

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

Criminal Procedure Rules, r27.2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.9; Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5b

Statement of: GROVES, PETER

Age if under 18: Over 18 (if over 18 insert 'over 18')  
AND DEVELOPMENT AT LFB

Occupation: ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF TRAINING

---

This statement (consisting of 25 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: P GROVES

Date: 05/02/2020

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded ☐ (supply witness details on rear)

---

I am writing this statement in relation to an ongoing police investigation that is being conducted by the Metropolitan Police Service. This relates to a fatal fire at Grenfell Tower, London on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

I am the Assistant Director for Training and Professional Development within the London Fire Brigade (LFB). I have corporate responsibility for training and development within the organisation. I have worked for the LFB since November 1987. I have been involved in their training since 1998. Corporate Responsibility means the initiation and development of training alongside the needs of delegates. Areas that are covered include, their safety, ensuring training is fit for purpose and meeting the organisational requirement. I don't evaluate training, a separate department does that. The Ops Policy and Assurance department evaluate the training.

Within my statement, I shall be naming several individuals who have different roles within the LFB. They are;

Assistant Commissioner (AC) Andy ROE (recently promoted to Commissioner)

Director of Operations Dave Brown (retired)

Chair of Authority Brian COLEMAN

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Head of Learning and Development Strategy, DAC Kevin HUGHES

Head of Ops Policy and Assurance AC Dom ELLIS

Head of Human Resources (HR) James DALGLEISH

Role to Rank Manager - Mick ELLIS

At the time of the Grenfell Tower fire, my responsibilities were slightly different to what they are currently. I had corporate responsibility for training that was part of the Babcock training contract. I did not have responsibility for Control training and I did not have responsibility for Station Based training. It involved anything where Heads of Service would commission a piece of training in which Babcock was the provider. It wasn't local delivered training or Control training. There were around 250 courses that would range from Fire Fighter Development training being 11 to 12 weeks long to one day IT course. There were a range of specialist skills like Urban Search and Rescue or Operational tactical courses which were delivered to maintain the skills levels at stations for frontline delivery, such as Leadership Management, Fire Safety training but nothing that was focused on maintenance of skills in relation to station based or control staff training.

At the time, Control training was the responsibility of The Director of Operations who was Dave BROWN and for station based training that was the Assistant Commissioner for Service Delivery who fed into Dave BROWN. Dave BROWN had ultimate responsibility for both of those functions.

Since April 2018, my remit changed and I now take responsibility for Station based training but I still do not have responsibility for control based training.

I took on Station based training as there was a corporate project from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) that came in and completed a review. It was suggested that station based training should be managed by me. Part of that new remit was to establish if previous station based training had been completed and recorded by individuals.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

The LFB have a training contract with a service provider called Babcock. This contract has been in existence between both organisations since April 2012. The details of the contract were decided between both parties.

In 2009, before the contract, there was a corporate project, with a direction from the Chair of the Authority, Brian COLEMAN, to look at alternative ways of delivering LFB training. Brian was an elected member and I think he represented Barnet. At the time, there were around 17 members of the Authority with various committees covering areas like resources, for example. There were seven local councillors and he was the chair for the Authority. Brian was pushing for a change in the way we were delivering our training.

In response to this, the options included looking at an 'in house' solution as well as potentially going 'outside' the LFB. A corporate project was formed and I was the project manager. The project sponsor was Gary DOBSON who was the Director of Ops Resilience and Training. Over a three year period we developed options and ultimately those options went to the resources committee at the time. They subsequently stated that they wanted the training to be outsourced.

We went through a competitive dialogue process meaning that we started off with around seven bidders, ultimately we got down to two bidders. Part of the competitive process was determining what would be in the contract such as the tender specification, what training would be included, the frequency of the training, what the expectations of trainers were, what would be required from venues, the equipment, the payment mechanism, the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's).

We developed the contract alongside separate lawyers (Sharpe Pritchard) giving legal advice and we had separate financial advisors (Grant Thornton) as well. They supported us through the development of the

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

contract. We developed the contract with the potential providers and got to a point by November 2011 where we went to our committee with the contract which was ready and they accepted Babcock as the preferred bidder. We worked with Babcock until the end of February 2012 to finalise the contract. The contract was signed 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012 and the implementation of the contract started on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012.

In the tender process, the LFB pursued what is called the Competitive Dialogue process which is slightly different to a normal restricted process. As the contract was so large in financial terms, it had to go out to Europe and it went through Official Journal of the European Union (OJ) notice.

We initially had around 105 expressions of interest from companies who believed they could complete training for the LFB. The LFB made it clear at the start of the tender process that we didn't want to break training down into lots of different areas but wanted a provider that would take on all the training, from start to finish. That restricted the amount of eligible companies almost straight away.

We conducted a prequalification questionnaire so we could check the suitability of potential candidates alongside their claims that they were suitable to take on our contract. That process brought the numbers down to seven companies and we asked them to submit some outline solutions. We produced an outward based specification which detailed all the courses, trainers and potential venues alongside how the companies could conduct the training, where this would take place and how much would it cost etc.

An evaluation process of the seven companies then commenced and this brought the numbers down to four potential companies. We had two months of all four bidders being in a room, one withdrawing from the process at that time and a further consortium leaving as well. This meant that there were two companies left within the process so we continued the dialogue with those two bidders resulting in Babcock being chosen as the preferred bidder.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

In essence, the LFB stated what it wanted regarding future training and the bidder deemed the most appropriate, in terms of quality and affordability, was chosen.

The department within the LFB that liaises with Babcock on a day to day basis is my department. There is also a Contract Management Group within procurement who also have contact with Babcock training alongside members of our property department and our fleet department. It is my department that has the main contact with Babcock.

Within Babcock, the main departments we liaise with are the design team, the delivery team and a commercial strand so they are the three main areas that we work with.

The contract is overseen by me, on the LFB side, and I have corporate responsibility for this. I oversee the contract and that it is discharged within a number of working groups but predominantly it's within my department and I have responsibility for it.

The LFB contract with Babcock has been signed until March 2037, a 25 year contract. The training delivery plan is agreed, however, on an annual basis. The training plan can be changed to reflect any new amendments.

My team's responsibility is to sit down with all Heads of Service to reflect on what they have had over the last five years, look at the London Safety Plan, look at the strategies (the aims for the next 3 to 5 years), what is required by staff in terms of training but also what is the corporate responsibility. An example of this is the head of IT, should not only be looking at his own department needs but also what the organisation needs. This information is collated on an annual basis and that is formulated into a training plan, it's tested against affordability, and is passed to Babcock if deemed appropriate. Babcock

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

complete an impact analysis to see if they have sufficient trainers, venues and equipment. If Babcock see any issues with this then they return to the LFB suggesting either we conduct the training or the LFB reprioritise the training requirement. Ultimately, it's the LFB's job to provide the Statement of Training Requirement (SOTR) and Babcock deliver it.

The Statement of Training Requirement is essentially a training plan that has been created with the various Heads of Service. They look at training trends from the past, look at their strategies and their action plans alongside what is happening nationally.

The LFB provide Babcock with an eligibility report to see who they need to allocate training places to, also using the 'filling rules' principle such as only taking a certain number of personnel from a Watch at any one time rather than giving carte blanche to take people from anywhere. This is explained further in my statement.

The LFB can also vary the training contract if an issue arises. An example of this is when the LFB varied the contract in relation to the number of secondees it provides to Babcock. Originally, a two year duration had been agreed but now this has been extended to three years.

Initially, there were a number of venues that Babcock could use from the Brigade estate however that has reduced over time as there is not the need for them anymore. The vast majority of the contract remains unchanged.

In relation to the LFB's considerations around training needs and requirements, a Strategic Training Oversight Board (STOB), chaired by me, presides. This is also attended by the Director of Safety and Assurance and the Director of Operations (now a Deputy Commissioner takes charge of both functions). The Director of Safety and Assurance and the Director of Operations (and now Deputy Commissioner) were both senior to me however I chair the meeting because I have corporate responsibility.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

If matters are discussed within the meeting that are affordable then they can be passed through with relative ease. If there are situations when things are not affordable then we will discuss the details of them and see if we can reduce them, such as reducing 50 people to 40 or reducing the frequency.

The Board may also decide that it needs to go for a 'growth bid' meaning that we would submit something through the ordinary budgetary round. The request would state that we want a particular requirement, having completed prioritisation, and that would go through the normal cycle, to the Mayor. The Mayor will make a decision as to whether there will be an increase in the budget or not.

Certain areas of training can be prioritised or changed.

Around two years ago, we had a situation where there was an increase in the leaver rate. The contract allows us to train 288 new fire fighters every year. When People's Services/HR came to us they stated that the leaver rate was looking higher than normal and they asked that 367 fire fighters be trained instead of 288.

The contract allows us to 'flex' plus or minus 20%. The LFB approached Babcock and explained the situation to them and that it was outside of the 20% limit. Babcock responded by saying that they could not facilitate such an increase in such a short period of time (around two months).

The LFB needed it within two months. Subsequently the LFB engaged with the Fire Service College (through Babcock) which meant that the LFB had separate negotiations with the college but because Babcock are LFB's broker's we had to pay their 'on' costs. This was an additional one million pounds for the LFB. As a result we completed some prioritisation but it wasn't affordable so we completed the growth bid, which was accepted.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:



The LFB are currently in the process of doing this now and this relates to Incident Command training. There are a number of training areas within the LFB that are considered a priority. Incident Command training is considered to be the 'Crown Jewels' of training, and has always been a priority training topic. As a result of the Grenfell Inquiry and the Home Office Inspection report, there has been a need to review the way incident command is trained and delivered. Incident Command is priority number one and we are changing the way the LFB provide Incident Command training. There is currently a revalidation part to training in Incident Command which there never has been. Adding in the revalidation means that the course requirement has now got bigger within the Incident Command area. That means that either something comes out of the training schedule or money is needed to supplement it.

Prior to the Grenfell Tower fire, in terms of yearly planning, the Fire Fighter Development programme, Incident Command, driving and anything we have as a statutory obligation to, were priorities. These elements of training would always have been considered first but I don't recall us being directed to make it a priority as we have been now for Incident Command. Areas like leadership, which some would consider to be a priority are not. They are considered to be 'second tier'. Fire Warden training, for example, is very low down on the lists of priorities.

I am not a fire fighter and do not have a background in firefighting. In order to understand what is required as a priority within the LFB at any one time, I obtain 'intelligence' from a number of places. Ultimately, this will come to the Ops Professionalism board which is chaired by the Director of Safety and Assurance. 'Intelligence' is received from incidents, the Incident Command database, looking at strategies not just within London but also nationally and internationally. That information feeds into our Ops Policy and Assurance Department, headed by an Assistant Commissioner. This department is our primary 'client' - they tell my department what needs to change or what needs doing, resulting in a training requirement.

All new training or changes to training is done by the Training Commissioning and Alteration Process (TCAP). A training need will be identified then the responsibility for that comes to my department. My

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:



department will sit down with the Commissioning Department and establish what they require and what do they need. At that time, we are not looking for a training solution-that is not their focus. What they need to say to my department, is that at the end of a chosen intervention, they want a certain amount of people trained in a certain training area. It is not for them to choose the length or venue of the training, it's purely the knowledge requirement, skill requirement or behavioural change and my project managers will work with them, alongside the designers of Babcock, to come up with a training solution. Discussions around practical training, Computer Based Training (CBT), course duration are then had at this stage.

The Commissioning Department then receive the suggestion and they will sign it off. Babcock advise and find a solution, LFB has responsibility and signs it off. As a result, a pilot is then launched and if it meets our requirement and the Commissioning Department are happy with it then it goes on to become training.

The content of a CBT and/or a Babcock course is ratified by the LFB. It is a decision within the LFB whether something is added or removed from a training package.

On a regular basis, the LFB will receive a training suggestion from Babcock and the content of the training will not be agreed, usually involving the design process. These are normally from training designers who are not operational and from a different organisation so they wouldn't necessarily know the day to day practicalities of the LFB. This is why the Commissioning Department will state that things need to be changed. This happens regularly. Babcock train LFB ranks of all levels.

A TCAP is raised by a department completing a Training Request which is normally a simple request for extra training in an area. The request is given to the Strategic Training Oversight Board (STOB) and they will review the request to see whether this is training that is required or is needed at the time, considering what the organisational need is. If the training request is agreed then further development will be allowed to continue. A TCAP form is normally about 40 pages long and detailed. The solution has to be signed off

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

by STOB in terms of affordability and separately it's signed off by the Commissioning Department.

Babcock do not attend STOB meetings.

Anyone can change process but ultimately it's the decision for the Strategic Training and Oversight Board to decide if they want to do it and the changes to be made. Invariably, the changes will come from the Ops Policy and Assurance Department and usually from looking at trends within the Incident Command database. The vast majority will come from delegate feedback, debriefings from incidents, or performance command.

The Ops Professionalism Board convenes on a quarterly basis and they provide a report with 'themes'. For example, problems around 'messaging' and then we suggest a formal input like station training or Ops News. If it is agreed that 'messaging' is an issue then it goes through to the Strategic Training and Oversight Board.

The TCAP process assists in deciding who is required for training, for example the requirement for Watch Managers. The LFB require from Babcock the eligibility report and highlight all the people that need the training. This comes from the Central Ops Team responsible for setting the filling rules, which happens annually. We have the 'filling rules' which means taking a couple of staff from certain stations, staff from Fire Rescue Units (FRU), staff from Control or staff from a specific station. The LFB dictate the 'filling' rules for the required quota. This prevents depletion of staff on the frontline.

Training across the organisation involves the eligibility report being obtained, allocation of staff is then made (with an awareness to not take too many staff from one watch). Babcock work to eligibility reports. It is a list of names of who should be going on a course. The LFB provide that information to Babcock.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Strategic Resource sits under the Central Ops team. A number of appliances can be off 'the run' to attend training. If an incident occurs then they can be pulled back. Babcock know the shifts etc. This is set on an annual basis.

The Planned Release of Personnel (PROP) relates an individual being assigned to a course, not an appliance. Central Ops have a formula about how many people can be taken on any given day. Babcock know what the PROP, SR and Filling rules are.

There are some Babcock initiated TCAPs but they are rare. Every three years, the curricular is reviewed so any changes are normally suggested then. The LFB wouldn't expect Babcock to identify any risk critical material as that is the LFB's role.

If an existing training course needs amending then it can come from two different sources:

The Course Review process means every training curricular needs to be reviewed every two years. Curricular means, for example, that within Incident Command courses it's reviewed every year by Babcock to review all of the Incident Command courses.

On the basis of feedback from delegates, national operational learning or changes to legislation, a course may be changed for a particular reason. STOB is notified of this change and they ratify this change.

The Commissioning Department will come direct to our department and may suggest changes if they know that new training equipment is coming into circulation, for example, LFB instigate as much change as Babcock do.

There are currently 45 TCAPs in circulation that LFB are looking at, 16 of which have been raised directly as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire. The topic areas relating to the 16 TCAPs are a review of

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Incident Command (all four levels), revalidation of Incident Command (all four levels), loggist training, operational discretion training, refresher training on fire survival guidance, new turntable ladders (32 metres and 64 metres), fire safety checks by station based staff, stress anxiety and depression training and first line leaders programme.

The decision to instigate the TCAPs in relation to Incident Command and Revalidation was already being considered prior to the Grenfell Tower fire. It has been 'fast tracked' since the fire.

Anything that has come from the ongoing Grenfell Public Inquiry that has been identified as needing attention, has been put onto a TCAP.

Implementation of a TCAP varies in terms of the complexity and content of it. On average it takes about a year, from start to finish, for a TCAP to be implemented. Some TCAPs can be dealt with quite quickly whilst others can take a lot longer to complete. On average there are thirty to forty TCAPs every year. Babcock should have exactly the same number of TCAP. That is the partnership of the delivery process.

In relation to training content, the standard of the content of the training can be dictated by national capabilities, such as Urban Search and Rescue training. Some are guided by legislation but that can be quite broad.

The LFB, through the Commissioning Department, will set the standard of the training. This may be linked to occupational standards, industry standards, what other Fire and Rescue Services are doing or may develop its own standard in terms of frequency and what the requirement is of the individual.

LFB tells Babcock what the expected standard of training is delivered to and the LFB alongside Babcock have their own evaluation and assurance officers to ensure the standard is being maintained.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

External inspection into training, as was part of the recent Home Office inspection, has not been conducted for some years. National Operational Guidance (NOG) is not for interpretation. The NOG explains what needs doing but does not give the LFB the solution as to how to bring it about. If the LFB decide the training should be completed using a CBT package, for example, then it can be shown that the LFB are abiding by NOG.

Any urgent information within the LFB that needs to be disseminated out for operational reasons, can be passed on with something called 'Operational News'. This is something that goes out across the Brigade around four times a year and relates to training matters. This focuses on subject matter that has come through from either the intelligence database or national learning and it tends to be for station based training and not for central training. Updating crews at stations around making themselves familiar with certain policies or making them aware that they need to complete a certain CBT pack, is part of the 'Operational News' process. The CBT packages may have tests built into them to record how well someone has learnt from the package.

To disseminate urgent information across the Brigade, the Director of Operations will give details of practices that have been analysed and may be deemed unsafe. A message will go out to all stations. The message is an online method of informing people. Watch Managers will be responsible for making sure that what needs actioning is completed.

As part of the Development and Maintenance of Operational Professionalism (DaMOP) team, that is then fed back into individuals training records. I can't say if that always happens. A daily message can go out to all fire stations too along with a special 'Ops News'. If something needs to be done quickly, we don't wait three months for it to be sent out.

I am not aware of this happening often because this is only disseminated to operational personnel. It is a simple process in that a teleprinter message goes to all fire stations.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Since April 2018, when the LFB governance changed and my department took over certain aspects of training, results have been recorded. This allows training records to be viewed and to see if someone has definitely completed their training and if this has resulted in a pass or fail where relevant.

Before 2018, 'Operational News' was still in existence but there wasn't a robust governance system in place. For example, if someone was trying to find training records on a particular Watch, it would be a bit 'hit and miss' in terms of the training records. This means that finding the training records and the recording of training onto records, was not a robust process. Training should have been recorded onto the station diary but wasn't always. It meant an incomplete picture of the skills level across the organisation. The last person who was responsible for station based training recording, before I took over, was AC Andy ROE. He is now the LFB Commissioner.

AC ROE'S responsibility, at that time, was station based training including the recording of who had completed their training, where and when. Station based training is conducted within fire stations across the LFB.

Station based training involved CBT packages along with drills and lectures. Watch Managers are responsible for presentations.

Station training is recorded on something called the 'Station Diary'. Training delivered centrally, such as the Babcock contract, is processed through a Learning Management System called 'Orchestrate'. That system belongs to Babcock and it feeds into a LFB system in station diary called The Station Training Evaluation Programme (STEP).

Since July 2019, Fire fighters and Watch Managers now have 21 competencies to demonstrate. This is over a two year period. This is through CBT packages so that it can be seen that an individual has logged on and accessed and completed the training. There are subsequent reports that can be given to line managers so they see how a person has got on. The station diary holds a lot of information, if completed correctly. STEP keeps an electronic record of individual training records so supervisors can access it to find out if their staff attended the course, passed, failed or cancelled a course. At the time of the Grenfell

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Tower fire, STEP was being used. It has been used within the LFB since 2009. Both Babcock and LFB personnel can access the system, dependant on access 'rights'.

There are two dedicated training facilities supplied by Babcock which are in Beckton and Park Royal. There are some other LFB facilities that Babcock use such as Plaistow, for Fire Fighter Development training, Barking is used for driver training, Harrow is used for Incident Command and fire safety training. Facilities in Croydon have been used up until recently as they are being refurbished to incorporate high rise facilities. Babcock can request to use a fire station to conduct their training but this needs approval from us.

The LFB ratifies the suitability for each site. As the contract between LFB and Babcock has been in existence for some time now, we both know which venues are good to use and they have been risk assessed. Any change in venue requires a TCAP and both parties need to conduct their own risk assessment.

Before the Babcock contract in 2012, the majority of training was completed within the LFB. The training department had its own design team, programming team and trainers. There were around 350 members of the training team. There were individual training teams within each of the commands and a central training department that set strategic direction and oversaw what was going on in individual areas.

There wasn't a full 'in house' service as the LFB would still send some delegates to the Fire Service College for some courses. The vast majority of training was delivered within the LFB by LFB trainers on LFB sites. That ended on the 31st March 2012. This ended as a result of the decision made by the Resources Committee. The Chair didn't believe that the training was fit for purpose, I am not aware of whether this was documented and if so where, however it was the site that wasn't adequate not the training content itself.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:



The vast majority of training was delivered out of the Southwark site, which was a Victorian building and was fit for some purposes just not all purposes. The Chair wanted modern facilities.

During that time, the shift patterns were changing and the delivery of the training needed to reflect these shift changes, including evening and weekend training. Training was being reviewed to be more tailored and also CBT packs were being considered. The standard of provision of training has improved dramatically since we outsourced it. The facilities are modern, professional and fit for purpose. The trainers are predominantly employed by a private sector company which means we have less issues with working patterns and Unions. An example of this would be, when we delivered training 'in house', the 'through put' rate was 69%, so only 69% of the training requirement was being delivered. Now it's 90-91%.

In terms of getting into a 'steady state' with the new training, it took nearly four to five years to get settled with it. The LFB signed the Babcock contract on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012. In the original plan, there was a year transition period and we were advised that needed to start from the 1<sup>st</sup> April so that first year was a very hard year for both LFB and Babcock. To switch something 'off' on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March and expect someone to take it all on from 1<sup>st</sup> April, was a big ask. The process was so truncated that it took nearer three years to imbed. It took until 2016 for the training to be fully imbedded and for delivery to be in a steady state.

There were a number of LFB trainers in the month of February and then Babcock had to find trainers from the 1<sup>st</sup> April. There was provision within the contract for secondees and there were 36 secondees from LFB who were placed to continue delivering training. The first six months were particularly hard.

We do quarterly reports called Training Update Reports which go to our Commissioning Board and previously the Resources Committee so they could see the training requirement.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Culturally, there were challenges around how LFB personnel engaged with Babcock. The Fire Brigades Union were not in favour of outsourcing. At the start we had issues with members refusing to be trained by a public sector entity. Even now, there are still people that believe that unless someone wears an LFB uniform, then they aren't credible. I think there is still that sort of mentality in parts of the organisation. Recent discussions with Babcock have resulted in trainers having to now wear LFB uniform. This came out of an independent review of training. I know there are some staff who would still want to be trained in Southwark as it's seen as 'tradition'.

Anecdotally, within the first month of the new training, some delegates refused to be trained as it wasn't a LFB trainer. Discussion would be had with Operations and the Union and contractual reminders were given to delegates refusing to complete the training. Disciplinary proceedings would be threatened if they didn't go. This is something that no longer happens.

The Commissioning Department decides whether training should be in a practical or theoretical format. Babcock propose the training solution and the commissioning department ultimately signs that off. This is overseen by a Head of Service.

There are sixteen heads of service, for example, Incident Command policy sits under Ops Policy and Assurance department. At the time of Grenfell Tower fire, there were the same amount of Heads of Service and they have not changed since the fire.

Concerns around training levels of expertise and capabilities were raised after a MOPAC review. An independent review of training by Ribband Star Consultancy Ltd was also commissioned and the final report was published on 11 September 2019. There were concerns raised around whether people were sufficiently trained to deliver station packages rather than just reading material out to a class.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

The LFB completed a series of workshops at the end of last year and we are commissioning a piece of training that has gone to the Oversight Board today (10<sup>th</sup> January 2020). This is about 'training a trainer' intervention for Watch Managers, this is to ensure that we are sure they have the skills to deliver training to a consistent standard. There are discussions around whether that may be mandated by the Institute of Leadership and Management, in the future. Before 2020, in terms of making sure Watch Managers were suitable to train, there were service standards (there are eleven and training is one of them). Over the years, there has been a cadre of individuals who would go out and see how drills and exercises were being delivered across the Brigade. Some visits were planned however I do not know if the cadre conducted 'mystery calling' (calling unannounced). Their job was to look at the standard of delivery and whether requirements had been met. The cadre were previously called Training Review Implementation Officers, then Service Review Officers and they are now called the Ops Assurance Auditors. Despite the change in name, their role is effectively the same. They are now coordinated under one place which sits under Ops Policy and Assurance. Previously, the training review officers, from different commands, would meet to discuss different trends. I was not involved in that process nor did I have any responsibility for that process.

In relation to the quality of station based training, which was conducted before I took responsibility for it, I do not know what information was collated and what happened after it was retrieved. This was something that the Service Review or Implementation Officer's would have more knowledge of. They sat under Dave BROWN, who had ultimate responsibility for that area. There were around 12 people who were conducting this kind of work. There were four areas and I think there were three in each area. Dave BROWN is no longer working within the LFB as he has retired. He was the Director of Operations.

At a station based level, there is a Station Commander, a Group Commander and a Borough Commander who should be checking training as well. In essence, there is local scrutiny as well as independent scrutiny. This has always been the case. I am unable to comment on whether scrutiny has improved as this is outside the remit of my role.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

The Station Commanders and Borough Commanders do not deliver training but their job is to set up a borough training plan which means there is a local delivery plan. The Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC) will ensure that the borough training plans are being completed. The Director of Operations will see if there are borough training plans across the LFB 'suite'. They then identify trends and thematic training was arranged known as 'Back to Basic' training. The Director of Operations would identify a theme and they would conduct 'Back to Basic' training locally. This Back to Basics training no longer exists and has been replaced with the DAMoP framework. The Back to Basics was not training completed contractually. I am aware that Breathing Apparatus (BA) drills have been done using this method of local training and delivery, in the past.

If an area of training requires physical exertion or a more practical approach then Babcock will come to us with a 'solution'. They will tell us if something needs to be practical or simulated. The LFB Commissioning Department will either agree or disagree with Babcock, such as whether something should remain a practical component. If this happens, Babcock will be asked to find another solution and then come back to LFB with a new one. If this is agreed then LFB will sign it off. Babcock offer the solutions but the LFB determine the final outcome. An example of this process is when Babcock suggested that driving courses could be simulated but the LFB disagreed and stated that it should be practical training. The practical training allows for delegates to sit inside the cab of a fire appliance (fire engine), using blue lights with different road conditions and weather.

The LFB sends personnel on secondment to Babcock, this is not a contractual requirement. The contract states that if Babcock wish to use LFB staff then they can request that. The LFB do not have to provide staff, however there are currently 6 people who are seconded to Babcock to assist with training delivery. The rest are Babcock staff who are either full time or on zero hours contracts. They may be subject area experts, retired or assisting other fire services.

It is for the LFB to specify what it wants in training packages.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

As mentioned previously, the LFB looks at National Guidance alongside national and international incidents. As a result of other fires, the LFB has changed some aspects of incident command training. Part of the Ops Professionalism Board meeting will look at things that have come from incidents nationally, internationally and then look at National Guidance, look at what other Fire Rescue Services are doing and then the Board will make a decision around the need to change our training. This then goes through the TCAP process.

The Ops Professionalism Board was previously known as the Ops Directorate Coordination Board. It has been in existence since at least 2012.

The Lakanal House fire happened in 2009, which was a fatal fire in Southwark, London. There were a number of Coronial recommendations made towards the LFB after the fire. There was a Lakanal Action Plan which the Ops Directorate Coordination Board was responsible for. Part of their role was to look at recommendations and to assess any training implications in relation to them. There were some recommendations that were related to training. I was not involved with the Lakanal training at that time.

The relevant department was notified of the specified training requirement and that was handed to the person responsible for training at that time. This ensured that the solution met the requirement and was signed off in the same way as a TCAP process. Any recommendations would have been monitored through the Ops Directorate Coordination Board. The action plan would be signed off at that board.

At the time of the Lakanal House recommendations, there were three people responsible for training. Training was split into two. The Training Assurance and Business relationship arm which I headed. The other half of this was the Learning and Development Strategy, headed by DAC Kevin HUGHES.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

There was a Head of HR, James DALGLEISH. There were around five deputies, my responsibility was around the contract and assurance, Kevin was responsible for the commissioning 'arm' of it.

A training package for Lakanal House still remains.

Currently, something of this nature would come to the Ops Professionalism Board. An example of this would be the Croydon tram crash. There were a number recommendations that came out after that incident. The Brigades response to these recommendations are that they have been fully accepted. The LFB are a learning organisation. The Brigade reviews all incidents via the PRC and PRO processes and identifies areas for improvement as well as good practice.

The LFB has been training Incident Command and BA but this has not been specially tailored to high rise buildings. Historically, there was more generic training. I use the term 'generic' to refer to Incident Command training- different scenarios and case studies are used, normally relating to incidents that have happened recently.

Within Incident Command training, there is theoretical input and a simulated input. At the moment, we are working on delivering a practical element for Incident Command. The idea is that there is theoretical, some simulation and a practical element as well. High rise training is part of Incident Command training and not a 'standalone' course.

Since the Lakanal House fire, the inputs changed and then changed again after the Grenfell Tower fire and the Shirley Towers fire. At the moment, the policy for high rise is being reviewed along with training inputs which are also being reviewed again too. It evolves all the time.

In relation to high rise training, centrally led training has dedicated facilities at Park Royal which has four floors. Locally, within stations, there are venues that can be used for high rise training but I do not know

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

their height. It should sit under the borough training plans. Before the Grenfell Tower fire, the LFB were looking at high rise facilities (six floors) and we are currently in the process of submitting a planning application for a new training venue in Croydon. This would be a LFB facility that Babcock will use. This gives the LFB more scope to train in different scenarios, using underground car parks, maisonette style flats etc. The LFB is restricted on size and is bound by sustainability and environmental strategies so facilities must not emit pollutants.

The Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service have a twelve storey high rise and it's in a very non-residential position so there is no concerns about residents, for example. There are early discussions at the moment around working with some neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services (FRS). Surrey and Buckinghamshire FRS are looking for new training facilities, potentially with the assistance of the LFB. If London do assist in the design of that, then potentially this venue could be added to the training estate portfolio. The LFB would want to add that to our training suite and would pay to send people to be trained there. The Fire Service College has a high rise but it is an old building. Scotland FRS have a high rise facility but there aren't many nationally.

In terms of Breath Apparatus (BA) training, there is a practical two day course which involves BA drills and exercises. Throughout the two day input, the scenario changes.

Since the public inquiry, CBT packages and 'Ops News' have been updated to include cladding, as a subject area. People have been asked to read the 'Ops News' to make them aware of updates. The CBT packages have had a knowledge component added to them. The Ops Policy and Assurance Department are delivering a series of workshops around high rise and cladding. That is feeding into a new suite of Incident Command courses. I have been asked if cladding was a topic the Brigade were aware of before the Grenfell Tower fire. I do not know how long the LFB have been aware of the topic of cladding and this is not within the remit of my role.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:



Part of looking at the incident database and national learning, there have been changes to training that have included the way a fire behaves or its combustion. There was an Ops News both prior to and post the Grenfell Tower fire on fire behaviour.

There is a policy around 'operational (Ops) discretion', there is no face to face training associated with Ops Discretion. It is being developed by Ops Policy and Assurance. The requirement up until now will be that staff are aware of the Ops Discretion policy. Operational News 37 includes a watch based package on operational discretion. AC Dom ELLIS is responsible for Ops Policy and Assurance and would be able to talk more about what is currently happening with it.

I am not an operational officer so I cannot comment on the use of 'Ops Discretion'.

Mass Evacuation, as a new training area, which is being reviewed by AC Dom ELLIS, who is overseeing it. Mass Evacuation is raised within the Fire Fighter Development programme. There is no standalone training on mass evacuation. The intention, going forward, is that mass evacuation will become a standalone training package. This is a direct result of the Grenfell Tower Fire.

Control staff have their own training department within the LFB. Babcock do not do specific control training but they design a CBT package such as the Lakanal House related CBT that Babcock designed. If a member of Control is going on a leadership course, then Babcock delivers that to them and they will be classed as an attendee. New entrants into Control who are on their development programme will be trained within Control. Fire Survival Guidance (FSG) is all done within their own training.

Training in relation to Command Support System (CSS) sits with Mick ELLIS, and he may be able to expand on this more than I can.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Currently, 7 2(d) visits incorporate a team briefing. A CBT package has been created as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire. Previously, 'Ops News' was used to make people aware and to familiarise themselves with 7 2 (d) visits. This could have been relating to a policy or procedure and delivered locally. Prior to April 2018, the responsibility was down to the line manager to ensure that it was being done. It should have been recorded onto the station diary and the Review Officers that I mentioned earlier would be checking records. The consistency and standard of delivery was checked by the Review Officers at time.

The system to record training is fit for purpose however it is a management issue about whether people complete their training. I have been asked to comment on training since the Grenfell Tower fire. There is an urgency within the LFB to get these training packages out quickly. Since the Grenfell Tower fire, any addition to training will have been advised from the AC of Ops Policy and Assurance, AC Dom ELLIS.

The LFB have set up the Grenfell Tower Improvement Board which is chaired by the Commissioner. There are a number of commissions within that. Commission Two relates to the TCAPs, which I am responsible for and each TCAP gives a specification timeline, design, pilot timeline and delivered. As mentioned earlier, 7 2 (d) visits and logist courses are a shorter timescale for a TCAP due to the training requirement. The logist course may be a day long CBT package. This means the newer training will be completed in different time scales.

The revalidation of Incident Command is on a phased approach. We are completing level one training first as the vast majority of staff are fire fighters and Watch Managers. We are adding in human behaviours which has not been included before. The LFB have been in contact with the Fire Service College and have consulted around current Incident Command training, as an interim measure, until further training happens. The LFB is currently meeting a national standard through an interim solution at the moment.

Internal meetings around training have 'action points' and summaries, LFB meetings are not minuted.

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by:

The LFB continue to improve their training and further develop since the Grenfell Tower fire. I am happy to provide further material to police, if requested.

(nb: page 25 is crossed through and blank)

Signature: P GROVES  
2020

Signature witnessed by: