

Babcock International Group

Notes of February Incident Command Review Project Board Meeting

Date: 2 February 2016

Present: LFB

Dany Cotton - Director of Safety and Assurance
 Sabrina Cohen Hatton – Deputy Assistant Commissioner Personal Development (SCH)
 Graham Ellis - Deputy Assistant Commissioner Operational Assurance (GE)
 Rachel Wetheridge - Personal Development (RW)
 Laurie Kenny – Group Manager Personal Development (LK)

Babcock

Cara Kelly – Design Operations Manager (CK)
 Doug Massey - Continuous Improvement Team (DM)
 Mark Gurney - Continuous Improvement Team (MG)
 Steve Gellard - Training Manager Incident Command (SG)

General	Action
1	Apologies for absence were received from Alistair Cumming and Dean Johns.
2	<p>Feedback from the Level 1 (Maintenance) training courses (19, 26 & 27 Jan)</p> <p>GE detailed the following concerns with regard to the pilot that he observed on 19th January:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * <u>XVR Graphics - GE explained that the graphics didn't accurately represent UK / London scenes, in particular left hand drive vehicles. The "Level Crossing RTC" exercise depicted a computer generated street scene from a European environment, with level crossing barriers as they would be in a left hand drive country with vehicles on the right hand side of the road. The graphics of LFB officers did not conform to LFB requirements of uniform / incident ground identification for role. It is vital that candidates see the correct depictions of uniform / tabbards etc in order to reinforce positive learning outcomes.</u> * <u>European style architecture and lack of IC tabbards. In another pilot XVR (basement fire), the building depicted was not typical of London architectural style and the scene looked European.</u> <p>CK explained that Babcock were currently working with XVR to develop two virtual environments that contain buildings and scenes that will enable all of the prioritised L1 and L2 Incident Command risks, identified by LFB to be created. Part of the brief for this work with XVR is to 'Londonise' these environments within the limitations of XVR.</p> <p>It was agreed that Babcock will share some images (currently in development by XVR) with LFB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * <u>Risk Critical Procedures - GE explained that specific procedures may be missed by delegates and or trainers when following the trainer guide prompts. For example the implementation of a BA Emergency Team was not covered when looking at whether a delegate had implemented safe systems of work. The "Hot Seated" candidate failed to consider an emergency team, despite committing BA crews to a basement fire. This is of great concern. In a facilitated feedback, none of the other three candidates mentioned and emergency team. The facilitator also failed to highlight the risk critical issue, and emphasise the fundamental importance of safety teams for all compartment fire / basement firefighting. This was recently featured as the lead article in LFB OPs News.</u>

CK to source and email images.

LFB (LK and LD) to generate a list of risk critical items for the scenarios currently being used. Babcock will consider risk critical elements associated with each of the training scenarios being

Babcock International Group
Notes of February Incident Command Review Project Board Meeting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the "Level Crossing RTC" pilot, again risk critical elements of an effective response were missed by candidates and not highlighted / discussed by the facilitator. The injects told the candidate that there were 40 passengers on the train, but there was no consideration of making contact with passengers / assessing passenger injuries or devising a plan to rescue / escort them from the train. The candidates left the session without this being highlighted. This is not acceptable, and was a wasted opportunity to emphasise risk critical messages associated with attending such a special service incident. <p>The group discussed the benefits of introducing a Risk Critical checklist for each scenario; this checklist could be ratified by both the facilitating trainer and the trainer in the control room to add extra resilience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difference in facilitation methods - GE explained that in the pods he observed the trainers used the observing delegates to carry out tasks to support the IC i.e. using the white board to make records of resources deployed etc. GE felt that this detracts from the experience for the observing delegates. <p>It was agreed that the lights in the scenario pods will be dimmed to encourage focus on the incident and that during the scenario the observing delegates will not be given any tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Messages - The importance of ensuring that the 'hot seated' delegate formulates messages during the scenarios. Asking another candidate to compose the messages gives the hot seated candidate a get out. We expect WMs to prepare and send timely messages when under pressure at incidents, and we must expect them to do the same in training sessions. <p>SCH added the following feedback with regard to the pilot that she observed on 26th January:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of Situational Awareness - That it would be beneficial for trainers to have a list of example questions for the three levels of situational awareness, for use during scenario freeze-framing to encourage delegates to explore their perception, comprehension and projection of the situation. Decision Controls - That the trainers weren't using Decision Controls. <p>It was discussed that with reference to the Decision Controls, trainers would benefit from some further input on this subject and how best it can be implemented into the training.</p>	<p>developed for</p> <p>L1. LFB SMEs will then be available to discuss these and agree the key elements for each scenario. Babcock will then develop this into a checklist for trainers.</p> <p>SG to inform all trainers of this.</p>
2a	<p>Babcock Feedback</p> <p>DM shared the feedback that Babcock had generated from the delegates on the initial three pilot courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% positive in terms of trainer and training content. Issues were raised by delegates in relation to venue travel distance and parking availability. Some delegates also reported that they felt that four scenarios in one day was mentally tiring. 	

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Babcock International Group
Notes of February Incident Command Review Project Board Meeting

	<p>Discussions followed relating to the delegate numbers (which determines the number of scenarios). CK explained that within the current TUs there is no capacity to increase the trainer numbers and that if LFB want to reduce the delegate numbers per course, their SoTR will increase which will have a commercial impact.</p> <p>It was agreed to leave the delegate numbers and scenarios as is. As more feedback is gathered this issue may be re-looked at in the future. It was also agreed that the JIs will be amended to inform delegates that the course times are 09:30 to 18:30.</p>	
3/4	<p>Fit to train & Human Factors – Trainer Training update</p> <p>SG and RW updated the meeting that LFB are adding the following to the FTT matrix:</p> <p>Human Factors Training</p> <p>Operational News</p> <p>LFB Revalidation</p> <p>In addition CK informed the meeting that Babcock are trying to identify dates within the current Incident Command training schedule to have the second session of Human Factors training.</p> <p>In light of some of the discussions held at the meeting it was agreed that if two dates could be identified for this training it would be beneficial for the Human Factors training to be open for relevant LFB members to attend and for additional slots to be identified within the two days for some joint information sharing with Babcock IC trainers and LFB ORT and potentially for an input on the three levels of situational awareness and decision controls, to alleviate some of the concerns raised in the pilot observations.</p> <p>It was also agreed that on a quarterly or six monthly basis Babcock IC trainer training sessions should be extended to LFB ORT to ensure that organisational trends, recent events and relevant procedures are being highlighted in IC training and that trends identified in training are being shared with LFB.</p>	<p>SG and CK to identify dates and liaise with GE and SCH re LFB availability.</p> <p>SG to liaise with GE to determine dates and nominated ORT officers.</p>

Babcock International Group
Notes of February Incident Command Review Project Board Meeting

5	<p>Level 1 e-Learning – design and development update</p> <p>CK informed the meeting that the Level 1 IC e-learning development is on track to be ready for the new Level 1 Watch Manager Development course scheduled for 14 March 2016. This e-learning would also then be available for all Level 1 Incident Commanders.</p> <p>CK informed the group that the IC training team will have iPads with the knowledge profile reference material pre-loaded, for use during the courses.</p> <p>Issues with delegates attempting to print the knowledge profile document at station were also discussed (the document is 2000 pages approx.).</p>	
6/7/8	<p>Level 1 XVR incident scenarios – design and development - update</p> <p>Level 1 (Development) – design and development update</p> <p>Level 1 (WM Development (Booster)) – design and development update</p> <p>DM informed the meeting that the L1 WM Development course will be ready for go live by 14 March 2016. The initial courses will utilise 8 scenarios and these are currently in development.</p> <p>These scenarios will also be part of the suite of scenarios available for the maintenance and the CM development course. (Aim: 32 scenarios developed to run Level 1 Development course).</p> <p>SG informed the meeting that work is continuing to identify venues for the practical scenarios to run over two days of the L1 Development Course, currently there are issues with TA centres as they will not allow water to be used at their sites. Babcock are exploring the possibility of using the yard at Plaistow and Harrow fire stations.</p> <p>Babcock raised that the scope of these exercises is still unclear. DC confirmed that LFB will write a scope / outcomes for these practical exercises asap and share with Babcock.</p>	<p>LFB (LK LD) to write scope for L1 Development Practical Exercises.</p>

Babcock International Group
Notes of February Incident Command Review Project Board Meeting

9	<p>Level 2, 3&4 - update</p> <p>It was agreed that the maintenance programme for IC Levels 2, 3 and 4 will follow the same format as that implemented for Level 1 IC.</p> <p>Yearly maintenance requirement, alternating between coaching / mentoring and assessment of performance each year.</p> <p>It was also agreed that a further meeting to discuss the status and progression of IC L2, 3 and 4 will be set up.</p>	LFB to set up meeting for L2,3,4 IC
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>N/A</p>	