

LONDON RESILIENCE PARTNERSHIP

London STAC Arrangements

STRUCTURED DEBRIEF REPORT

Incident:	Grenfell Tower Fire
Date of Incident:	14 June 2017
Date of Debrief:	17 July 2018
Debrief Location:	Prospero House, 241 Borough High Street, London, SE1 1GA
Debrief Team:	Facilitator: Craig Cameron Digital Scribe: Charliy Merrick

Debrief Participants:	No	Name	Incident Role	Organisation
	1	Ruth Shaw		Environmental Agency
	2	Yimmy Chow		PHE London
	3	Adrienne Dunne		PHE Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental I
	4	Bryony May		Met Office
	5	Ann Ramage		Royal Borough of Kennington and Chelsea
	6	Andrew Willis		RBKC
	7	Dr Deborah Turbitt		PHE London

	8	Maria Farrugia		London Resilience Group	
	9	Steve Day		Bureaux Veritas	
	10	Matt Hogan		London Resilience Group	
	11	Edwin Wynne-Evans		PHE	
		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: Activation		
Aspects that went well	Comment from	Supported by
Deputy Regional Director called the STAC – first time a formal STAC in London since creation had been called (not within an exercise).	7	ALL

The STAC activation followed the plan by having STAC activation 'approved' by the SCG (3 rd SCG), requested by the Deputy Regional Director, PHE London. {This process is in the plan and can be activated in 2 ways either by SCG or by PHE London}.		2	ALL
EPRR colleagues (London Resilience Partnership) in London had the contact details who would attend the STAC		2	ALL but 1
Environmental Agency (Air quality and technical advice) were using pre-existing contact within PHE and having those talks early on.		1	3
Royal Borough of Kennington and Chelsea and PHE staff were trained in the STAC process; however it would have been difficult to have only 1 representative from each organisation on the STAC. Royal Borough of Kennington and Chelsea had 2 reps which worked well to allow resilience within the team – (CC'ed in Item 4)		5	ALL
All the activation steps were simple and effective.		7	ALL
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
In a major incident, PHE as a Cat 1 responder should be invited to the SCG when an SCG is called independently to the activation of the STAC {for the SCP}		7	ALL
There might need to be more flexibility of who can activate STAC, depending on the incident (Subject Matter Experts).		11	ALL
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
1	To ensure that there are at least 2 representatives trained on STAC processes to allow resilience in organisations present on a STAC.	5, 6	ALL
2	Enable the Subject matter experts who would be present on a STAC to be able to activate a STAC in London.	11	ALL

Item 2: Notification

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
LRG keep a contact detail of STAC representatives for all Local Authorities and the process of notification worked.		5	ALL
Within the first meeting, the correct personnel were present and considerations were given for additional members.		2	ALL
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
The notification route of some agencies about a STAC need to be clarified.		1	ALL
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
4	Relevant organisations to confirm generic contact details for notification of a STAC forming and added as a restricted annex that should be updated on a regular basis.	10	ALL

Item 3: STAC function			
Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
All the functions and roles were carried out within the plan.		2	ALL
A PHE Comms representative sat on the STAC who could feedback into the London Resilience Comms Group (part of the SCG) to provide the public facing Comms message from STAC and the direct Comms message from PHE.		1, 2	ALL
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
The STAC should formulate the public health advice not only to the SCG but the public health messaging to be used for member of the public once authorised by the SCG chair.		5, 6, 7	ALL
The STAC should consider whether validation testing in the affected area would reassure members of the public.		7, 9	ALL
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
5	The STAC should formulate the public health advice not only to the SCG but the public health messaging to be used for member of the public once authorised by the SCG chair. {edit to the role of the STAC "... scientific, technical, environmental and public health advice to the SCG and the Public in during the response"	5, 6, 7	ALL
6	The STAC should consider the implementation of validation testing in the affected area to reassure members of the public.	7, 9	ALL

Item 4: STAC meetings

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
The flexibility of the delivery method (Virtual and face to face) was good.		6	ALL
The plan, annexes were clear and easy to use (i.e. for agenda template and role cards). The STAC support roles were very useful and supportive.		2	ALL
Meetings were focused and content was relevant due to agenda template and chairing skills.		5	ALL
The recommended timings of the STAC meeting (in Annex C) is a good reference to keep to.		9	ALL
The PHE representative (PHE Local Gold) attended the SCG instead of the STAC chair; however this currently not in the plan.		2, 11	ALL
The Subject matter experts and the chair are separate in roles.		11	ALL
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
In virtual meetings, it is hard to hear when a spider phone is used.		6	ALL
Those who attend STAC should have the authority to make the decisions required.		11	ALL
For a live log to be written during the meeting would have been beneficial to be disseminated straight after the meeting.		11	ALL
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
7	If virtual meetings are required, to ensure that robust telecommunication are in place, with training and exercise in place.	6	ALL
8	The attendees present of the STAC should be those that can make the decisions to input to conversation and the output of the STAC, in support of the response.	11	ALL
9	For the PHE representative to attend the SCG instead of the STAC chair; and to be added into the plan.	7	ALL
10	For an action log to be written during the meeting to be disseminated straight after the meeting.	2	ALL
11	To review the STAC support role and whether they are require for each incident.	7	ALL
12	For the plan to specify that the Subject matter experts and chair should be separate roles.	11	ALL

13	For STAC members contact details to be disseminated straight after every meeting, to be conducted by STAC support roles.	5	ALL
----	--	---	-----

Item 5: Stand Down

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by
Input into the Recovery Management Group was appreciated.		7	ALL
The STAC was flexible (was stood down and stood back up) in line with the demand of the incident.		3	ALL
Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
14	Prolonged response mode maybe required in some incidents and resilience needs to be established. {In the plan it states days, weeks; needs to add months}	7	ALL
15	During a recovery phase, STAC needs to be aware of which activities require STAC to consider and which could be managed at Business as usual.	11	ALL

Item 6: Other

Aspects that went well		Comment from	Supported by

Aspects for improvement		Comment from	Supported by
No.	Recommendations	Comment from	Supported by
16	For the multi-agency debrief to be conducted as soon as possible.	11	ALL