

WITNESS STATEMENT

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

Statement of: DAVIS, NICHOLAS

Age if under 18: OVER 18 (if over 18 insert 'over 18')

Occupation: LFB FIRE OFFICER

This statement (consisting of 32 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: SIGNED

Date: 27/10/2020

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

I am making this statement in relation to my role as the Station Commander (SC) of North Kensington and Kensington Fire Stations, leading up to, and after the Grenfell Tower Fire on 14th June 2017.

I have been spoken to by way of digital media, with DC WHITBY and CI BRATHWAITE. I understand that this statement is a written version of what we discussed at UNION STREET on 8th September 2020.

During this meeting I declined to have anyone present with me.

At the time of the meeting I had in my possession a copy of my Rule 9 statement dated 19th July 2018 which I had provided to the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry prior to me giving live evidence. I am happy for the content of the Rule 9 statement to be included in this evidence.

I have been asked if I have provided any other evidence or exhibits to either the inquiry or investigation team, I can confirm I attended the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry on 2nd October 2018 and gave live evidence, I provided the inquiry in advance of that hearing a Rule 9 statement, and throughout this investigation I have provided the inquiry team with over 300 emails from my time as SC at North Kensington and Kensington.

I have been asked if the details within my Rule 9 are correct, I have clarified, as I did when I attended the Public Inquiry hearing, that the statement at the time of writing and to the best of my knowledge was correct. However whilst watching SC Andy Walton's evidence it became apparent to me that my permissions within the Operational Risk Database (ORD) action log screen were different to what I was seeing at the Public Inquiry.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

It was all around the ORD, and specifically around the plans of the building, or lack of. One of my functions is to quality assure the information that the watches collect during a visit, and enter onto the ORD. There's certain things that are risk critical, i.e. plans of the premises, so in my mind I was under the assumption I had authorised the picture that's on the ORD. It wasn't until, SC Andy Walton was giving evidence that I saw a screen shot of the ORD action log. What I didn't realise was I didn't have the same access to that action log as I was seeing on the screen. A watch officer would have a certain level of permissions, so if we were all in different roles, we would see different screens of the same application. If I was a watch manager and you were a SC you would see something different to me, if you were her line manager you would see something different to me and you.

It wasn't until I saw the screen shot at the inquiry, that I noticed my name wasn't on the log, it showed that I'd rejected the map and made a comment where I asked them to put plans on the data base, but I hadn't seen that, so I assumed in my mind I must have authorised the map to go on the ORD.

Again it wasn't until SC Andy Walton was giving evidence and the inquiry was referencing the actions on the ORD, that I then went down to see Chris O'Connor from IT and said 'have you seen that the screen is different to mine' he agreed. He said 'you won't see this on your screen as I have different permissions'. The screen I was looking at logged everything and everyone's action on it, and it became apparent to me that I had rejected the image. Then the issue was, that the log was saying that after rejecting the image it never came back to me to review which it should have done. So, there appeared to be a glitch in the system. It should go through two channels – me as a SC and then go on to what's called a central final check by Predetermined Attendance (PDA) team, which is the final check on the ORD. My understanding is that the PDA team don't check each individual entry, so in effect they sample, they pull one out and sample it, so the assumption is, that it appeared it never got sampled, I believe if anyone had seen it, they would have rejected it as well.

I have been asked if I have reviewed any material on databases since the incident - It's the first thing I did, it's a bit of a fire brigade thing, if ever there's a fire when you're not on duty in your borough, your team, your station, one of the first things I do, is look up the ORD. It's one of our information tools, its where we get information from, and as soon as, one of the things you look for are plans and maps. So when I woke up at 4 o'clock in the morning, because I got a text to say there's a job on, I logged on, checked the ORD and to my horror there were no plans on there, 'Google street? How's that?' I just couldn't work out how it got on there, so I done a lot of looking through all my bits and pieces, looking at my emails, because I am thorough and don't just rely on IT systems.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

So if there was an issue I wouldn't just sit in my office next to the station office, I am one of those managers that wouldn't just send an email to the officer, I'd go out and say to the officer, if they were on duty I'd say there's a Google street map or there's no plan on the ORD entry can you make sure you reject it and put the right plans on there. So I was going through my emails to find out if there was any evidence of what I had done, I couldn't find any emails so it maybe that I've just physically walked out rejected it manually on the computer screen and verbally asked them don't forget you got to get some plans or maps. Other than that amendment, my Rule 9 statement is correct.

I joined the LFB in 1996 my first station was Tooting, I served for 11 years as a firefighter, I then went to Wandsworth as a Firefighter crew manager (CM), I did two or three years there, then I went to Lambeth for the CBRN or RRT which is the chemical team for us, I spent a number of years there, this was during the Olympics as the Brigade needed to increase their resilience by making the team a little bit bigger because of the increased threat level.

I was a CM then as my substantive rank but acted up as a Watch Manager A (WMA) for the team. Then I got promoted as a WMA and went out to Wallington, South East London, I then went to Sutton as temporary WMB, I undertook these two roles for 3 or 4 years as a WMA/B and then got promoted to SC which is when I went to North Kensington and Kensington in 2016 / 2017. Since then I've been promoted to Group Commander (GC). I was at North Kensington and Kensington as SC and just before the Grenfell Tower fire I went to the South West area team for about 2/3 months and then got asked to undertake a staff officer role at Headquarters for the Deputy Commissioner.

My training as a Firefighter in comparison to when I reached higher ranks was different. As a firefighter you are more hands on/practical they are the 'doers' in effect, they do a lot more practical roles, there's more managerial or command/control element I would suggest to the officer training because that's what you're there for, to manage safety. The biggest difference if you talk about the roles is it can be quite a lonely role as a SC/GC, especially if you spend years and years on the team and then all of a sudden, you're a SC and there's only, you. When I was at Kensington & Chelsea Borough, you had two SC's so that in affect that's your team and you bounce ideas off each other, you're helping, supporting each other, you've got a line manager who at the time was GC Rob DAVIS for Kensington and Chelsea who was really supportive. At North Kensington and Kensington I was the SC, it was unusual for a SC on development to be given twinned stations, so in effect you duplicate your role, you're managing two stations. It's a bit of an anomaly within the LFB so you will get a Borough Commander (BC) of Sutton who'll only have two stations that they manage, with two SC's. But at Kensington & Chelsea there's

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

three stations in the Borough, but only 2 SC's so there's always going to be one SC who manages two stations, so in effect the same role as a BC in a smaller Borough. The ORD would be a good example – you look at the ORD – and like I said at the inquiry it's not just North Kensington's ORD you need to look at, because I was managing Kensington as well which has got more buildings on the ORD than North Kensington. That's where I learnt very quickly that I needed to understand the IT and work queue to help me manage my workload. During my development period there's two things you can do, as a WM, before you go into that role if you're proactive and you're looking at stuff you're fully involved in what the processes are so you've got an understanding, in effect you're one end of the chain and you're now going to be sitting at the other end of the chain, so actually I always use to looking at it from the perspective of “why am I doing stuff” “what's the impact on my SC because that's what I'm doing, what I do will affect their workload, how can I make that easier, what do I need to do, and it's also doing your role properly. So, if you do that role properly and gain an understanding of what the other side is doing then I would understand the IT systems that would support me. As a WM I had an understanding of how it works as a SC but as I said earlier I physically don't see the screens till you get that permission, until I became a SC I never knew what those screens looked like. You might be lucky that you've got a SC that's good with development, that'll talk you through the processes. I have been asked to explain what access firefighters and managers have to our IT systems. As a firefighter, they all have access to station diary, this is used to manage a watches day, they plan their day, their training, etc. Most of our IT systems feed into the station diary. For example, we have a system called STARS which holds all the information about all our staff and tells us who is on duty, who is on leave, it identifies staffs skills.

If a station needs two drivers because they have two appliances but because of sickness or leave there is only one driver available on duty at that station, STARS feeds into another system that will flag up that the station is one driver short and needs one driver to be sent to that station to ensure both appliances are on the run. The system allocates these resources for the day, one of the jobs when they come on duty is they've got to confirm the figures, so Resource Management Centre (RMC) that manages all station based staff know that they need to move John from A to B. I believe all our IT systems feed into each other at some level. A firefighter has limited access to STARS, – STARS is a simple one, they have access to looking at the STARS for their watch or a watch on their station, but they can't look at another stations STARS. Their line manager can enter their leave, no one can enter their own leave and you must go through your line manager to enter annual leave.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

As a SC they will have more access and can look brigade wide. A firefighter needs to have access to STARS to check when their courses come through, they'll also get an email saying you've been allocated a course for 2 days and they need to sit down with their WM who also gets the email and check it's on the system correctly.

The station diary doesn't contain STARS, but STARS feeds into it. If you were opening up your home screen you would see different icons for different applications, there's one for station diary, there's one for STARS, For example, if you open your station diary, it will have the current day displayed for you and they'll be the time down one side and they'll be blocks within those times indicating what activities are booked in. This might be a home fire safety visit (HFSV) appointment that gets automatically created by their area team, this function then gets loaded onto their diary. This feeds into STARS because this then allocates who's on duty and available to undertake that visit. As a SC I can create additional people to go on that visit, but firefighters can't. It might be that I've got some staff on light duties available to me, these are people that are not fit for operational duties but are still on their watch, they may be recovering from an operation rather than them being off sick. Following an occupational health assessment staff can be placed light duties and available for community safety work. I'm not sure if a firefighter has that same permission to add someone else to what would be the rota because it's on STARS.

The ORD is the operational risk database, that is a function that sits within the station diary, this is different in the sense it is an application that you access through the station diary. Within that, the station diary is different for a watch officer, so I have a station diary that manages the station and covers all 4 watches and then within my station diary I have the station master ORD list, which is a database that I would open up within the station diary and it would have the full list of every single ORD for the station. For example, a watch would do a visit to an address only to find the building had been knocked down, its gone, brilliant, we don't need that on the system anymore because the building doesn't exist and I have permission to delete this. I can delete these entries and I can create new ones as well, watch officers can also create new entries. As with all IT systems there are glitches within them so there are regular updates to our systems so every day is a learning day as I'm constantly learning. For example, the other day I found out there's a little function on our fire brigade computers that I was unaware of, I might have 30 screens open at one time, and I would have to minimise them all to get back to the home screen, I've just found out there's a little icon on my screen that you can click on and it takes you back to the home screen and I never knew it was there. It's not a key it's a little icon on the bottom, I didn't know that – I always

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

remind people you've got to remember when I started in the job, we didn't have computers. My first job was, as a junior firefighter was to change the carbon paper in the typewriter so we use to use triplicate forms. I type with two fingers, but I've got slightly quicker every day is a learning day with IT with me. All our IT systems are continually updated, like the ORD and all the functions will have upgrades. They'll be things that change and you tend to find that certain officers, are helpful to go to and confirm your understanding as they may use them more regularly. Certain people will be comfortable with systems they regularly use and if you haven't used something for a while you may need to refresh yourself or you might have to ask someone. Regarding training to use computers and IT systems within the LFB there's several computer courses you can select to go on e.g. Excel, Word etc. It's not compulsory, so I suppose one of the challenges is IT, like I said when you go through different promotion ranks you have different functions and responsibilities so the ORD would be a good example. There is no specific training about how to use the systems and the differences between the access and permissions you have as you get promoted.

No one formally sits down with you and after promotion that when you get to a station, and you open up the station diary, you will see certain screens and functions that you may not have seen before. What they've got is a user guide of over 100 pages, which you must download. It's on hotwire which is our intranet system, again you must know where it is, you must know how to find it which isn't always easy. I think it works for some people but for me, personally I much prefer being shown and demonstrated stuff. I don't always take that information in, especially 100-page document and all I want to do is access a small function. I'll end up spending two days reading up the 100-page document, whereas sometimes it's easier to just pick up the phone to one of your mates who has been doing that role a long time.

Currently now, you get firefighter, leading firefighter, sub officer, station officer, because the rank structure has changed since the Grenfell Tower fire, so each role/rank they'll see the same screen visually, but have different permissions dependant on rank or role.

So, a firefighter may just have read only access, depending on what the function is. They may be able to see other functions but unable to access it and their permissions denied. That's just one of the challenges for a SC generally. There seems to be a default with all the IT systems that require the SC to sign off on everything. Working through the diary all the systems links up to help you manage all your different work, you've got HR, ORD, training and this shows on my work queue.

When I open the station diary and click on it, it only shows me my work queue initially. I can see other junior officers work queues at my station, but they can't see mine.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

As a SC if I log on at a station that I am not managing I might not have the same permissions as I would have for my own stations. For example, one of the watch officers, went on a standby to another station and they log on at that station some of the permissions wouldn't allow them to access their home station work queue. So, this has now been fixed which allows standby officers to access their home station work queue as well as the station they are at.

When it comes to IT issues one of the challenges was knowing who to contact. There are different IT systems and there'll generally be a lead for each system. It's a matter of knowing who to contact at headquarters for help. Once you've actually found out who is the lead on that particular function with IT, you can actually pick the phone up to them and say 'look I'm really stuck here can you help, I think I'm doing something really silly or stupid but I just can't seem to make it work' and generally they'll say 'go back a page click that option and that'll work'. – The problem for station-based staff is they are on duty 24/7 but the IT support generally works Monday to Friday 9-5. So, depending on the shift they are working, you could be on duty over a weekend so it might be another 2 weeks before you are back on duty and able to talk to IT. The two separate shifts and departments don't always coincide

There are ways you can report IT issues into the BC, they sit with SC's in meetings where you go through, HR issues, ORD issues or whatever the challenge is, the BC will then feed into the area team. This will help to establish if this is a wider issue or user error and identify a solution.

It wasn't until I witnessed SC Andy WALTON giving evidence at the Public Inquiry that something jogged my mind and I realised that what I had been thinking over the past 18 months was incorrect. I thought I had made a mistake, I was ready to accept responsibility, but in fact the action log for the Grenfell ORD was different to mine. It showed me rejecting the original ORD and asking for plans to be added, it then showed the Google image being submitted but not coming back to myself for authorisation, but instead going straight to PDA.

I thought it was quite important people realise a firefighter doesn't have the same screen as I do.

It's the same thing with the ORD, what you see at a station and what you see on the fire appliance are completely different, and when you print it off, again the printed version of the ORD is different. The content is the same, the difference is in the formatting.

Regarding the changes around 7.2. ds have been a journey if I'm honest, when I first started as a new firefighter you get chunked in the deep end, you do all the running around and recording. We used to do a lot of visits, sometimes two or three a day. What we use to call 'G' visits, residential care homes predominantly, pubs, clubs and all the old licencing stuff we use to do then. There was a period under

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

Regulatory Reform Order (RRO) that in effect changed the number of visits we needed to do because the responsibility was given to the owner of the properties. It took the powers away that we historically had and then there was a period where we almost didn't do visits, so there was a period of time where there was a bit of, I don't know...nothing happened, and then the computer system happened.

Prior to the arrival of the new computer system we had tangible folders, in the old-style filing cabinets filed in date order. They were colour coded. The visits would be in rolling date order. You'd simply open the draw and you would just look, there wouldn't necessarily be a visit on every day of the year.

Some sites would have thick folders containing visits over many years, if it was a relatively new building it would be a small folder. Then there was a period where everything became electronic, so the honest answer is I can't remember how it's done, and I think there was a combination of centrally uploaded information, if my memory serves me right, that centrally they migrated the headline visits. For example they created a visit for St Georges hospital, Tooting, that was approximately 3 pages long, but the ORD for St Georges was considerably bigger because it had so many risks, and hazards in different buildings. We lost a firefighter there at a fire, so it was quite an important one.

St Georges is an example of the extreme visit that would take a whole day. It was probably 15 years ago when it migrated over, you had a central team that created an electronic version of the ORD, but when it was created, the electronic file for that location would solely contain the address and the local station would have to populate it.

If you looked back at the original Grenfell Tower ORD entry the very first date on the action log would show when its first electronic version was first created.

The date when that process started, you would see how it's morphed over time where gradually there's been different formats and policy changes, we've now got Electronic Premises Information Plates (EPIP). As these have been added to the process as it has been updated.

7.2. d's use to be referred to as 'G' visits, there were different letters for different visits, E.g. 1.1. d's (familiarisation visits)

The process for creating a new 7.2.d, is, an SC from our fire safety team would send an email to the SC at the station to say they have plans for a new tower block to be built on their ground. I would then get the crews to have a look at the site, and to complete a risk assessment. Whilst the crews were undertaking the risk assessment, they would take into account a number of factors; construction, life risk, building use, access, and a lot more areas which could affect the score matrix.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

The attending watch would then have to score the premises with the risk assessment, and then, from that it comes back to me with the score, as a SC it would then sit in my work queue. I then open it up electronically, go through it, the sheet I see is formatted in a different way as to how others see it. I can approve it, and it would recommend the frequency of visits. There's a couple of options that I can choose to do, it might be it doesn't warrant a visit as the score is so low.

It might have a particularly high residential risk score, or a residential care home, or it has a complex layout, there's lots of different triggers in the risk assessment that can increase the score and obviously the basic principle is the higher the score the more frequently we visit, so I could recommend that we visit four times a year, so each watch attends and is aware of the risks.

A new risk assessment is generally for a new 72D visit only, however, if the risk has changed at an existing 72D visit this can be amended.

There's an electronic prompt for primary and future visits for certain selected parts of the risk assessment, for example the EPIP, you don't get an EPIP prompt to do it for every visit because the EPIP is generally for high rise residential buildings so if you haven't selected the buildings over 7 floors it won't give you the option for an EPIP as you go through your process.

It's part of your regular visits, so we do the risk assessment, for instance Wormwood Scrubs prison would be visited once a year, we have a good working relationship with the prison. I know if they were doing a major refurbishment they would generally contact the fire safety team, we would get a notification through that says there's some building works going on, I would then get the crews down there to have a look and amend the ORD if required. Then there maybe the building managers have called the station or emailed the station it depends if there's an ongoing relationship, one of the challenges is we don't always get told of refurbishments, so you might not know. That could be one of the issues, and then we have a process, for example when a crew does a 7.2.d visit, we always have a challenge with residential care homes about propping doors open, with wedges, especially in the summer its really stuffy, but actually that's the purpose of a fire door, if you then go out for the night and that doors wedged open, then that compromises that floor because you'll have a fire in that room or that flat, this would allow the smoke to travel out of the compartment and affect other parts of the building.

Crews can address minor risks at the time of the visit. For more serious infringements they can request over the radio, a senior fire safety officer (SFSO) to attend, which is a default thing, because we're not all SFSOs, and this is quite a technical area.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

A firefighter wouldn't receive fire safety training which could mean they may not know if that's a fire door or not, there's some tell tell signs but I wouldn't be 100% sure if that meets building regulations. Depending on what the building is, if it's a hospital, or social housing, then the central fire safety team also have their own cycle of visits, that they report on.

They don't refer to these visits as 7.2. d's, they must refer to them as something else, I'm not sure what. Their visits are separate to station visits carried out by firefighters.

There are certain triggers that activate the attendance of a fire safety officer, a fatality, 4 pump fires and over, or an injury to members of the public, then you would notify a SFSO who may attend on the night, it maybe that they phone up, and ask for further information before deciding if they need to come.

Certainly, if it's a fatal, they will turn up and they will do, what they call, an initial inspection and report. A residential house is not covered by the RRO. Within a residential block of flats, they would cover the communal areas including fixed installations, fire lift, fire doors, dry riser, all outside of the individual residential flats, within that block.

Following the fire, the report by the SFSO is sent to the local fire safety team who will complete a post fire audit and will also arrange a formal visit within a set period.

The fire safety team would do a more thorough visit where they would check maintenance records, risk assessments, they will do the in-depth information gathering, if a fault or an issue is identified at the time of the incident, this will also form part of their investigation, that then feeds back into me, as the SC, I would normally be notified by email.

Within that email, they normally explain if the issues were rectified at the time or not.

As an example, we had a fire in a residential high-rise, there they had a wet riser, and the crews were saying that they had no water. The wet riser should provide us with water to all floors, and there was a fire on the top floor. I picked this up on the Monday, via email, and through discussion with the crews. I was aware this was a TMO property. I was made aware that the wet risers were not working, this is critical, we need to get that fixed. I informed Janice WRAY, that she'd need to get an engineer in that day. I recall she came back and agreed it had been tested and it was working, it must have been user error. Something just didn't sit right with me, I then asked what tests were carried out, and was told the engineer turned up in the pump room, on the ground floor, plugged in his computer and did an electronic test and said, 'it's working'. My question was, have they done a physical test at the outlet, on the 30th floor. The answer was – no they haven't – so I requested they manually test it. And that it needed to be tested that day.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

They went back and discovered a fault at the very top of the riser – so electronically, it says its working fine, but there's certain times you need to do a practical, manual test, and one of my roles is to question what type of test is completed, to quality assure it. This is a safety issue for residents and crews.

There may be times it could be user error, it's my role to ensure the correct protocols are followed and identify any training needs.

We won't always know when fire safety officers (FSO) do their visits, or where those visits take place. Fire Safety Officer (FSO) have their own work schedule.

They have their own lists of addresses to visit and I wouldn't expect to know their work schedule. They also report to a different line manager.

On a fire station they have a system called 'imapping' which will allow station-based staff to access and view postcodes or addresses, and what activities have taken place at these venues. This will also include if an ORD is recorded. There is another tool called 'Postcode lookup' which is another function that allows you to do the same thing.

I'm going back a few years, I know the process has changed now, but if I wanted to get my station or borough to target HFSV, I would use either of these functions to identify what we call 'P1 postcodes' or 'P1 people'. You can look up an address, to check what fire safety action has been taken against that postcode, this allows you to prioritise your HFSV's.

For example, you can search the name of a high-rise, or tower block and it will tell you things like; how many HFSV's have been completed, the dates of the visits, the name of the resident and any outstanding risks recorded. As an example, 'Flat 7' has had 10 visits in the last 10 years, but you've had 10 different residents within the same address. This could indicate the location has a high number of new resident turnover.

There is also a function you can look up to see if there's been any enforcement, any action or if there's been part of a general inspection as part of the fire safety team.

They wouldn't always necessarily tell you their day to day workings – enforcement notices are very important for us, because we need to let crews know if there's been an enforcement notice, this is normally done via an email to the BC and SC, which is then shared with the watch officers.

I would receive the email, with the full details of the specific issue which I can then forward onto the watches.

As an example, if following an inspection at a fire we've identified that there's a number of fire doors within a block that's had its self-closers removed, I need to make sure all the 4 watches know about that

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

as a starting point. I do this by emailing the watch officers and verbally updating those on duty at the time. This would include any actions that need to be completed.

Normally notifications from fire safety teams are never minor and would require action either by the responsible person or owner, and a record of this action will be required. There are occasions following a watch visit where minor issues are identified and can be simply rectified immediately without the need for further action. For example, a wedged door.

This wouldn't necessarily need to be put on the station diary. It would be my role to disseminate that information as I deem appropriate. I would go to the watch officers so that they can share that information with their firefighters or complete a 7.2.d visit if it's appropriate.

We also have a handover book, a tangible book, different stations have different ways of doing it and there's no set process. A handover book will contain relevant information for the oncoming watch e.g. 'FF BLOGGS on Red watch has booked first day sick, lost keys or helmet as a prompt for the watch officers. Road closures are also noted in the book as well as the wall map updated manually indicating where they were and for how long. These road closure updates are sent directly to the SC for dissemination.

The handover book is in addition to the electronic email, if a standby officer is on duty the SC may not know who they are so they would not receive the email which is another good reason for the handover book.

One of the reasons that the ORD was brought in was because there wasn't an electronic up to date version that was available pan London, so if an appliance attends an incident on their neighbouring stations ground, they can now access the information on the ORD for that address.

About 7.2.d visits, there is a checklist within PN800 which crews can access which provide them with guidance on what to check for example fixed installations.

If there was an existing ORD entry you would use that information almost as a check list for any changes or updates to the building. There is also a check list for the risk assessment which is accessed through the station diary. Following the risk assessment this allows the SC to ascertain the frequency of visits required they do this by using the risk matrix evaluation.

The visits are then allocated automatically through the station diary. However, a manual amendment to the time of the visit, can be altered by the SC or watch officer if needs be.

For example – the appliance maybe mobilised to a fire five minutes before the visit so crews would have to reschedule for another time.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

About 7.2. d's I'll describe how I would do it. Different watch officers do it in slightly different ways. I would print off PN800, and the ORD, the appendix, and the checklist itself if it's a new visit. As I'm putting in new information, I need to make sure this is accurate, and I reference the checklist to ensure I don't miss anything. If I was revisiting a premises and the information is already on the system I would normally just print off the 7.2.d paperwork.

It maybe that I'm new to the station so I haven't done a visit to these premises before, I would check with the crew as they may have visited before and have valuable local knowledge.

An example being a residential care home, it will have a list of hazards and risks, and we need to check for any changes. This would also include several residents and staff at both day and night-time. The crews will also be aware of any complex layouts or locations of hazards like a cylinder storeroom. Crews will also check that a risk assessment is on site and up to date. It maybe that there are no changes to be recorded for the visit and it is just a familiarisation visit for crews and will be recorded as such.

Familiarisation visits and 7.2.d's can be one of the same it would depend on what the issue was, just like the care home I described earlier. It would depend on the issue identified, like following a 7.2.d visit or a notification from fire safety, they can be recorded as a revisit on the system or simply an email return to fire safety and the SC.

If crews are unsure about a certain issue, they can call a fire safety officer to seek their advice and guidance in relation as to what action to take, followed by an email, with a fire safety form attached. The importance of this form is that it is two sided and must be completed by the recipient and emailed back, to ensure that the issues have been acknowledged. The form goes to the area fire safety team for their action.

This information is stored on a completely different database, this is a fire safety system called FARYNOR. Senior officers and fire safety officers have access to this system, watch officers and station-based staff do not have access.

The role of the PDA– Pre-determined attendance team – in relation to 7.2.d, is a quality assurance level which forms part of the process. Firstly a SC is the first quality assurance, once it's gone through them, there's a final central quality assurance, which is the PDA team.

Their team consisted of two staff members responsible for quality assurance, for the whole of the LFB. The PDA randomly sample visits.

All actions in relation to individual 7.2.d visits are recorded within an action log attached to the visit.

This would include the visit itself and any Quality Assurance (QA) processes applied.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

As with the Grenfell Tower ORD, the PDA QA entry appears several times, as they are last in the chain. At station level we have five QA's that are completed on a yearly cycle that cover a range of station activities from training to station inventories and includes 7.2.d visits.

Each QA will take most of the day and the SC will sit down with the watch and go through several records, these include practical sessions using a printed check list to reference areas to be covered. There are four QAs that are completed by the SC for each watch and a fifth QA completed by the GC. 7.2. ds are covered by this QA. You sample the master index with a recent visit that the watch has completed. This enables us to check the electronic information on the database and confirm it is correct. The advantage of doing it in this way, as SC you get to speak with the crews directly. I sit down with the watch officer to check with them how they conduct a 7.2.d visit from start to finish, including how they enter the details on to the ORD. I then sit down with the firefighters separately to confirm their knowledge and understanding of the visit, I don't expect them to be experts, but they should have a good working knowledge of their role in relation to building regulations and basic fire safety. The QA process covers a number of other areas including training and is done in the same way by checking that the electronic records are up to date, including the ORD entries, station diary, any high-rise visits, checking their knowledge and understanding, core skills training and includes directly observing of training sessions.

QAs are very time consuming, and as SC at North Kensington and Kensington I would have to complete eight watches over the two stations. The GC completes QA five which is done with the on-duty watch and the SC.

At the time there was a lot of focus on training, and there was a big focus on trying to get staff away from computers that was one of the criticisms from staff, that they were spending too much time in the office. It's important to try and get out and see the crews, its actually nice spending an hour putting ladders up and completing training, getting a bit of fresh air and exercise so that's another point of contact when completing the QA.

The level of information that should be updated on the ORD would depend on the type of premises. As an example, St Georges Hospital would have a very large list of hazards including chemicals and radiation compared to a residential care home with 20 rooms which may only have a small amount of oxygen cylinders.

Each visit would contain the same information but depending on the type of premises the amount of information in each area would vary in size. This includes the number of residents/occupants, hazards,

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

tactical plans and floor plans, to name but a few. These visits may also identify the types of residents, for example if we have an ORD for a care home it's important the crews understand their needs whilst dealing with disabled or vulnerable residents. These would be covered by the fire risk assessment and evacuation strategy completed by the responsible person.

The responsible person should have a maintenance contract, it's their responsibility to make sure the lifts work properly and maintain them. From a firefighter's perspective when they do a 7.2. d, they must understand how the firefighter lift works and they will test it by using the drop key to ensure it operates correctly

This is done during the 7.2.d visit and the firefighters would go to the lift lobby on the ground floor and push the button to request the lift to return to the ground floor to check it works, they would then send the lift up the building by selecting a floor, physically moving it, then they would use the lift keys to turn on the fire lift controls and if working properly the lift will automatically return to the ground floor. Fire lifts should only be controllable by a firefighter and they have different functions from normal lifts once activated. A member of the public can't use that lift without a firefighter.

During an incident you assign a firefighter to the fire lift. Once the lift is under the firefighter's control, it allows the firefighter certain functions and control which are not available to the general public. For example you have to hold the floor button down, so as its going up, then if you became overcome by fumes and you pass out the doors would shut and return to the lift to the ground floor, this is a safety function within a fire lift.

There are many different types of lifts, with different functions and controls.

We have lots of different drop keys for different lifts. So that's part of the visit, so you understand what keys are required to control that lift. Drop keys are very similar in appearance but can perform different roles i.e. drop keys and straight keys.

Some of them are very similar looking, the crews will get to know visually what key works with what lift. During a 7.2.d we don't record on the ORD what drop key would operate a specific lift.

You don't know what drop keys operate what lift until you physically check the lift, at an incident you would take all the lift keys in with you

In some new buildings the fire key access may not be easily identifiable.

Some of your standard new buildings would have several lifts, and if you're looking where to activate the lift its normally to one side of the lift. In some older buildings the lift key might be around the corner from the lift, so it is not always in the same position for each lift. Nine times out of ten the key is to the

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

side of the fire lift, that's best practice. If you're looking at a new lift and where to insert the key, they are sometimes behind a flap, you lift the flap up and insert the key. That information would go on the ORD, 'there is a fire lift here and to operate the fire lift the access point is behind a decorative panel that you lift up and that's where you insert the key'. You wouldn't normally put in the detail of what type of key it is or what model the lift is.

As regards instruction on how to use the fire lift there is a policy note on what lifts do and what you expect them to do.

I would have to look at it to find the detail, there is a British standard of fire lift that explains what they must do at certain times. If the fire lift for example following a visit is not working, that's risk critical so we need to take some action.

Crews would need to inform the responsible person or their on-site representative to get it fixed. If crews had concerns, they would phone up or get control to contact a SFSO, they'll probably speak to them on the phone. Then it's a case of updating the ORD and other crews at the station that the fire lift does not work in that building.

During a 7.2.d visit I would expect firefighters to physically put the drop key in and turn it, move the lift and get in it, they need to check it works. This is part of their checks they don't have to record how they have checked it, but they should check a fire lift works correctly. If it is a standard lift and works as you expect, all I want to know on the ORD is that a fire lift is there. I don't need to know the model of it, I don't need to know what key it takes, the only thing I want to know is, one, if it doesn't work or two if there's something out of the ordinary that I wouldn't expect like the key access is hidden.

There are many different lifts – you've got hydraulic lifts, so you need to know where the lift motor room is. It's not just fire calls that we attend, we get called to people stuck in lifts, so we must have a good understanding of lifts.

Firefighters know what type of function each drop key performs and there's several sized drop keys so we might have 10 or 15 drop keys.

Each pump has a set of Gerda keys. Local Authorities started to use Gerda keys, these are not for the fire lift but access to the lift motor room or other restricted areas, this is meant to try and standardise our access. We also use the drop key, not just for fire lifts, they're used for access to blocks and sometimes we also use electronic fobs, you hold them up to the door for access.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

I've been asked if training drills conducted at high-rise buildings using a forward entry and bridge head set up – and if these drills involve moving several floors up from the bridgehead and are radio signals checked - radio signals are checked as part of the 7.2.d so not just on exercises, so you'll tend to find that crews know their local buildings that have weak radio signal areas.

I don't know if Grenfell Tower is a building with any weak radio signal areas. If it was identified during a 72d visit, that it did have any weak signal areas, that were risk critical, it would be recorded on the ORD. The ORD is designed for the very first initial officer in charge whose is attending, they need to know what information is important for their initial actions. E.g. does the building have a fire lift? One of the first actions they have to do is access the ORD, because that will tell them to do certain things. One of the tabs is your tactical plan, so actually it might be that part of that 7.2.d they've identified a weak radio signal, normally an incident commander should be at the front of a building but sometimes the inlet for the dry riser might actually be round the back and that's where their pump will be, does the radio work, or will a booster be needed.

So, at a 7.2.d that's what you would do when you test the radios. As a watch officer I would test my comms, from the driver at the pump to the incident commander, then to the crews at the bridgehead, then to the furthest point in the building. If it works fine, if it doesn't you need that recorded on the ORD. This information is important if someone who doesn't know the building turns up and is trying to contact a crew via their handheld radio and they're not answering, it might be because the radio signal is poor in that area. This would then inform us that we may need to put a booster in place that boosts the radio signal.

Training drills are conducted in high-rise buildings, residents generally don't like you training in their buildings as they find them disruptive. I've attended numerous high-rise training exercises, generally it's in an unoccupied building. In fact, I've never attended a training exercise in a fully occupied high-rise building. I don't know if they've ever been done, I think they've been done in partly occupied buildings. I attended an exercise in Croydon, that was a new high-rise building, the floors between certain levels were occupied, they agreed to let us train on floors 20-30 which were unoccupied. There's also exercises, whilst I was at Kensington & Chelsea, where we did high-rise training as part of our borough training days, the whole borough would go to Hammersmith and train in a high-rise scenario within the tower at the back of the fire station and that was one of our topics whilst I was in the borough. Each year they have a different topic to train on as part of the borough training days.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

This training would be yearly– the whole borough went there and did high-rise training, the following year there's a different subject matter, high-rise is quiet topical for us, it might be basement incident one year, they'll do a different subject. Each watch has a watch training programme, one of the topics is high-rise firefighting so there's an expectation that the watch officers would do high-rise training themselves at the station so that would be theory and practical sessions, each watch would be different to how they would deliver the training.

When we do exercises, we use a full entry control and a bridgehead for larger exercises like Croydon we would have role players including Police, LAS and local authority. The Croydon exercise was a 12 pump exercise. Large scale exercises are not done whilst firefighters are on the run (available for calls), but with 7.2.d visits they are still classed as on the run most of the time, if it was a particularly complex visit like a prison or hospital then the watch officer will make the appliance unavailable for a period of time to do that visit.

There are contingencies in place during 7.2. d visits if they're deployed to an incident this will be recorded on the station diary, I think this is called a split appointment. This can only be done when they return to the station, they would then move the appointment to another time.

The firefighters come on duty at 0930 in the morning, all their appointments for that day are in the station diary, as the time clock goes through the diary they become red as uncompleted appointments. If a watch officer has a really busy day and hasn't had time to complete any of the appointments in the diary until the following day the appointments will show as red until completed. They will just go back through the diary the following day and complete any outstanding appointments. They would open up the training appointment and if it was a ladder exercise it would say ladders, then you open another tab and within that tab you assign roles to each individual firefighter, it might be that day they did 9mtr ladders, but that Firefighter Jones and firefighter Smith did 135 ladder training. You physically assign those firefighters to the roles. Each tab is slightly different depending on what the appointment is, but in essence you're assigning roles to the individuals and then you have to complete the appointment. There's a tab that says its completed and the appointment turns black to indicate it is completed, if it doesn't get touched at all it will stay red to indicate its incomplete.

It doesn't move to the next day it stays in its original slot, but it's just shown as a red incomplete appointment, different watch officers do it differently. It's not a set process, you just need to have a process that reminds you that you've only done half of that visit, you may have been called out on a shout

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

so you need to go back and finish that visit off. You can split the appointment sometimes as well so you can leave it on the original date but then have a mirrored appointment on another day. Incidents show on the diary, an incident will show up on a diary as an appointment, again they will show as red until completed, station staff don't create them, they are created by another system that feeds into the diary. There are loads of different systems that feed in and out of each other.

About the supervision process for the ORD I've been asked if crews on 7.2.d visits check the ORD before 7.2.d visits, and compare details whilst conducting these visits for relevant changes or critical information.

My expectation for crews would be to check the ORD for relevant changes, and critical information, before completing a 72D visit. My understanding was that all the crews at North Kensington were aware of Grenfell Tower refurbishment and its location. It was handed over to me, from the previous SC that the North Kensington crews would do regular familiarisation visits and update the ORD if required, therefore not all visits were recorded.

I made a comment about the dry riser not being available to use, it's really important that we put measures in place when they're doing work on the riser and that all four watches were aware, when they went to look at the riser it should show as a 7.2.d appointment but I wouldn't expect them to do a full audit of the building. It's down as a 7.2.d visit but they're only going to look at the dry riser. I wouldn't expect the crews to complete a full 7.2.d every time they went to Grenfell Tower as this would take up too much of their time. Crews had a good understanding about Grenfell Tower so I presume the decision was made, they would keep doing the regular visits just to make sure nothing's changed.

There's a difference between the visits, a scheduled 7.2.d appointment and a visit to check a specific issue or if they wanted to go down and do a familiarisation to check on any changes to the site. If the crews needed to update the ORD following a visit for the dry riser, they should have gone into the master schedule, and opened it up. When you go into the outside duties master schedule it lists all the 7.2d's for that station, the crews can scroll down until they find Grenfell Tower. For example, double click on the address and it will open the ORD and they can do, a manual update.

If the ORD was updated it would then appear in my work queue to allow me to QA and verify any changes, When it comes into my work queue I would click on the tab and it takes me through to that ORD entry, then it takes me through the options that I have, in effect reject or submit they're the two options I

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

have. Obviously if I submit it its literally a click, if I reject it, I must put a comment on it why I'm rejecting it because it goes back to who submitted it. With the Grenfell Tower ORD entry, I was asking the watch to put plans on it, so my comment was it needs to have plans submitted which it didn't. I rejected the entry because of this, it then goes back to the person that you're tasking to do that job – they went away and they uploaded a google image not drawings or plans and its appeared on the ORD.– I had assumed that I'd submitted it and agreed it, but it never came back to me in my work queue, I wasn't aware at the time but it was identified at a later date that there was an IT issue, which meant the entry with the Google map picture wasn't returned to me.

With regard to members of the fire safety team accompanying crews at a 7.2.d visits – so the wet riser would be a good example, when I said there was an issue with it, I specifically asked them to attend because I'm not a fire safety subject matter expert. I wanted the crew to attend with a SFSO for that visit. But it's not normal for them to attend but you can ask for them.

With regard to Grenfell Tower and the dry rising main (DRM) – this was the only issue I was aware of during the refurbishment, I asked questions about it being a dry riser and not a wet riser and work on the riser itself, they wanted me to make a decision but this wasn't my decision to make. We had a good working relationship with the contractors on site, because the crews were going down regularly, they were on first name terms with the contractors, it wasn't a problem for the crews as far as I was aware. It was a building site, the access was poor, even without the builders being on site it was never great access, it was an inner London estate. Our issue was could we, if we had an incident during the refurbishment be able to do what we needed to do and the reality was we would do it, it would be hard but we would still do it. No different to any other incident from that point of view, my first interaction was just before Christmas 2015 and that was because the contractors wanted to make sure we were happy with the access arrangements during the Christmas lockdown because the builders and contractors would be off site for three weeks. There was a 24-hour security presence onsite to help, if the contractors packed up, will that still give crews access to the dry riser inlet? The crews went there, it's not for me to physically go down and look at the site, it's for the crews to take the appliance to check access and can they get the hoses in. When it came to the dry riser this was part of the refurbishment of the building, they weren't extending the building they were making extra floors. What they did was the bottom floors got changed in use, creating an extra 3 floors of residential use I think, but the height of the building itself wasn't changing. You had what was the ground floor, which was garages and offices and, these were converted.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

So, the actual building height never changed, the height of the building stayed the same, so I asked a question, "should it be a wet riser or dry riser". We have a set height when it should be a wet riser and in my view, it should be a wet riser.

In 2016 I remember receiving an email from the onsite contractor, I can't remember his name but the email described to me the process the contractors went through to decide that it's not a wet riser, it was a dry riser because the height of the building was not changing and it was originally signed off as a dry riser. The contractors wanted to put a new riser pipe the height of the building, their original plan was to do the whole lot and have no riser for several weeks. I said you can't do that but then I said that's my opinion you need to do a risk assessment because you are the responsible person you need to complete a risk assessment that tells you how you complete the works. They came back with a plan to do it where we would have 2 or 3 days with a temporary DRM inlet. It would require some hose on site for the crews to use.

I did two things – I communicated with a SFSO (I believe this was by email) to make sure technically and legally what they're doing was ok. I also spoke to a bulk media officer GC Richard WELCH, they are the water experts when we have large incidents, they attend and put water plans in place. In central London getting water isn't generally a problem, in some outer parts of London and some industrial estates we have real issues with water supplies. In relation to high-rise buildings they're experts in understanding water and what we need to do to get water to the top floors, but you would only normally use them at an incident. I showed them the plan that the contractor suggested, told them that I had spoken to fire safety and they're happy with it.

I asked if there were any issues operationally they felt we needed to be aware of, they were generally happy. So the process was agreed with the dry riser to enable them to do the work within the Tower for a short period of time, you can't have someone living in a tower block with no riser for seven weeks, we physically can't get the water up there quickly, so you come up with a solution to get around the issue and minimise the risk to the occupants and our firefighters.

There was a historical email chain between the architects and the contractors which was forwarded to me, because I had asked the question why was it remaining as a dry riser? From this it was concluded that it remained a dry riser because the height of the building was not changing.

The two issues I highlighted when I was SC was the maps and the dry riser.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

I believe the question of the dry riser came from the contractor on site and not from the Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) who were the owners of the building.

I have been asked about my knowledge of the automatic ventilation system (AOV). I had limited knowledge for the actual Grenfell Tower system, I knew there was a system there. I knew that because Andy WALTON was a SC that I was assisting, he was relatively new to LFB and he'd been in a central team, he had never been at a station in London. So, I was asked if I would take him to North Kensington because I had two stations. He was the same rank, it was deemed that I had enough knowledge that would have been helpful to him around the systems and the IT, a lot of it was the IT systems because centrally based officers don't use their station diary like a station based SC. A station diary pretty much runs the station, all systems are linked into the diary the level of HR is massive at the station. A station-based SC has to do all the HR so it was decided that Andy could come and work with me so I could mentor him and show him through the different systems. He was going to be allocated a station at some point as a SC but they didn't want to do that without giving him additional training and support using the systems at a station. So specifically, with Andy there was a visit that I gave him to do which was to go down with the on site engineer to look at how the AOV system worked. So, to confirm my understanding of the system was that there was one there, I didn't know the detail of how it worked I wouldn't be expected to know. I would class that as a 7.2.d visit because that information needs to be recorded on the ORD, it's a fixed installation and is one of the options on the ORD. When you go through it you can add fixed installations then there's a drop-down box, one of them would be a fire lift, a dry riser would be a fixed installation. So, there's a drop-down box for an AOV.

We deal with the ventilation system similarly to how I described we deal with the lifts – so as a crew you would want to know is it a manual or is it an automatic system? How does it work? Some systems you don't want to touch because they're so technical. That's why we have a SFSO that attends incidents, they are the subject matter experts they know how an automatic system works and how we can override them. But as an operational commander I would do that with great consideration because its designed to help the building and residents, a SFSO has got that expertise and they can make an informed decision.

Regarding any information about the AOV keys you would want that information, I would say from my experience most of them are automatic systems and they generally don't want firefighters touching them without the specialist advice of a SFSO.

When it doesn't work automatically or when it fails, I would expect the SFSO at an incident to give me information and advice. The responsible person should provide us with that information so this would be

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

an example where the engineers from the contractors have asked us to attend. Andy went to Grenfell Tower and from my understanding they showed him how the AOV system worked and what it did. Andy as SC, I think he decided to go down because he had a fire safety background, so actually it made sense that if he's got fire safety background he then asked some questions around the system. The expectation would be that the information should then go on the ORD.

I was never shown how to use the AOV system at Grenfell Tower, and I was not made aware of any problems with the system at Grenfell Tower. I was not aware of any faults with the AOV within Grenfell tower before the fire. I have been asked about any awareness of a red and yellow key that operates the smoke control system found on each lobby floor - to operate the system - I wouldn't know I didn't attend the incident.

During my time as SC at North Kensington I cannot recall ever being notified of any deficiencies or enforcement notices being issued to the local authority regarding Grenfell Tower.

I have been asked about my knowledge of Premises Information Boxes (PIB) at Grenfell Tower and whether I was involved in discussions around the PIB at Grenfell Tower - I can't remember. I would have to check my emails on it, but I can't recall..

PIB form part of a 7.2.d- the one we have outside Unison Street is quite visible but like we said with some of the newer buildings they don't always like them to be seen, so it might be its behind a panel and you have a 'push to open' type box, but that information should be on the ORD.

There should have been one at Grenfell Tower, but I can't recall if there was one or not, PIBs are recommended in high-rise buildings.

After the refurbishment a 7.2.d would have taken place, it wouldn't necessary have generated a new entry for Grenfell Tower but we would have updated the original entry to make sure it's now current. The ORD would have been updated as we were going through it, so the update we said around the dry riser would have gone on the system then it would be updated again once the works at Grenfell Tower had been completed.

Operational discretion - I've never personally used it, we have over 300 operational policies in the Brigade, operational discretion is one of them. My understanding of operational discretion is if, as an incident commander (IC) at a high-rise incident, and you were required to work outside of the high rise policy because what you needed to do went against the policy or wasn't foreseeable then you implement operational discretion. This is done by sending a message to control informing them that you're doing it.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

You must do a risk assessment, identify the risks and put in place control measures to mitigate that risk.

There's a risk matrix that scores it so then that gets recorded in the key decision log on the command unit.

The risk and benefit I am referring to is such that we would be taking some extra risk for a specific task for a specific period. We would revert to our policy once that task is finished.

Anyone has access to operational discretion – so a firefighter might suggest it but as a simple example: a child stuck in playground equipment – our policy says we wear all our PPE all the time, we put gloves on for manual handling, you wear a helmet, a tunic, actually you know that we might be scaring the kid here, so we take the helmet and gloves off, policy says you shouldn't be doing that, so a firefighter does have that discretion – is that technically ops discretion? I would argue not but it's not what the policy says – so a firefighter does have access to it. When it becomes more formal, is when a message must be sent from the incident commander. They have that responsibility to complete the assessment, so we must declare a tactical mode. It can be defensive or offensive, the reason we send it is to say an incident commander has carried out a risk assessment of the incident ground and it's the fire services way of formally stating that a risk assessment has been completed.

–If a firefighter were to use operational discretion it should go through their incident commander and be recorded.

Within the LFB we are provided with training regards the use of Positive Pressure Ventilation (PPV) so yes there's a training package we've done around PPV. As I described earlier, all the systems are slightly different they will impact buildings in a different way.

The LFB are aware of the use of PPV, I have not had any practical training with it, it was available on a specialist vehicle at the time of the Grenfell Tower fire. I've worked with it when I was at Sutton, we had an incident at a David Lloyd and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service attended with us, so we used their PPV to ventilate the gym.

It was about 2015/2016 it was a David Lloyd centre In Cheam village in Surrey. It was a typical gym set up, there was a fire in a beauty salon which was on a mezzanine floor from my memory at the front of the building that was burnt out. Because of the gym and the size of the gym room it was quite heavily smoke logged – we just couldn't get the smoke out – so Surrey had their PPV, they set it up and opened the gym doors, it assisted in ventilating the gym, minimalizing the smoke damage to the building.

In regards to PIB's my understanding is that the LFB is not legally responsible to provide premise information boxes, I wouldn't know if the provision for this is included in the FRA, the answer to that is

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

my understanding is it's not down to us to provide the boxes it's the building owner or the responsible person.

I would like to clarify from my Rule 9 statement, where I said I would 'then forward this information onto crews visiting Grenfell Tower to familiarise themselves with changes and update the ORD' I would clarify this via email – but it would depend on the urgency of the job. An example of this would be, when I asked Watch Manager DOWDEN to visit Grenfell Tower I can't remember what the reason was for the visit. but it may have been that I had received a request, I checked who was on duty that day, I'll gave him a call so I could give them some details about the visit and information I want them to check or action I want them to do. It would depend on what the request was for and if a wider circulation was required, I would email the station to inform them and get the ORD updated by Watch Manager DOWDEN.

I attended Grenfell Tower myself on 18th December 2015 the Christmas visit before the Christmas lockdown this wasn't a familiarisation or 7.2.d visit. The reason I attended was because I wanted to see the building and the site, I recorded this visit in my calendar.

PN800 specifically says that a SC is not to attend for the process of a 7.2.d visit, I am there as a quality assurer to check on the quality of information on the ORD. I'm not to check for example the number of floors. There's a capacity issue for a SC, as within the Borough there may be 400 plus ORD entries and I can't physically go back out and double check all the crews work. I did this visit because I was new to the Borough and it was a large refurbishment.

I was attending meetings with the TMO and it was important that I knew what I was talking about, I've also got a visual image of what the building looks like. There's no formal process that says I must do a visit to a building or refurbishment. But I thought that it was good to meet the on-site contractor to put a name to the face, as I'd received several emails from him.

I believe the blue watch attended when the site was closing for Christmas, I would either have sent an email or called them regarding the visit. If it's in their diary it could be down as a 7.2.d visit, – it's not always going to be an appointment in the diary as a 7.2.d every time the crews visited.

The other thing to bear in mind, due to the number of visits that the crews had done to Grenfell Tower that they may not record them all on the station dairy, some visits are short notice requests from the TMO or contractor, that might have been via telephone or email. The watch officer may not have had time to create an appointment. If they don't need to update the ORD then it might not necessarily show up as a

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

7.2.d visit – it might be as another appointment, if you need to update the ORD, you can create a manual appointment in the station diary or through the outside duty master list.

As a watch manager you would enter an appointment to show what you were doing during your day, your days are never completely blank, all your activities including training, community fire safety and incidents would show up on your diary. North Kensington has got two appliances, so it might be one appliance is doing something and the other appliance is doing something else. So it might be that both appliances did not attend, I'm not aware if both appliances attended but I do know it was the blue watch. That was the closing down for the Christmas period, Watch Manager Wayne U'CHONG is on the blue watch, I would have to check if it was both appliances and who was on duty at the time, I couldn't recall. Several watch managers and I experienced IT issues, there was an issue with the work queue and authorising the map. The normal IT process didn't appear to follow the process I had expected it to. As no actions came back to me, E.g. authorising the maps.

There were some issues around duplicate appointments in my work queue. I also had an issue around twinning at the stations.

I was managing two stations, from an IT perspective its easier if you manage one station, because your work queue has only got one stations work in it, I managed two stations both Kensington and North Kensington. There was a bit of an issue depending on my location. If I was at North Kensington and I wanted to manage Kensington's work queue, the system would default to your physical location. Sometimes you'd find you'd open your work queue and you would have two appointments for the same visit in your work queue. You could have one as SC and another was a watch manger one, but the watch managers shouldn't have been in my work queue.

In regard to Mr WALTONs IT access during his attachment specifically around that appointment I would have to refresh myself and look at the log on the ORD to see what his access was. There was issues with Andy's IT generally, because we tried to de-twin the stations because it would have made sense to give Andy all the North Kensington IT permissions including the ORD and other SC notifications including HR. IT said they could not de twin all the systems and it became too problematic, so without checking it I'm not sure what he did and didn't have permission for? .

In relation to who had updated the ORD, so with that specific IT function I would have to double check the log, but the rule of thumb with all the IT training I was doing with him, was a show and tell. I would sit down with him, I'd explain how the outside duty master list worked, for the crews, then how they completed their paperwork and submitted the details. He then understood what happened to the crews

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

with each visit on their diary and how it worked when he logged on with his work queue. I was showing him my queue, this would be how it would look like for him. SC WALTON would log on as himself, and I logged on as me.

No one can log on as someone else, you have your own secure log on details.

He would only see his own work queue when he was logged on, he would not have permissions to authorise certain things unless IT had given them to him. I think the agreement between us was anything he couldn't do to let me know and I'll log on and then do it. I would log on using my access, we're not allowed to log on as any other people. I could update things for him on his behalf, but it would still show me as completing that entry.

I think during the 7.2.d visit involving the AOV, at the time, I was on leave or something, I forwarded the request onto Andy and asked him to arrange for the visit to be done, and attend on my behalf.

SC WALTON was not going to remain at North Kensington long term, he would stay for a month or two to get some familiarisation and then he would be getting his own station, I think he went to Kingston.

There are a few twinned stations in the LFB– I can't remember I think about 12 or 15 twinned stations and the rest are all single stations. It depends on the Borough layout, the London Borough of Sutton only has two stations, they have two SCs, where the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea has three stations, so they have two SCs.

I was asked to supply a copy of the dry riser certificate. I tried to look for it but couldn't find it, I knew I had emails relating to it. The IT team went through my data and managed to find it.

To access LFB computers when you log on you must put a username and password in, depending on your role you will have different icons on your home page. The LFB diary is a different version since the Grenfell Tower fire, it's been updated several times.

Whilst recording this statement I logged onto the LFB database to show the Police officers what my screen looks like. I showed the officers what a watch officer would see – diary entries for ORD, Epip, etc.

I looked up 18th December 2015 to the 'planned visual audit'

The watch may have doubled up and completed hot strikes too - basically smoke alarms.

There was nothing in the station diary that they've recorded for 18th December 2015, it must have been that I got an email asking them to attend.

I also attended the site myself on the 18th December 2015 so I could familiarise myself, the blue watch attended as the site was closing for the Christmas period. My recollection was that I met them on site. so, I would have driven there in my car, I remember struggling to park near the site due to the residents

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

parking bays. Where the building refurbishment work was taking place, they had boarded off an area keeping all the tools and materials secure on site, with 24 hr security. If we had an incident during normal working hours there's normally enough people on site to make sure we would have access to the inlet for the dry riser because that was on the outside of the tower within their building site. It was important during the Christmas lock down that they were going to leave access to the riser inlet and always kept it clear because there would be no one on site to move materials around if we needed to.

Again, I looked at the database whilst the officers were with me. I looked at the 'duties master list' and tried to view 28/04/2016 to try and establish who did what entry. I noticed it has been updated since the fire. It is all now just 2020 visits – the old one must be somewhere but they may have protected it.

We've had a problem with plans, we have no way of scanning a document at a station, station staff have no facility to scan documents so what use to happen was we use to take pictures on our mobile phones and email them in. We relied on staff to use their mobile phones which they're not allowed to carry whilst on duty.

No one actually has the time to sit you down and go through the systems – they updated the station diary once and did not tell anyone, the whole system was different, it took us about a week to get the hang of the new system, we couldn't do our normal day to day work.

I have tried to access 28/04/2016 for any email or appointment dates. I know it's an ORD entry but we're locked out. I believe Andy or the watch would have entered the 7.2.d manually by going into the master index.

There is a slightly different format now because the diary is different to what it was at the time.

There's no way of knowing if there are any other visits planned for that day 28/04. Because as mentioned the system is now locked.

I can't check the entries 28th & 30th as the system has now been locked – I think they've locked the ORD. It can be accessed to show the logs when Andy was giving evidence. Within the comments the new ORD only had two comments dated and who had done the visit.

On 28/04 I can see I've got outside duty high-rise duty 7.2.d – North Kensington white watch.

Two days after that visit 30th there's an ORD entry and that's the dry riser and ventilation issue.

30/04/2016 ORD entry – nothing showing up – if there was an ORD entry, there should be an appointment in there to reflect that, because we can't access the old ORD system to show the logs for Grenfell Tower. My understanding of how the log works for an ORD, I think you must have an appointment that would correspond with that log, it is a record of an action or comment.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by:

I have been asked if the ORD has been reviewed since the Grenfell Tower fire, I think the ORD is being updated continually, the glitches I talked about earlier, when I went down to see the IT man (Chris OCONNOR), when I viewed Andy's logs from the inquiry he said the glitches had been fixed. Whilst recording this statement the officers accessed the ORD which is displayed via the public data access to the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry website.

By looking at that layout of the ORD, I can tell you what date that is, that's the date that Adam FOSTER updated the system not the date that he did the visit. If you look at the time he's done that entry, that it's two days later he updated the ORD.

It gives you his name Adam FOSTER who logged on to update the action.

Whoever completed the visit is responsible to log on and update it.

Adam was the firefighter from the watch, he was acting up as a crew manager, it would have gone through to me, and I've rejected it back to Mike, and then it's gone back to be updated. The visit is on the system, they don't always have time to complete or input the data the same day they do the visit, so that's a record of when the system was updated on the logs and not when the visits were done.

I'm not sure of the time limits these need to be updated— there will be an expectation sooner rather than later I'd have to check the policy, it maybe 48 hrs.

For this specific entry, if Andy WALTON's name is not on there, he hasn't got access to do that, but his job is to only quality assure it, his job is not to input any data.

Just to help the investigation if you see Phil JOBSON, he is part of the PDA team —when you see his name you know it's the 2nd QA in that process.

I can confirm on 13th June 2017 I left work at 5pm and returned the next morning at 8am.

I can confirm that when I heard about the news of the fire and logged on and I saw the 'map'.

I stopped at the map because when I saw that I was mortified, because I knew that was a really important part for the crews and everyone at the incident, so I didn't really look much further.

As a result of the LFB IT department locking the ORD for the Grenfell Tower Investigation Team (GTIT), I cannot confirm all of the dates I have given above therefore these have all been given to the best of my recollection.

Signature: SIGNED
2020

Signature witnessed by: