

Minutes (Public Version)

Meeting	London Local Resilience Forum
Date	Monday 10 June 2013
Time	2.00pm
Place	Committee Room 5, City Hall

Attending (in alphabetical order of organisation):

Kevin Blythe, Manager Security and Asset Protection Global Security Lilly UK (Business Sector Panel) (on behalf of Don Randall)

Steve Thomas, Assistant Chief Constable, British Transport Police

John Barradell, Town Clerk and Chief Executive, City of London Corporation

Adrian Leppard, City of London Police

Clare Wormald, Head of Strategy, Performance and Assurance, Department for Communities and Local Government (on behalf of James Cruddas)

Howard Davidson, Director South East, Environment Agency

Paul Wright, Archdeacon (Faith Sector)

Mike Moore, Chair, Local Authorities Panel

Alan Palmer, London Ambulance Service (on behalf of Richard Webber),

Doug Flight, London Councils (on behalf of John O'Brien),

Col Hugh Bodington, Chief of Staff, London District (Military)

Steve Hamm, Assistant Commissioner, London Fire Brigade (on behalf of Ron Dobson)

Andrew Pritchard, Head of Emergency Planning, London Fire Brigade

Maxine de Brunner, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) (on behalf of Mark Rowley),

Ed Stearns, Gold Communications Group Chair, MPS

Nikki Smith, NHS London (on behalf of Simon Weldon)

Peter Guy, Operational Security & Continuity Planning Manager, Network Rail

Yvonne Doyle, Public Health England

Seamus Kelly, St John's Ambulance (Voluntary Sector Panel)

Sarah Burchard, Emergency Risk Specialist, Thames Water (Utilities Sector)

Mike Weston, Operations Director, Transport for London

Nigel Furlong, Head of Resilience Planning, Transport for London (Transport Sector Panel)

Greater London Authority officers:

Hamish Cameron, London Resilience Manager

Alison Ingleby, London Resilience Officer

Anna Flatley, Senior Committee Officer

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, noting that there were a number of new faces, by asking them to identify themselves and state which organisation they were from.

- 1.2 Apologies had been received from Don Randall, Business Sector, James Cruddas, DCLG, Andy Trotter, British Transport Police, Mark Rowley, MPS John O'Brien, London Councils, Simon Weldon, NHS, Mark Rogers, Met Office, Steve Bath, Utilities Sector Panel.

2. Minutes and Matters Arising from Previous Meeting

- 2.1 **The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 11 February 2013 as a correct record.**
- 2.2 The London Resilience Manager introduced the Update on Actions Paper (43 02) and highlighted those outstanding actions (marked as red).
- 2.3 (a6) The Forum agreed that the London Resilience Plans should go to the LRF for approval.
- 2.4 (d5) The Chair reported that the use of volunteers was seen as a success in the Olympics and was to be discussed at the Communicating with the Public Group next month.
- 2.5 (d3) In response to a question it was noted that lead agencies for Mass Evacuation and Fuel had now been resolved.

3. London 7 July Inquest – Recommendations Progress Update

- 3.1 The London Resilience Manager introduced this item and confirmed that at this stage all items reported to the Coroner had been incorporated into the Forum's work and recommended that this be removed from the agenda as a standing item.
- 3.2 The Chair, whilst recognising the significance of this event, indicated that, if all necessary actions were being incorporated into the established process for dealing with lessons learnt, it was not appropriate to have this singular issue as a standing item, when other issues were not.
- 3.3 The Forum was supportive of this if it was clear that all issues from 7/7 had been addressed and a process for dealing with lessons learnt from all events was in place. It was recognised that procedures needed to be in place to ensure any updates on this issue could be provided to the Government as required.
- 3.4 A question was raised as to whether the LRF should write back to the Coroner. The Chair asked for this to be considered with the intention of bringing back a proposal to the next Forum on this point. DCLG will seek advice and report back.
- 3.5 The Forum then agreed that this issue be streamlined into the established process for lessons identified from exercises and incidents.

4. Key Updates and escalation of issues and decision to the London Resilience Forum – Dashboard Report (May 2013)

- 4.1 **Dashboard (43 03)** The Chair explained the Dashboard report was in a trial format, designed to highlight progress and escalate any issues that required LRF discussion or decision. It was an experiment, with the intention of making sure discussions and decisions were not taken in isolation. The Chair asked the Forum to flag up any issues which they considered were not covered in this format and to give feedback on it, including whether they were happy with it.
- 4.2 **Threats** - MPS gave an oral report on current threats, noting that the threat from International terrorism remains at significant and the threat from Northern-Ireland related terrorism remains at moderate. The most significant recent event was at Woolwich. There were signs that incidents of domestic extremism were increasing. There were currently a number of challenges on the horizon because of the start of the G8 in Northern Ireland and related events.
- 4.3 Local Authorities noted that the community engagement in Woolwich worked well and it was hoped this could be built upon. In response to questions, it was noted that the multi-agency review of the incident would be held as soon as possible. The MPS noted that feedback indicated that engagement with partners was still not as good as they would like.
- 4.4 The Chair said there were 2 significant elements; firstly the immediate policing response and secondly the activities around community cohesion, the latter on which the earlier the lessons were identified and learnt from the better.
- 4.5 **Hazards** - The DCLG reported that the top risks remained human pandemic (flu), community disorder and protest (including relating to animal welfare), economic disorder, public sector industrial action, flooding and space weather.
- 4.6 **London Resilience Partnership Structure and Governance.** The Chair noted that the LRPB had requested that the Forum should formally sign off London Resilience Partnership Plans. The Forum approved this.
- 4.7 The report (43 03) was then noted.
- 4.8 **London Risk Register (43 04)** The Forum approved the London Risk Register
- 4.9 **Terms of Reference (43 05)** - The Chair then introduced the updated LRF Terms of Reference, which had been delayed since the last meeting to incorporate lessons learnt from the Olympics. In particular the Chair asked the Forum to consider whether changing the number of times a year the Forum met (from 3 to 2) to reduce work for the London Resilience Team relating to the meeting itself would be detrimental to the work of the Forum.
- 4.10 The point was raised that this could create a long gap between plans being signed off and it could decrease the connection felt by some Members of the Forum.
- 4.11 It was noted that sub regional level bodies currently met 3 times a year, but this was in response to the LRF so could be changed.

- 4.12 The Forum approved the Terms of Reference; to stay at 3 meetings annually but to undertake some internal work to see if the preparation for the meetings could be reduced.
- 4.13 **London Resilience Partnership Strategy (43 06)**. The London Resilience Manager introduced this Strategy of which the bulk was approved at the last meeting. The main amendment was the inclusion of the delivery plan at the end of the document.
- 4.14 The Forum then approved the London Resilience Partnership Strategy (43 06).
- 4.15 **Flooding (Capability 6)** The Environment Agency gave an oral update on the risk of major flooding from London's 53 reservoirs, in particular the King George V reservoir for which it was proposed the off-site plan for this reservoir should be brought to this Forum. The other 52 were dealt with at local borough level in local resilience teams. The Forum approved the LRF role in reservoir planning; namely that the Forum should sign off the updated London Strategic Flood Framework and the King George V reservoir plan
- 4.16 **Humanitarian Assistance Plan (43 07)** The Chair of the Local Authorities Panel introduced this, explaining it was designed to ensure care of those affected by an incident. Guidance was in 4 main parts and there was no substantial change to the preceding plan. The lessons learnt from the public disorder in 2011 had been incorporated.
- 4.17 The Forum then approved the Humanitarian Assistance Plan.
- 4.18 **Communicating with the Public (Capability 2)** – The Chair informed the Forum that this work, the body of which he was chairing, was seeking support from individual organisations. Whilst there was some difference of opinion, he believed this was core business rather than solely communication type work and urged Forum Members to consider who were best placed in their organisations to be involved.
- 4.19 **Evacuation (Capability 4)** – The Chair reported that the City of London Police had agreed to be the lead agency on this work, but with support from local authorities and others. As a result, the current status was reduced from red to amber in the first instance.
- 4.20 **Recovery Protocol (43 08)** – The Chair of the Local Authorities Panel introduced this, which aims to provide a flexible approach to managing the recovery stage of an emergency. Again no substantial changes to the previous protocol, and there had been wide consultation on the amendments.
- 4.21 The Forum then approved the Recovery Protocol.
- 4.22 The London Resilience Manager (**Interoperability**) informed the Forum that the LRT were doing some work around options for increasing situational awareness and would report to the next meeting of the Forum.
- 4.23 The London Resilience Manager stated that LRT had been invited to become part of the LESLP group to ensure a stronger link between the partnership and operational coordination arrangements. MPS agreed that a review of LESLP membership would be timely and include more than just traditional blue light

partners.

- 4.24 Steve Hamm agreed to provide a brief to all Forum Members on the Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Programme (JESIP).
- 4.25 **Training and exercising** - The Chair reported that the Gold Summit training undertaken at the City of London had been useful but welcomed feedback on how to maintain progress, including on structure, length of training (half day rather than full day), number of training sessions how to get key people there, etc.
- 4.26 Forum members, including Thames Water, TFL reported it had been very useful as a whole day event and supported a minimum of 2 full days a year, and feedback from the event indicated support for full day events.
- 4.27 The London Resilience Manager noted that the cost of a full day, including catering had to be borne in mind, including who would pay. The issue of costs will be considered by the London Resilience Programme Board .
- 4.28 The Chair indicated that no formal decision needed to be taken on this, but further thought would be given to this, after the next event in July.
- 4.29 **Sector Panels** – An update on **Faith** was given – It was noted that the faith sector was looking at the way it was structured to strengthen relationships between all 9 major faiths and its major incident plans. Details of recent work undertaken in mosques and with the Jewish community was given.
- 4.30 **Single Repository** – The Sub Regional Resilience Forum raised the possibility of a database accessible to all Members of the Forum which would contain details of events /risks in London at any one time. The intention would not be to recreate the database used during the Olympics, which had been for a finite length of time and entirely dealt with the practical implications of the events, but to use it as a basis, as it had proved a useful resource tool. It was also noted that this summer was in effect busier than the 100 days of the Olympics.
- 4.31 The Chair indicated he was sympathetic to the idea of a more co-ordinated picture of what was happening in London but stressed the need for it to be timely and accurate in order for it to be relevant.
- 4.32 The Forum discussed the issue and it was recognised that a lot of this information is already recorded by individual organisations. The MPS recorded a lot – although some of this as marked as restricted – as did TfL. The Forum agreed to set up a discreet body to progress this project, to be led by MPS and to come back to the Forum at its next meeting with any suggestions.

5. **LRF to confirm priorities for next four months.**

- 5.1 The London Resilience Manager verbally introduced this and in particular sought the Forum's confirmation or otherwise that the principal activities listed as key priorities were so and whether there were any others. This was confirmed.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 There was no other business.

7. Date of Next Meeting

7.1 The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 22 October 2013 at 2.00pm.