

LONDON RESILIENCE PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC COORDINATION PROTOCOL STRUCTURED DEBRIEF REPORT

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Incident: | Grenfell Tower Fire |
| Date of Incident: | 14 June 2017 |
| Date of Debrief: | 11 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 |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| | 3 | Chloe Sellwood | NHS 01/ Senior EPRR | NHS England London |
| 4 | Barry Emerson | NHS 01 at the weekend | NHS England London | |
| 5 | Stuart Priestley | Silver and RBKC advisor to Silver | RBKC | |
| 6 | Tristram Newey | None | Maritime & Coastguard | |
| 7 | Paul Wyatt | Area Duty Manager | Environment Agency | |
| 8 | Alan Taylor | Representing LFB Gold | London Fire Brigade Representing LFB Gold | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| | 9 | Mark Sawyer | Supporting Local Authority Chief Executives | London Local Authorities | |
| | 10 | John Hetherington | LRG Strategic Advisor | LRG | |
| | 11 | Toby Gould | LRG Strategic Advisor | LRG | |
| | 12 | Steve Feely | On Call | MPS | |
| | 13 | Mandy Otten | None | MPS | |
| | 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: Notification | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| Aspects that went well | Comment from | Supported by |
| Notification for the declaration of the SCG took place in a timely manner | 11,10 | 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13 |
| Although notification as per the protocol didn't happen that is not unusual as protocol is written to cover a wide range of incidents and therefore there is flexibility. Protocol is for guidance and written as 'should' not 'must' | 11,3 | 4, 8, 10 |

| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
|--|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| LRG first became aware that something was happening through a request for assistance rather than a formal notification with a METHANE report | | 11 | 3, 4, 5, 10, 12 |
| Although notification as per the protocol didn't happen that is not unusual as protocol is written to cover a wide range of incidents and therefore there is flexibility. Protocol is for guidance and written as 'should' not 'must'. | | 11,3 | 4, 8, 10 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Raise awareness of the protocol with regard to notification through training and exercising and relationship building | 9 | 4, 5, 7, 6, 8,10, 11, 12, 13, 3 |
| 2 | Clarify that this notification process is for the declaration of the need for strategic coordination. Initial incident notifications between agencies should take place at operational and tactical levels. For example add the content of 2.1.1 into the front prompt sheet on page 3. | 10,11 | 3, 5, 6, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 |
| 3 | Continue to embed the use of METHANE reports for notification and information sharing from the scene through to tactical and strategic levels of command | 10, 11 | 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, |

Item 2: Assessment

| Aspects that went well | | Comment from | Supported by |
|---|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| LFB Gold Commander and MPS Gold Commander worked very well together to carry out the initial joint assessment which was passed to the LRG. | | 8 | 5, 10, 11 |
| Assessments were carried out as per page 4 to determine the level of coordination required. | | 10 | 11, 4 |
| Conversations and meetings were held in accordance with 2.5.1 - 2.5.5 on page 18 - 19 | | 10 | 3, 4, 11 |
| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
| Re 2.5.6 and 2.5.7 LSAT was not used its full potential. Written situational awareness was recorded in SCG meetings. There is a need to embed LSAT to increase familiarity with it. | | 11, 12 | 3, 4, 8, 10, 13 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Clarify that in the immediate hours of a fast paced incident it may be more appropriate for shared situational awareness to come from discussion at SCG meetings and recorded in those minutes. | 10, 3 | 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|-------------------------------|
| 2 | Clarify that the prompt sheet on page 4 refers to the initial assessment and not the ongoing assessment as per 2.5.9 on page 19 | 3 | 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 |
| 3 | Embed the use of LSAT as an information sharing medium by training and regular use. | 13 | 3, 5, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 |
| 4 | Review how situational awareness can be enhanced in advance of the initial SCG | 9 | 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 |

| Item 3: Activation | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Aspects that went well | | Comment from | Supported by |
| In advance of the first SCG LRG invited partners as per the protocol | | 11 | 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13 |
| First meetings were virtual, by teleconference, which worked well. | | 11, 13 | 3, 4, 8, 10 |
| Contact list is circulated to partner agencies for update every quarter | | 10 | 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 |
| 1 st SCG invitation was made to all by telephone and email rather than just relying on emails | | 11 | 3, 4, 8 |
| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
| The use of individual contact information for activation and notification is time consuming and potentially ineffective if the contact information is incorrect | | 10 | 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13 |
| Some organisations felt disadvantaged by not being invited to the initial SCG meetings | | 7 | 4, 3, 11 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | A core list of Cat 1 responders and appropriate others is maintained to invite to the first SCG meeting to ensure the right people are on the call from the outset and achieve inclusivity | 10, 12 | 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 4, 10, 11, 13 |
| 2 | Consider non person specific central contact for every organisation | 4 | 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 |

| Item 4: Strategic Coordination Group | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Aspects that went well | | Comment from | Supported by |
| The first SCG meeting was held by teleconference and subsequent meetings were held at Lambeth and by teleconference as per the protocol and this worked well. | | 13 | 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11,12 |
| The joint strategy was agreed at the second SCG meeting and reviewed at subsequent meetings | | 11 | 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12 |
| The template agenda at page 38 of the protocol was referred to as a guide in SCG's | | 12 | 7, 10, 8, 11,13 |
| The agenda template aligns to the JDM | | 13 | 6, 7, 8, 5, 11, 12 |
| Aspects for improvement | | Comment from | Supported by |
| The coordination structure used was different from that envisaged in the Protocol and not all of the agencies and sub groups were aware of the wider coordination structure | | 11 | 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13 |
| Various sub groups worked in different locations to the SCG on a scale which was not envisaged in the Protocol | | 11 | 4, 5, 10, 12, 13 |
| No. | Recommendations | Comment from | Supported by |
| 1 | Review how situational awareness can be enhanced in advance of all SCG meetings e.g. the timely dissemination of actions and minutes from previous meetings | 9 | 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 4 |
| 2 | Produce and share an organogram to create greater visibility of the coordination structure and points of contact for all agencies. This could be published on LSAT | 10 | 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 4 |
| 3 | Consider plotting the resourcing requirements for all strategic sub groups and where they can be physically located | 11 | 5, 6, 7, 8, 4, 10, 12, 13 |