

LONDON RESILIENCE PARTNERSHIP RECOVERY MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL STRUCTURED DEBRIEF REPORT

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Incident: | Grenfell Tower Fire |
| Date of Incident: | 14 June 2017 |
| Date of Debrief: | 10 July 2018 |
| Debrief Location: | Prospero House, 241 Borough High Street, London, SE1 1GA |
| Debrief Team: | Facilitator: Joanne Hodson Digital Scribe Sandra Broad |

| Debrief Participants: | No | Name | Incident Role | Organisation |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | 1 | Terry Leach | Controller London Coastguard | Maritime & Coastguard Agency |
| 2 | Mary Mullix | None | West London CCG | |
| 3 | Kate Cochrane | Tac Officer for LP | West London CCG | |
| 4 | Louise Proctor | Lead response for CCG | West London CCG | |
| 5 | Doug Flight | Liaison with other London Boroughs | London Councils | |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|--|--|--|
| 6 | Richard McEwan | NHS England ICC | NHS England | |
| 7 | Kyle McNeely | Support to Recovery Director | NHS England | |
| 8 | Martin Machray | NHS England Recovery Director | NHS England | |
| 9 | Mark O'Donoghue | Co-ordination of Church response | Area Dean | |
| 10 | Emma Spragg | Strategic Liaison Gold | British Red Cross | |
| 11 | John Hetherington | Strategic advisor to SCG | London Resilience Group | |
| 12 | Steve Feely | EP on call | Metropolitan Police Service | |
| 13 | Jo McDonald | None | Metropolitan Police Service | |
| 14 | Deborah Turbitt | PHE Incident Director | Public Health England | |
| 15 | Barry Quirk | Chief Executive and Chelsea from 24 June | Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea | |
| 16 | Mark Sawyer | Support to Local Authority Gold | London Local Authorities | |
| 17 | John Barradell | Gold for post Friday | City of London | |
| 18 | Alex Woodman | Staff officer to John Barradell | City of London | |
| | Luke Cornelius | None | Oxford University research student for the Faith Sector Observer | |
| | Jeremy Reynolds | None | LRG Observer | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------|-------------------------|--|
| | Fiona Mair | None | LRG Observer | |
| | Emma Lloyd | None | City of London 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 |
| Relationships that were generated over the response period (9 days) and the effective communication and decision making that resulted from these relationships. Some of the staff were part of the SCG became the same staff for RCG | 16 | 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18 |
| E-mail distribution lists published over the 9 days facilitated effective communication | 11 | 4, 12, 14, 15 |
| Westminster Council suite used as an impartial, non-hierarchical multi agency recovery centre for face to face meetings enabling key staff to come together. This also worked very well for virtual participants | 11 | 8, 17, 5, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 |
| Aspects for improvement | Comment from | Supported by |
| Consider how to communicate and coordinate with the emergent local voluntary sector. | 9 | 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 4 |
| Each agency needs to be represented by someone who can make decisions for their organisation. (as per page 23 of the Protocol) | 12 | 16, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18 |
| Sector panels need to consider how to achieve representation for their sector of someone who can make decisions for their organisations in the response phase. | 17 | 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18 |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------|---|
| | Create an environment where strategic conversations can take place in a timely fashion | 16 | 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17 |
| | Have a single point of contact for each agency/sector to avoid relying on individual email addresses to ensure that information is passed to the right place. | 9 | 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Have a single point of contact email/phone number for each organisation/sector | 9 | 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, |
| 2 | Create a template for a suite that can be used by all as the Westminster Council suite was for this incident | 16 | 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 |
| 3 | Consider how to exercise the relationships with the established voluntary sector and their local authorities | 9 | 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 |
| 4 | Consider how to manage offers of help. | 3 | 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 |

| Item 2: Recovery Coordinating Group | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Aspects that went well | | Comment from | Supported by |
| Use of critical friends/wise counsel of equal level and similar experience e.g. fellow chief executive worked very well for some strategic commanders | | 17 | 12, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18 |
| PHE virtual peer review meetings with other organisations to explore rationales for decision making and support decision makers (as per page 10 3.12 of the Protocol) | | 14 | 4 |
| Battle rhythm for meetings was dictated by the need to make a decision as a result of changes in the incident/situation or when information was required for e.g. the CRIP | | 17 | 3, 9, 11, |
| Continuous conversations were able to take place as a result of the co-location of agencies/organisations in the 'Recovery Coordination Centre' in the Westminster Council suite | | 16 | 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 |
| A dynamic action tracker was developed by the secretariat for the RCG | | 11 | 9, 12 |
| Westminster City Council provided administrative staff to collate and analyse data to support decision making | | 11 | |
| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
| Allow staff who have not had experience of this scale of incident the opportunity to shadow an experienced member of staff to create a learning opportunity | | 12,14 | 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Be aware of the need for summer planning with regard to the availability of staff in July and August to ensure the right staff are available for organisational resilience | | 15 | 3,5 |
| Be aware that recovery can be as resource intensive as the response | | 16 | 3,2,4 7, 10, 11, 12 |
| Add to page 10 in the Protocol “read 3.12 taking into account 3.15 – 3.18” to illustrate the flexibility of the guidance in the Protocol | | 17 | 9 |
| Sharing of personally identifiable information between agencies was challenging | | 8 | 2, 4, 3, 10, 11, |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Consider the use of a ‘critical friend’ to support strategic commanders | 17 | 3, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 |
| 2 | Use of a standard action tracker for the RCG as developed for this incident | 11 | 3, 9, 10, 12, 14 |
| 3 | Add to page 10 in the Protocol “read 3.12 taking into account 3.15 – 3.18” to illustrate the flexibility of the guidance in the Protocol | 9 | 17 |
| 4 | Consider if an explanation of time periods can be inserted under the critical information section | 3 | 8, 3, 4, 14, 16, |
| 5 | Consider exercising recovery processes in the same way as for response incorporating data collection and resource management | 3 | 11, |
| 6 | Consider establishing a template for a multi-agency intelligence /analytical support cell | 16 | 11, 2, 3, 4, 9, |
| 7 | Consider effective pre planned signposting to partner agencies on how to share personally identifiable information | 3 | 2, 3, 4, 7, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16 |

| Item 3: Liaising with Others | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Aspects that went well | Comment from | Supported by |
| London Local Authority Gold (LLAG) led meetings with community groups | 9 | 16, 3, 7, 8, |
| The community engagement plan developed over time in an attempt to meet the community’s needs | 16 | 9, 8, 2, 7 |
| Interaction with DCLG RED in their role as Government liaison officers | 11 | 9, 16 |
| Aspects for improvement | Comment from | Supported by |
| Consider including more in the protocol with regard to engagement with the public and in particular the role and management of public meetings | 11 | 3, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Include on page 15 a paragraph with regard to listening to and speaking directly with the community affected in the incident | | 9 | 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11 |
| Consider the impact that an incident and the subsequent actions of others have on tensions within communities | | 3 | 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Consider including more in the protocol with regard to community engagement | 11 | 3, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16 |
| 2 | Include on page 15 a paragraph with regard to listening to and speaking directly with community affected in the incident | 9 | 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11 |
| 3 | Recognise the impact that an incident can have on tensions within communities | 3 | 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 |
| 4 | Ensure all agencies recognise the importance of community engagement and have appropriate plans in place | 16 | 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 |

| Item 4: Stand Down | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Aspects that went well | | Comment from | Supported by |
| There were protocols in place to facilitate the handover from the RCG to RBKC and due process was followed. | | 16 | 8, 11, 7 |
| The handover process from RCG to RBKC was well managed and not rushed | | 11 | 16, 3, 8 |
| Partners agreed that the process was well structured and all informed | | 8 | 11, 3, 7 |
| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
| Earlier engagement with legal advice and the Inquiry into the possibilities of holding hot debriefs would have expedited the debrief process. | | 11 | 3, 7, 8, 16 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Consider early engagement with legal advice to expedite the debrief process | 11 | 2, 3, 7, 8, 16 |