

101. The attendees at individual meetings are provided in the minutes. Meetings of the CSB began in July 2016. The CSB was superseded by the Strategic Training Oversight Board ("STOB") and the Training Committee. The Training Committee was established in November 2018. The Strategic Training Oversight Board sets the priorities of the organisation with regard to training across the organisation. This committee was established in June 2019.

33. In respect of paragraph 10.5, please provide copies of the quarterly Training Update report produced between 2012 and June 2017.

102. I produce at (exhibits PG/72: to PG/104:) an index file and 32 of the quarterly Training Update reports.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Title	GTI Reference
PG/72	Index to Quarterly Training Update reports	
PG/73	12-CMB11 – Training contract Babcock performance Q1 2012-13	
PG/74	FEP 1967 – Training contract – Babcock performance Q1 2012-13	
PG/75	FEP1994 – Training contract Babcock performance Q2 2012-13	
PG/76	13-CMB013 – Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2012-13	
PG/77	FEP2047 – Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2012-13	
PG/78	13-CMB084 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2012-13	
PG/79	FEP2102 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2012-13	
PG/80	13-CMB116 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2013-14	
PG/81	FEP2140 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2013-14	
PG/82	13-CMB144 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2013-14	
PG/83	FEP2154 Training Contract –	

	Babcock performance Q2 2013-14	
PG/84	14-CMB032 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2013-14	
PG/85	FEP2232 - Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2013-14	
PG/86	14-CMB107 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2013-14	
PG/87	FEP2284 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2013-14	
PG/88	14-CMB130 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2014-15	
PG/89	FEP2320 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2014-15	
PG/90	14-CMB156 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2014-15	
PG/91	FEP2346 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q2 2014-15	
PG/92	15-CMB041 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2014-15	
PG/93	FEP2422 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q3 2014-15	
PG/94	15-CMB077 - Training Contract – Babcock performance Q4 2014-15	
PG/95	FEP2473 Training Contract –	

	Babcock performance Q4 2014-15	
PG/96	15-CMB114 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2015-16	
PG/97	FEP2507 Training Contract – Babcock performance Q1 2015-16	
PG/98	Training contract: Babcock's performance – Quarters 1 and 2 2015/16	
PG/99	Training Contract: Babcock's performance – Quarters 1 and 2 2015/16	
PG/100	Training contract: Babcock's performance – second half 2015-16	
PG/101	Training contract: Babcock's performance – Second half of 2015/16	
PG/102	Training contract: Babcock's performance – first half of 2016/17	
PG/103	Training contract: Babcock's performance – first half of 2016/17	
PG/104	Training contract: Babcock's performance – second half of 2016/17	

Independent Review of Training

34. If known, please provide details as to when the independent review of operational training is due to be completed.

103. The final report was presented to the Commissioner's Board on 9 October 2019, shared with the Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience on 15 October 2019 and was made available to the public via the Greater London Authority website on 16 October 2019.

Tactical Decision Exercises

35. Can you provide the following details regarding Tactical Decision Exercises:

- a. What are they*
- b. How they are devised*
- c. Who devises them*
- d. Who evaluates them*
- e. How they are recorded*
- f. How they are disseminated across staff in the LFB*

36. In your role as Head of Development and Training, are you aware of any Tactical Decision Exercises that were created to cover any of the issues set out below between 2009 and June 2017:

- a. High-rise firefighting including but not limited to a fire breaching compartmentation and spreading and the stay put policy;*
- b. Fire survival guidance;*
- c. Evacuation;*
- d. Lesson learned from the Lakanal House fire*

104. I do not deal with Tactical Decision Exercises within the remit of my role, instead these exercises fall under the remit of the Operational Policy and Assurance department.

37. In your role as Head of Development and Training, or in any previous role within the LFB, were you aware of the Tactical Decision Exercise about FSG that was created by SM Peter Johnson? In that regard, your attention is drawn to p.5 of SM

Johnson's witness statement and pp.217-234 of the transcript of evidence on 4 September 2018.

105. In my role as Head of Development and Training and in any previous role I am not aware of the FSG TDE created by SM Peter Johnson.

Integrated Personal Development System- Code of Practice

38. Please set out your understanding of:

- a. If and how the LFB apply, and have historically applied, the four principles set out in the "Integrated Personal Development System- Code of Practice" drafted by the Department of Communities and Local Government (as it then was) in February 2008;*
- b. Please provide any documents that assist your understanding.*

106. The Training and Development department are responsible for one of the four principles within the Integrated Personal Development System, principle 3. Responsibility for the remaining principles is as follows:

- Principle 1- Define the jobs that need to be done to deliver the IRMP- People Services Lead
- Principle 2- Select the right people to do those jobs- People Services Lead
- Principle 4- Ensure that they continue to perform effectively- People Services Lead.

107. 'How Training Works' sets out how the Brigade apply Principle 3- 'Train and develop them to do their job competently'.

Exhibits

39. In respect of PG4 and PG5, you have exhibited policies that post-date the Grenfell Tower fire. Please exhibit the policies that were in force on 14 June 2017.

108. I produce at (exhibit PG/105:) the version of policy note 698 that was in force on 14 June 2017 and at (exhibit PG/106:) the version of policy note 812 that was in force on 14 June 2017.

Other rule 9 requests

109. I have been asked to address a number of issues raised in rule 9 requests from the Inquiry sent to other member of the Brigade or former members of the Brigade. It was felt that I was better placed to answer these requests and I do so as follows:

110. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to Gary Reason dated 7 October 2019. Within that request I am advised Mr Reason was asked the following:

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.

111. I produce at (exhibit PG/107) a report entitled 'Future Options for Training (FoFT)- Project Closure Report' which was presented to the CMB on 6 March 2013. This report sets out the project objective, the departments involved in the project and the project outcome. I also produce at (exhibit PG/108:) the Project Initiation Document dated 1 September 2009. This document sets out the background, context and scope of the project and the individuals and stakeholders involved. The Inquiry has previously been provided with a report to the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority dated 24 July 2008 entitled 'Training and Development- Future Options' exhibited to my first statement as exhibit PG/2.

112. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to Mark Gurney dated 15 November 2019. Within that request I am advised that Mr Gurney was asked the following:

1. The MP4 exhibited at MWG/1 is a video recording of the Lakanal House Case Study ("the Case Study") playing on a computer. At times this format impacts the

quality of the audio. Does the LFB hold the native MP4 (or similar file) of the Case Study? If so please disclose this file.

2a. If not, please explain what software the Case Study utilises, and why it cannot be disclosed in its native format, or in an MP4 file.

Question 2b. If not, provide either a PowerPoint or collection of screenshots of each 'slide' or 'segment' of the training package. In order to capture the essence of a particular segment, more than one screenshot may be required. Please use your discretion in deciding how many screenshots are required, bearing in mind that this document is designed to assist the Chairman and the CPs in understanding the content of the Case Study.

Question 2c: If not, please provide a verbatim transcript of the Case Study's audio.

113. I am unaware of the software the Case Study utilises. I have requested this information from Babcock and at the time of making this statement have not received a response to that request. In addition I have requested a Powerpoint of the training package. The Brigade do not hold a verbatim transcript of the Case Study's audio.

114. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to the Brigade dated 23 October 2019. Within that request I am advised that the Inquiry requested the following:

4. Please detail any policies, training, or other brigade-disseminated materials in place as at 14 June 2017 which relate to the use of radios or other communications equipment (particularly in high rise buildings), and any planning or preparations for the same. In respect of each, please:

- (a) Provide copies of the materials in question;*
- (b) Set out the individuals, groups, boards, committees, or departments involved in, or responsible for, the creation and/or dissemination of the materials;*
- (c) Explain when the materials were disseminated, and to whom they were sent;*

(d) Explain whether any actions were taken to ensure that these materials were acknowledged and/or being followed by staff.

5. Please identify any policies, training, or other brigade-disseminated materials in place as at 14 June 2017 which identify and/or consider the possible difficulties with, or failures of, communications equipment in operational environments, and how such problems may be overcome or mitigated. In respect of each, please:

- (a) Provide copies of the materials in question;*
- (b) Set out the individuals, groups, boards, committees, or departments involved in, or responsible for, the creation and/or dissemination of the materials;*
- (c) Explain when the materials were disseminated, and to whom they were sent;*
- (d) Explain whether any actions were taken to ensure that these materials were acknowledged and/or being followed by staff.*

115. I am able to respond to this request in respect of training. The following training is provided as part of the Firefighter Development ("FFD") course. The response is divided into two parts:

- i. Initial acquisition face to face training by Babcock
- ii. Initial acquisition online learning

Initial acquisition training is the term used for the training of those new to the role and in development. The training outlined below includes training that has communications equipment as either the primary focus or that covers communications equipment generally.

Firefighter Development face to face training

BA008P Telemetry Exercise

116. This is a practical activity facilitated by Babcock trainers for FFD delegates. The objectives of this session are:

- Demonstrate how to test an Entry Control Board (“ECB”)- means of managing BA wearers
- Demonstrate how to change the time/date on an ECB
- Demonstrate how to log a BA wearer on/off the ECB
- Demonstrate how to manually log a BA wearer on/off the ECB
- Explain the information available on an ECB and demonstrate how it can be accessed
- Explain the communication that can occur between the ECB and BA wearer
- Demonstrate the withdrawal of a BA team in an emergency situation using the selective or evacuate all buttons

BA018C- Communications Equipment

117. This is a practical activity facilitated by Babcock trainers for Firefighter Development delegates. The objectives for this session are:

- Demonstrate correct roving of the Breathing Apparatus Radio Interface Equipment (“BARIE”) to a BA set (wearing BARIE in conjunction with breathing apparatus provides the wearer with an enhanced level of audibility for both transmission and reception of communications.)
- Demonstrate correct Don and Start procedure when using BARIE
- Demonstrate the correct use of a handheld radio and BARIE set
- Demonstrate how to send messages using correct radio terminology

BA020P- Search and Rescue (Comms)

118. This session is a practical activity facilitated by Babcock trainers for Firefighter Development delegates. The objectives of this session are:

- Demonstrate the correct use of a handheld radio and BARIE set
- Demonstrate how to send messages using correct radio terminology
- Demonstrate correct stage 1 ECO procedures
- Demonstrate correct don, start up, and close down procedures

- Demonstrate accurate and thorough search procedures and safe movement in restricted visibility
- Demonstrate correct actions when a casualty is found and safe casualty handling
- Demonstrate correct procedure for door entry and accurate landmarking
- Demonstrate effective communication and teamwork
- Demonstrate effective air management
- Demonstrate mutual exchange of air
- Demonstrate situational awareness and operational risk assessment
- Demonstrate working to a brief and effectively debriefing the task
- Demonstrate the correct procedure for testing a BA set

Firefighter Development Course Online Learning (Individual)

BA 004 Wearers Guidance

119. This online learning module includes:

- Checking telemetry signal regularly and taking appropriate action when out of signal (i.e. contacting ECP via radio communication)
- BA team leader's role in deciding whether to continue to carry out operations should radio communications with the ECP fail recognising that a BA emergency team may be committed to investigate
- BA team leader's role in ensuring that in the event of loss of both telemetry and radio communication simultaneously the BA team will withdraw and inform entry control.

BA 007 Entry Control

120. The areas covered in this online module include:

- Breathing Apparatus ECB
- BA Communications Operative (Comms- Op)
- The positive indication available that a telemetry signal connection exists between the ECB and BA set

- Feature of time elapsed from loss of signal from a logged on BA set to the ECB
- ECO role in entering BA tallies into ECB ensuring telemetry signal is achieved
- ECO role in monitoring the telemetry signal displayed on the ECB
- ECO role in making immediate radio contact with any BA team(s) when loss of telemetry signal is identified to confirm the safety and wellbeing of the team and, if radio contact fails, inform the person responsible for the ECP and commit a BA emergency team to investigate. The Incident Commander (IC) or Sector Commander (SC) must consider if circumstances require a 'Firefighter Emergency' to be declared
- ECO role if telemetry signal loss is prolonged and cannot be re-established (BA team welfare has been confirmed by radio contact), the ECO must inform the IC/SC who shall consider deploying telemetry repeaters or leaky feeder
- ECO role in requesting regular gauge checks from wearers where there is a signal loss due to an obstruction or being out of range and that the ECO should inform the IC or Sector Commander, so they can consider the use of repeaters and/or leaky feeder
- Details of actions to take if the ECB fails.

BA 008 BA Entry Control- Telemetry

121. This online module covers:

- The Telemetry ECB
- ECB- Sleep mode
- Logging On
- ECB- Monitoring
- ECB Communication- Emergency Evacuation Signal
- ECB- Logging Off
- ECB- Testing
- Telemetry Repeater and Leaky Feeder
- The ECB feature which displays time elapsed since loss of telemetry signal to a BA set

- Where there is a signal loss due to an obstruction or being out of range, the ECO should inform the IC or sector commander who should consider the use of repeaters and or leaky feeder to restore the signal
- Requirement for manual log off of ECB if there is a permanent loss of telemetry signal
- Use of repeater units to provide a means of minimising the risk of transmission loss between the ECB and the BA set
- Indications on ECB if there is a loss of telemetry signal between the ECB and the BA set
- Use of repeaters and leaky feeder reels to restore a lost telemetry signal due to range
- Methods of deployment of repeaters

BA017 Emergency Procedures

122. This online module covers:

- Emergency Procedures
- Distress Signals
- Entrapped Procedure
- Emergency Exchange of Air
- Cable Entanglement

BA018 BA Communications Equipment

123. This online module covers:

- BA Communications Equipment
- Entel HT981 incident ground radio
- Entel HT981 Battery
- BARIE
- Allocation and Stowage
- Fitting BARIE to Breathing Apparatus
- Incident ground Radio Channels
- Incident ground Radio Use

- Testing, Care and Maintenance
- Circumstances when a handheld radio can be used when a BARIE set is unavailable

OP 004 Incident Command

124. This online course covers:

- Before the incident
- En route
- Actions on arrival
- The Incident Commander
- The Decision Making Model
- Issuing and receiving orders
- Command Support
- Initial Command Pump (including the role of the Command Pump Officer in using a hand held radio to maintain contact with the IC)
- Command Unit
- The Forward Information Board ("FIB")
- Senior Officer Specialists
- Sectorisation at Incidents
- Tactical Mode

OP006 Firefighting in Basements

125. This online module covers:

- Hazards associated with basement fires (including information on the reduced effectiveness of radio communication below ground)
- Basement Openings
- Information Gathering (including information of how gathered information should be passed back promptly using radio communications)
- Fighting the Fire (including information on how if there are problems with radio communications it may be necessary to use a leaky feeder or for BA teams to relay messages)

OP 007 High Rise Procedure

126. This online module covers:

- Hazards and operational considerations
- Features associated with high rise buildings
- High rise procedure (including information on how hand-held radios and fire telephones should be used for communication between staff working on different floors)
- Sectors

OP015 Fixed Installations

127. This online module covers:

- Automatic fire alarms
- Automatic sprinklers
- Drenchers
- Water Spray Projectors
- Rising mains
- Fixed installation hose reels
- Fire lifts (including information on how the lift operative must closely monitor radio traffic to ensure that the lift is used to greatest effect when required at either the Bridgehead or ground floor)
- Foam inlets
- Roller shutters (fusible link)
- Extinguishing systems that do not use water

128. The Brigade issued two radio communication training support packages aimed at senior officers and station based staff as part of Operational News 36 dated February 2019. The training packages cover radio equipment and usage and messages. To supplement these training packages, which are mandatory for all operational staff, the Brigade is in the process of training its cadre of Operational Review Team (“ORT”) officers to become Airwave Tactical Advisers. To become an Airwave Tactical Advisor the ORT

are required to attend the National College of Policing who deliver this accredited training course to all agencies that utilise Airwave technology.

129. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to the Brigade dated 8 November 2019. Within that request I am advised that the Inquiry requested the following:

5. In relation to any express lift key models purchased/used by the LFB, please set out (enclosing and exhibiting any relevant documentation):

d. any instructions or training provided to firefighters on the use of such keys.

130. There is no specific training on the use of express lift keys. The Core Skills e-learning module OP 012 of the Firefighter Development ("FFD") Programme deals with 'Passenger Lifts' and at 'Section 4- on arrival' states that lift keys should be taken into the building at a lift incident. As part of the 7(2)(d) training package, crews are reminded that they should note the location of the lift, identify if the lift is a firefighting or fireman's lift and note the location of the lift machinery room and the type of lift mechanism.

7. Have there been any changes to the (a) models of express keys used by LFB or (b) procedures associated with their use since the Grenfell Tower fire?

131. I have been asked to provide a response to question 7(b). There have been no changes to the procedures associated with the use of express lift keys since the Grenfell Tower fire.

132. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to Andrew Roe dated 7 October 2019. Within that request I am advised that the Inquiry requested the following:

9. In paragraph 42, you refer to two training packages which you exhibit as AR/6 and AR/7. You state that you are referring to these two packages "by way of example":

(i) Please state, in relation to each training package, the name of the individual(s) who produced and delivered the training, and when this was first provided to personnel

133. I am advised that exhibit AR/6 is the Powerpoint presentation on High Rise Incidents- Standard Training Support Package ("STSP") dated 26 September 2014. I am advised that AR/7 is the Lakanal House Case Study training package MP4.

134. In relation to AR/6 I understand the individuals who produced the STSP were:

- Phil Evans
- Adam Campbell
- Roger Nicholls
- Craig Carter
- Geoff Chapman
- Stuart Grout
- Stuart Bowles
- Kevin Woodhouse

135. As the STSP was computer based it sat under the Training Support icon which could be accessed by staff to complete the training, rather than the training being delivered.

136. In relation to AR/7 I produce TCAP 0153 *'Lakanal Training Case Study'* at exhibit PG/9. The TCAP explains who was involved in the production of the Lakanal House Case Study Training Package. TCAP 0153 *'Lakanal Training Case Study'* resulted in the Computer Based Training package being developed. As set out at paragraph 42 the *'Lakanal Training Case Study'* CBT package was developed and issued as mandatory training for all operational staff in 2014 and delivered through a series of face to face sessions to senior officers, under course code OLHICS and as a stand-alone package for use by station based staff. The package was made available with two distinct pathways and delegates were required to choose the package applicable to their role (i.e. station based staff or senior officer) and to complete the relevant package. The relevant training materials resulting from TCAP 0153 were uploaded to Big Learning, the Learning Management System ("LMS") on the following dates:

- Lakanal House Case Study and Online Learning Module – 8 April 2014
- Training Guide- 4 June 2014
- Timeline, Script and E-learning script- 4 June 2014

137. I understand that a further request for evidence was sent to Dave Brown dated 7 October 2019. Within that request I am advised Dave Brown was asked the following:

6. At paragraphs 22 and 69 to 79 of your statement you deal with the inquest recommendations for which you were responsible.

b) As to action 4a, paragraph 78 and the corresponding action in the Report, please explain how often it was envisaged that staff would need to be reminded of revised fire survival guidance practices. Please also explain how often it would be expected that watches were required to review PN 790.

138. There was no specific requirement around the frequency of review of PN790. However, the following 'Operational News' publications contained a mandatory requirement that Watches review PN790:

- Operational News 24- March 2013
- Operational News 27- June 2014
- Operational News 37- August 2019

139. It is now an annual requirement that watches review PN790.

c) As to actions 4b and 4c, paragraph 78 and the corresponding action in the Report:

(i) Please exhibit a copy of the training commissioning document;

140. I produce at exhibit PG/109 TCAP 0143, 'Awareness of Brigade Control's FSG procedures and practices'.

(ii) Please explain what steps were taken to introduce the training after the commissioning document was produced;

141. On 2 September 2014, there was a communication to all staff from Dave Brown requesting completion of the packages by 30 November 2014. The communication specified that completion of the training had to be recorded in the Station Diary.

(iii) Please exhibit a copy of the computer-based training package that was developed;

142. I produce at (exhibit PG/110:) the Computer Based Training package 'Brigade Control FSG Procedures and Practices' for Senior Officers. I produce at (exhibit PG/111:) the Computer Based Training package 'Brigade Control FSG Procedures and Practices' for station-based staff.

(iv) Please explain who created the computer-based training package;

143. Control have an Operations Support Team ("OST") who have a remit for training. The training packages set out in paragraph 142 were initially developed by OST, aligning the package to Fire Service Circular 10/93. Upon award of the contract, the package content was delivered to Babcock to finalise as CBT. The final content for approval was completed by Vic Bagnelle within OST and the dates provided from Individual Training Records (as set out in paragraph 145) identify that Vic Bagnelle used the packages three times prior to official launch by Dave Brown (as discussed in paragraph 141).

(v) Please explain how often it was envisaged that watches would need to complete the training package;

144. As detailed within section 4.6 of the TCAP it was envisaged that the training package be available on Big Learning so it could be accessed as part of ongoing training whenever an individual or watch identified a training need.

(vi) Please explain when watches completed the training package; and

145. I produce at exhibit (PG/112:) a spreadsheet showing when individuals completed the training package. The data in the spreadsheet is taken from Individual Training Records.

(vii) Please explain the purpose of your role in monitoring the total numbers of those undertaking the initial training and please outline your discussion with DACs.

146. This was a question asked of Dave Brown, however, for clarity, I had no role in monitoring the total numbers of those undertaking the initial training. This was the responsibility of the Area DAC.

12. As to paragraph 59, please explain how the training package for Incident Commanders was reviewed and enhanced. Further, please exhibit a copy of the training package for Incident Commanders.

147. I am advised that at paragraph 59 of Dave Brown's statement dated 29 January 2019 he states:

'In addition to the training provided for firefighters the LFB provided specific training to Incident Commanders, through its training provider, Babcock. The LFB training package for Incident Commanders was reviewed and enhanced following the rule 43 recommendations from the Coroner.'

148. As set out at paragraph 12 above, a new suite of incident command courses were developed through the TCAP process. TCAP 0124 *'Enhanced Incident Command Training based on Lakanal Inquests Rule 43 recommendations'* is produced at exhibit PG/10. Following the Coroner's recommendation, a review was undertaken by the Brigade and Babcock to establish whether the existing IC training addressed the specific elements highlighted by the Coroner. The new suite of courses included the Blackwall and Holcroft House exercises. Both exercises were designed to incorporate the focus areas highlighted by the Coroner, including situational awareness of changing circumstances, anticipation of fire behaviour inconsistent with the compartmentation principle and awareness of risk to those above and adjacent to the fire flat, although only the Holcroft House exercise was ever used in training. All extant courses were subject to review. The outcome of the review led to some courses being discontinued and new courses being introduced in April 2016 and again in April 2017. The Lakanal House Case Study was developed and issued as mandatory training for all operational staff in 2014 and again incorporated the Coroner's recommendations. I have produced a

list of the training packages material at (exhibit PG/47: and exhibit PG/54:
) and can provide copies of those materials required on request.

149. I am advised that a further request for evidence was sent to Peter Cowup dated 26 September 2019. Within that request I am advised that the Inquiry requested the following:

45. The flowchart in Appendix 3 refers to the need to, at this stage in the process, "liaise with Training and Professional Development department (T&PC) and Babcock (through T&PD) to review/agree training options." This is not referred to in your report. Please state:

(i) Whether the Training and Professional Development department and/or Babcock were consulted in order to consider training options as part of the review of PN633 in 2015, and

(ii) If so, what training options were discussed, agreed and implemented

150. Both the Learning and Development Strategy Team and Babcock were consulted in relation to PN633 in 2013.

The Future of Training

151. As set out within 'How Training Works', the Brigade has a continuous process of review and is always looking to learn and improve practices and procedures. In relation to training, the focus is on the effectiveness of current training, the systems in place to ensure maintenance of skills, the recording of training, the quality assurance processes to ensure fitness for purpose and whether the current training provision is adaptive to future demands. As part of this review and in order to bring about continuous improvement, the Brigade proposes to:

- Deliver the recommendations of the independent review of training;
- Develop, improve and maintain core skills for all operational staff;
- Undertake a review of the existing training contract with external training providers;
- Deliver a restructured, repositioned training function;

- Develop and deliver an organisational training needs analysis;
- Deliver the training programme to revalidate incident commanders and drivers; and
- Design and deliver a new suite of leadership development programmes.

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: P. GROVES

Print Name: PETER GROVES

Dated: 05.03.2020