

LONDON RESILIENCE PARTNERSHIP LRCG EMERGENCY PLAN STRUCTURED DEBRIEF REPORT

Incident:	Grenfell Tower Fire
Date of Incident:	14 June 2017
Date of Debrief:	19 July 2018
Debrief Location:	Prospero House, 241 Borough High Street, London, SE1 1GA
Debrief Team:	Facilitator: Steve North Digital Scribe Sophie Huthwaite

Debrief Participants:	No	Name	Incident Role	Organisation
		5	Glen Sebright	
	1	Richard Mountford		National Health Service England
	2	Andrew Pike		NW London Collaboration of CGs
	4	Hamish Cameron		London Resilience group
	9	Terry Leach		Maritime & Coastguard Agency
	7	James Odling-smee		London Councils

	6	Angie Patton		London Ambulance Service	
	3	Sam Wickes		Metropolitan Police Service	
	8	Robin Campbell		Westminster City Council	
	10				
	11				
	12				
	13				
		Jeremy Reynolds	None	LRG Observer	
		Fiona Mair	None	LRG Observer	
	<p>Debrief Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Participants were informed of the ethics of the debrief process ➤ For purposes of cross-referencing comments, participants have been allocated a number ➤ The structured debrief will allow each participant the opportunity to reflect on their respective organisation's involvement at strategic level in the incident. The key issues around what went well, aspects for improvement, and recommendations will be discussed based on the protocol section headings. 				

Item 1: Alert systems/activation

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
The right parties were in contact early on during the incident; almost immediately (although this not as per the plan)		5	
Conference calls took place and worked well.		6	3,6,4
There was a good understanding of who to contact during the incident.		5	7,6,4,3
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
First alert system not used immediately		5	6,4,3
Secretariat support		4	4,6,3
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	What's app included in plan.	6	5, 1,4
2.	Discussion about Maritime & Coast guard agency (MCA) membership being included in the first alert/cascade system and any other agencies that may currently be missing from it. Which stakeholders to be included in the first teleconference.	9	6,5
3.	Test the activation number routinely on a monthly basis – telephone number and what's app group.	5	6,4,3,2
4.	Clarity on who can activate the system.	1	2,3,4,5,6
5.	The lead organisation to take responsibility on providing the teleconference facilities (as per page 4).	2	6,5,4,2,1
6.	Test and rehearse the plan on a multi-agency exercise.	5	8,6,4,3,2,1
7.	Action card to be added to the front of the plan in relation to the activation of the system.	4	1,2,3,5,6,7

Item 2: LRCG

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
The fundamental core responsibilities of messaging were solid, despite initial misunderstanding and prior to any statements being released.		5,6	1,3,7
The secretariat support from third conference was very helpful. The principal leads worked well together.		5,4	6
The united front in regards to messaging was evident from the live interviews.		6	1,3,5,4
Good links with the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG).		4	5
Resilience during the period was aided by help from public services was good 24/7.		8	
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
Initial support for the recovery phase was offered in the early teleconferences. It is at that point that planning should start to be considered by all Local Authority (LA) and other agencies to activate that support.		8	1,2,5,3,7
Resilience over a long period of time would have been difficult to sustain without the response from the public services.		8	2,4,7
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	Explore the role of the coroner in communications around fatalities.	4	5,6,2,1,8
2.	An agenda template (core questions including capacity, recovery and community engagement)	4,6	5,8,3,2,1,7
3.	Explore how and when the London Resilience Communication Group (LRCG) one moves from the response stage to the recovery stage.	4	2,8,7,6,5
4.			

Item 3: Media

Aspects that went well	Comment from	Supported by
------------------------	--------------	--------------

The monitoring showed that the correct messages were being put out to the public in a timely manner, including digital media.		5,3	1,6
Deputy Gold for the London response (southwark council) was a credible spokesperson.		8	7,1,4
London fire brigade commissioner provided an early voice and reassurance.		5	8,7,6,3,1
Good sharing of official lines between agencies.		8	1,3,5
Regular issuing of official lines from different agencies.		6	5,3,1,8
An early explanation of Disaster Victim Identification (DVI) to the media.		3	6,5
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
There was a breakdown in trust between LA and media.		8	7,6,5,4,3,2,1
A lack of proactivity by some agencies led to a misunderstanding of the public agencies response. (Initial emergency response was good; recovery response was slow in explaining what was going on).		8	4,3,5,6,2,7
Misinformation and lack of information to front line staff.		5	7,8,2
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	Page 9 of plan to be reviewed – regarding establishing a media centre.	5	1,8,7,4,9
2.	Explore the use of social media – Taking a digital first approach to be considered for inclusion in the plan.	2,6	8,1,2,3,4,7,5
3.	Explore ways forward for a collective response to the media to demonstrate the unified and multi-agency response to an incident.	4	7,5,2,6,4,8

Item 4: Public information		
Aspects that went well	Comment from	Supported by

Good multi-channel response to meet the needs of the community in multiple languages.		8	5,6
The key public safety message was heard and used where appropriate.		5	
Coherent messaging to members of the public living in high rise buildings across London/national.		7	1,8
The availability of pre prepared digital content in relation to safety.		5	7,1,4
The control of messaging via social media/digital means your message is heard (in collaboration with partners).		6	8,7,5,3
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
A need to develop a comprehensive communications and engagement strategy and exercise it. Develop partnerships with community leaders and faith group leaders.		2	7,4,8
Review of joint working between Local Authority (LA)/National Health Service (NHS) communications and exercises working on recovery.		7	1,2,4,8
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	Agenda should include consideration of community engagement and who is responsible.	4	3,5,1,7,8,2

Item 5: Website information and updating

Aspects that went well	Comment from	Supported by
-------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	Reconsider rewording the description of the website on page 13 and review whether the website is necessary.	4	1,5,2,8,9

Item 6: Other			
Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
Secretariat support for offers of assistance to Local Authority (LA)		8	
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1.	Review the London Resilience Communication Group (LRCG) plan and whether it should cover the recovery stages and if not where this will be covered.	2	8,5,4,1
