

# MINUTES

**Meeting**      **London Resilience Forum**

**Date**        **Thursday 22 October 2020**

**Time**         **2.00 pm**

**Place**         **Via Microsoft Teams**

Ref	ACTION	OWNER
4.2	MHCLG to provide an update to the LRF on the planning assumptions for projected arrivals of British Nationals from Hong Kong.	MHCLG
4.3	MHCLG to share the letter sent to local authority chief executives on 23 July 2020 relating to the arrival of British Nationals from Hong Kong with LRF partners.	MHCLG
5.2	This information has been redacted.	GLA
6.9	LRG to decide a final point by which a decision can be made about the delivery of MAGIC courses currently scheduled for December and January.	LRG
6.10	Partner agencies to share virtual training/exercising tips and learning, as well as any COVID-19 risk assessments for in-person training with LRG.	All
8.5	Members were asked to promote the Flood Action and Weather Ready campaigns within their organisations.	All
9.2	The actions from today's meeting to be shared via email with partners after the meeting.	GLA Secretariat

**Present:**

Fiona Twycross AM, Chair  
Moushami Aktar, MOPAC  
Joseph McDonald, MPS  
William Duffy, City of London Police  
Sean O'Callaghan, British Transport Police  
Natasha Wills, London Ambulance Service  
Patrick Goulbourne, London Fire Brigade  
Terry Leach, Maritime & Coastguard Agency  
Mark Sawyer, Local Authorities Panel  
Doug Flight, London Councils  
Martin Machray, NHS England & Improvement (London)  
Edward Wynne-Evans, Public Health England  
Cantor Mocke, Environment Agency  
Monica Cooney, Transport Sector Panel

Guy Huckle, Network Rail  
Bill D’Albertanson, Utilities Sector Panel  
Peter Lavery, Business Sector Panel  
Alex Milne, Voluntary Sector Panel  
Luke Miller, Faith Sector Panel  
Jeremy Bagshaw, HQ London District  
Matt Woodhouse, London Resilience Communications Group  
Paul Phipps-Williams, MHCLG  
Mark Rogers, Met Office

**London Resilience Group (LRG):**

Hamish Cameron, LRG  
Toby Gould, LRG (joined at 15.00)  
John Hetherington, Head of LRG  
Jeremy Reynolds, LRG

**GLA:**

Felicity Harris, Board Officer (clerk)

**Also in attendance:**

Elizabeth Channon, MHCLG  
David Cook, MPS  
Kelly Dallen, LRG  
Steve Feely, MPS  
Emma Garrett, MHCLG  
Gideon Levitt, MHCLG  
Kimberley Lynne, MHCLG  
Zoltan Maczik, LRG  
Edit Nagy, LRG  
Chloe Sellwood, NHS England & Improvement  
Anna Sexton, Public Health England  
Rebecca Short, LRG  
Jonathan Smith, London Fire Brigade  
Sarah Street, HQ London District

## **1 Chair’s Opening Remarks**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Members to the Forum and expressed her thanks to all attendees for making the time to attend the meeting at what continued to be a busy period for all partners.

## **2 Introductions and Apologies for Absence**

- 2.1 Apologies were received from: John Barradell, Local Authorities Panel; Jon Paul Graham, GLA; Diana Luchford, MOPAC; Simon Moody, Environment Agency; John O’Brien, London Councils;

Andy Roe, London Fire Brigade; Emma Spragg, Voluntary Sector Panel; and Deborah Turbitt, Public Health England.

### 3 Minutes and Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting

- 3.1 The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum (65 01) held on 11 June 2020 as an accurate record.
- 3.2 With reference to matters arising, the Forum noted that an update on action 5.16 would be covered within this agenda and that action 7.8 was a timebound action related to messaging around COVID-19 restrictions.

### 4 Current and Emerging Risks to London

- a) **Threats:** The MPS confirmed that the threat from international terrorism remained substantial, meaning that an attack was likely. It was noted that COVID-19 measures meant that the risk to crowded places had been reduced but that it would be vital to remain vigilant, particularly following a recent incident in Paris. The MPS continued to engage with local authorities' security advisors and would review ongoing changes to infrastructure and road layouts, both temporary and permanent, ensuring that security considerations would be factored into planning arrangements.
- b) **Hazards:** The MHCLG representative confirmed that current risks included:
- the potential threat of industrial action in response to a rise of deaths in service of key workers, a sharp increase in staff absentee levels and pressure in response to the Government's employee support scheme;
  - power disruption resulting from changes to the national demand for electricity;
- Afternote: HMG consider winter margins for electricity and gas to be adequate and expect demand to be met.**
- public order tensions caused by varying understanding of COVID-19 restrictions, access to testing and individuals flouting self-isolation rules;
  - backlogs within the justice system;
  - disruption to the supply chain for veterinary personal protective equipment (PPE); and
  - cyber threats and ransomware.
- 4.1 The latter was considered to be a growing threat following an upward trend in targeted ransomware demands based on organisational value, as reported by the National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC). Members noted that a wide range of guidance was available on the NCSC website and that training was available via Resilience Direct. A cyber exercise for a multiagency group was being developed and partners would be contacted with further details once confirmed.
- c) **Weather forecast:** The Met Office representative provided a brief update on the forecast over the following 7-10 days, noting that conditions would be generally unsettled with heavy rain

and strong winds at times. Low pressure and unsettled conditions were likely to continue into early November before being replaced with high pressure across southern parts of the UK. This would lead to sunny spells and lighter winds, with an increased chance of fog and frost overnight. It was noted that a La Nina was developing across the Pacific Ocean, which would affect weather patterns in Northwest Europe. In a La Nina year, there tended to be an increased chance of westerly and north westerly winds in late autumn/early winter, leading to slightly lower than usual temperatures. Moving into January, mild, wet and windy conditions were expected, with possible cold spells.

- d) COVID-19, update from the Strategic Coordinating Group (LRG and PHE):** Members heard that the SCG had been reestablished in late September following a rise in infection numbers. The SCG was meeting weekly to take on overall, system-wide assurance for London and to identify risks across all agencies and subgroups. A Delivery Coordinating Group (DCG) had also been established to oversee assurance of delivery and operational capability, and to assess how partners were mitigating risks. London was also tied into national processes for escalation and de-escalation and would be involved in joint decision-making processes with political leaders based on the latest epidemiology. The representative from PHE noted that approximately 1,000 cases per day were recorded during the first wave and that while numbers were far exceeding that during the second wave, it was important to acknowledge that there was now considerably more testing being carried out in the community. London was on an upward trajectory in terms of cases and while growth remained exponential, the rate of infections was not thought to be as severe as it was in March and April. The Chair concluded this update by expressing her thanks to those involved in the COVID-19 response.
- e) Winter pressures (NHS):** The NHS representative began by thanking partners for their support over the past few months. In preparation for the winter, there would be four key factors impacting the NHS and care services: usual winter pressures, COVID-19, EU exit, and ongoing recovery from the first wave of the virus. Members heard that virtually all services across London were operating as normal, albeit with some services being delivered differently from usual in line with infection control restrictions. Admissions for patients with non-COVID-19 related health concerns had increased following a drop off in heart attack and stroke patients in particular in the early stages of the crisis. The usual flu vaccination programme had begun and had been successful to date. There had not been a considerable impact from flu in the southern hemisphere as normal, but this was likely due to social distancing restrictions. The end of the EU exit transition period remained a challenge for the NHS, both in terms of workforce and supply chains. Potential workforce difficulties would be mitigated nationally but there were ongoing concerns about supplies from central Europe.
- f) Brexit – End of Transition (LRG):** Preparation for the end of transition continued, with MHCLG recently sharing the reasonable worst-case scenario (RWCS) with the Brexit Contingency Planning Group. The Group had been meeting regularly to develop planning assumptions for London using the national RWCS modelling and it was noted that the key difference from previous RWCS planning was a reduction in local partners' readiness to deal with the associated challenges while resources had been diverted to the COVID-19 response.
- g) British Nationals returning overseas from Hong Kong (MHCLG):** Following China's introduction of new security laws, the Home Secretary announced in July the establishment of a new Hong Kong visa for British Nationals Overseas (BNOs). An estimated 5.4m Hong Kong citizens would be eligible for the new visa, which would give them a pathway to UK citizenship.

Around 30 applications for citizenship were being granted everyday so there was potential for a significant influx of BNOs arriving in the UK. This could have implications for ports across the country. While it was expected that those who chose to come to the UK would have an existing support network, thought had to be given to how local partners would support BNOs with housing and settling into their new communities. MHCLG had been liaising with Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) across the country and would establish more updated planning assumptions in due course. Members queried how information would be shared with local authorities, whether there had been any communications already issued and if there could be greater clarity in the language used, noting that messaging should go through business as usual routes and not just through resilience teams. MHCLG agreed to provide an update to the LRF on planning assumptions and to share a letter that had been sent to local authority chief executives on 23 July 2020.

4.2 **ACTION:** MHCLG to provide an update to the LRF on the planning assumptions for projected arrivals of British Nationals from Hong Kong.

4.3 **ACTION:** MHCLG to share the letter sent to local authority chief executives on 23 July 2020 relating to the arrival of British Nationals from Hong Kong with LRF partners.

h) **Other agency updates by exception:** There were no further updates.

## 5 Special Agenda Items

a) **Bridges planning:**

5.1 **This information has been redacted.**

5.2 **ACTION: This information has been redacted.**

b) **London Resilience Forum (LRF) COVID-19 Recommendations (Paper 65 02):**

5.3 The Deputy Head of the London Resilience Group provided an overview of the paper circulated in the pack, noting that the paper consisted of suggestions for consideration on how to implement some of the recommendations and thinking from early COVID-19 lessons. There were a range of ideas included within the paper, from those which could be easily implemented, such as a revision to the Strategic Coordination Protocol (SCP), to those that would need further consideration. There were limitations to consider, a fundamental one of which was that the LRF had no legal status and that financial and staffing arrangements needed to be provided by different organisations. It was recommended that the suggestions outlined in the paper be reviewed by the London Resilience Programme Board (LRPB) in conjunction with legal and financial advisors during the next financial year.

5.4 **DECISION:** That LRF COVID-19 recommendations be reviewed by LRPB in conjunction with legal and financial advisors from agencies in the next financial year (2021/22).

c) **London Situational Awareness System (LSAS) security/development update (Paper 65 03):**

- 5.5 The Head of the London Resilience Group explained that security vulnerabilities in the LSAS had been identified. Development work would need to be done to bring the security of the system up to industry standards. It was noted that LRG judged the system in its current state to be no less secure than sharing OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE over email which was common practice. It was suggested that the existing LSAS service would be upgraded and extended for a period of at least 6-12 months as an interim measure, while a project was developed to scope and establish the future arrangements for partnership situational awareness and ICT solutions.
- 5.6 **DECISION:** That the existing LSAS service be upgraded while future arrangements for situational awareness and ICT solutions were considered in parallel.

## 6 Progress Against London Resilience Programme

- 6.1 The Chair acknowledged that the ongoing response to COVID-19 meant that there had been a series of delays to progress made against the London Resilience Programme and that decisions would need to be made on how to prioritise the work programme over the next 6-12 months. It would be important to focus on areas of greatest risk, while also recognising ongoing pressures across all agencies.

### a) National resilience work programme:

- 6.2 The MHCLG representative noted that the national resilience work programme would aim to map capabilities needed to respond effectively to particular incidents. In light of the ongoing COVID-19 response and wider pressures, it was stated that this would not be taken forward before the end of the year.

### b) London Partnership capabilities update (Paper 65 04):

- 6.3 The Head of the London Resilience Group provided a brief overview of the paper which set out where work on capability reviews had reached. It was noted that COVID-19 response work had led to a number of delays to the completion of capability reviews and it was noted that a decision would need to be made on which capabilities should be prioritised. It was suggested that the following capabilities be prioritised over the next 6-12 months:
- Strategic Coordination Protocol;
  - London Resilience Communication Group Emergency Plan;
  - Humanitarian Assistance Framework;
  - Structural Collapse, Response and Recovery;
  - LESLP Major Incident Procedure Manual;
  - Mass evacuation; and
  - Mass shelter.

6.4 **DECISION:** That the proposed priorities within the work programme over the next 6-12 months be approved; and that the delay to the remaining workstreams be noted.

**c) Risk and planning assumptions (Paper 65 05):**

6.5 The Deputy Head of London Resilience Group (JR) provided an update on the ongoing accelerated risk review (necessitated by new methodology in the National Security Risk Assessment published 2019), and explained that this was further disrupted by the ongoing COVID-19 response. It was noted that the London Risk Advisory Group and partner assessors had managed to complete 12 of the 89 risk assessments and that further workshops had been scheduled for November. Partners were working hard to complete the assessments and meet the original target by the end of the year, including the MPS, which had an additional 23 threats not previously included.

6.6 JR also provided a brief outline of the paper, and proposal to relaunch the review of planning assumptions by capability groups.. This assessment against PAs built on established processes and was not a major new piece of work but an ongoing one. There was an appreciation that there will be cases where capability groups feel there is not enough supporting information to disagree with the national planning assumption and also expecting some capability groups to advocate that meeting the planning assumption is not feasible or warranted – this nevertheless needs to be captured. The proposed timeframe for the relaunch had been set out in the paper and Members were asked to approve the relaunch and to note the proposed leads for new planning assumptions, and potential capability gaps, as outlined in the report.

6.7 **DECISION:** That the Forum approve the relaunch of the review of planning assumptions by capability groups and note the proposed leads for new planning assumption, and potential capability gaps, generated by the latest National Security Risk Assessment (August 2019).

**d) Training and exercising:**

6.8 The Deputy Head of London Resilience Group (JR) told Members that a MAGIC course scheduled for October had been cancelled due to the availability of a range of delegates across the partnership. The course would be postponed, potentially until April to avoid winter pressures. Courses in December and January were still in the diary and the team were confident that there had been a better uptake of bookings for these dates, but it was suggested that some early thinking should go into considering whether the scheduling of these courses remained viable. It was likely that partners would still be in response mode at that point and it would be important to have the right delegates from across a number of agencies in attendance. It was suggested that the courses could be aimed at developing what would be the next set of leaders and that those who had signed up to the courses should be encouraged by their respective agencies to ensure they were able to attend, where necessary finding cover for their roles.

- 6.9 **ACTION:** LRG to decide a final point by which a decision would be made about the delivery of MAGIC courses currently scheduled for December and January and to contact participants in advance to ensure they can still attend.
- 6.10 **ACTION:** Partner agencies to ensure individuals signed up to MAGIC from their respective agencies can commit to attending the course, recognising likely increased demands on staff over the winter period.
- 6.11 Members acknowledged that bookings for Multi-Agency Gold Incident Commanders (MAGIC) courses would be lower than usual given the situation but queried whether training could be delivered virtually. It was noted that virtual training was being developed by the College of Policing but would likely not be ready for delivery for another six months. Despite pressures faced across the partnership, Members recognised the need to maintain the delivery of multi-agency training to ensure the Partnership's readiness to respond, particularly as some agencies continued with in-person training, albeit with strict social distancing measures. It was agreed that partner agencies would share tips on virtual training and exercising with LRG.
- 6.12 In terms of exercising, the Deputy Head of London Resilience Group proposed that this remains deprioritised as a result of other pressures, although elements such as COVID-19-related exercising were ongoing. Partners were keen that training and exercising was not neglected.
- 6.13 **ACTION:** Consideration of the partnership to not neglect training & exercising. Partner agencies to share virtual training/exercising tips and learning, as well as any COVID-19 risk assessments for in-person training with LRG.
- 6.14 New Strategic Coordination Protocol briefing sessions were to be arranged by LRG and the MPS once the revised framework was approved, and pan-capability workshop exercises remained on pause. Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP) and MAGIC training continued.
- e) Lessons status report (Paper 65 06):**
- 6.15 The Deputy Head of the London Resilience Group (JR) provided an update on the lessons status report, noting that although it was not being done at the usual pace, capturing and debriefing on lessons continued. This activity was outpacing the speed at which partners could progress and complete lessons.. A significant number of lessons were now over two years old so a dedicated effort would be made by the capability groups to understand the nature of the older lessons and progress these where possible.
- 6.16 **DECISION:** That the lessons status report be approved.
- f) Work Programme and prioritisation (Papers 65 07 and 65 08):**
- 6.17 The Head of the London Resilience Group sought agreement from Members on the priorities set out in the papers circulated with the agenda. Members were asked for their views on whether full capability reviews would be expected by the next LRF meeting in February 2021,



or whether lighter touch reviews could be undertaken to allow partners to continue focusing on delivering other response-based priorities. Members agreed to the latter.

- 6.18 **DECISION:** That ‘lighter touch’ reviews of capability assessments and subsequent prioritisation to inform the next stage of the work programme be approved by the Forum.

## **7 Documents recommended for approval**

### **a) London Strategic Coordination Protocol (Papers 65 09 and 65 10):**

- 7.1 The MPS confirmed that the London Strategic Coordination Protocol (SCP) had been through an extensive consultation process, with every relevant agency having been provided the opportunity to contribute. The SCP had been signed off by the LRPB and was presented to the LRF for its approval.
- 7.2 The Chair noted her thanks to Claire Aubrey-Robson from the MPS and everyone else involved in updating the Protocol.
- 7.3 **DECISION:** That the London Strategic Coordination Protocol be approved.

### **b) Voluntary Sector Capability Document (Papers 65 11 and 65 12):**

- 7.4 The Deputy Chair of the Voluntary Sector Panel noted that this was a routine review, with minimal changes having been made. The contents directory and the summary of services available were now placed at the front of the document and the organizational summary of each agency had been reduced to just one page. All other changes were minor.
- 7.5 The Chair thanked those involved for their work in updating the document.
- 7.6 **DECISION:** That the Voluntary Sector Capability Document be approved.

### **c) London Novel Coronavirus Framework (Papers 65 13 and 65 14):**

- 7.7 The PHE representative noted that the London Novel Coronavirus Framework had first been produced in February 2020 and had undergone a series of reviews throughout the pandemic. Approval of the Framework was sought with the caveat that it would be updated as the pandemic progressed. Members were also asked to note that the SCG diagram would be updated to reflect the latest response structure.
- 7.8 The Chair thanked those involved in producing and updating the Framework over the past few months.
- 7.9 **DECISION:** That, subject to the updated SCG diagram being included, the London Novel Coronavirus Framework be approved.

## 8 Agency and Sector Updates

- 8.1 In order that the meeting finished on time, the Chair requested that updates from agencies and sectors be provided by exception only. The following updates were provided.
- 8.2 **Public Health Agency** – A number of resources on winter planning would be published online shortly.
- 8.3 **Environment Agency (EA)** – The Flood Action campaign would run from 1-11 November 2020. The campaign would largely be focused on raising awareness amongst 18-34 year olds, encouraging people to check their flood risk and ensuring people knew what to do if they were to experience flooding.
- 8.4 **Met Office** – Members were reminded to re-register for cold weather alerts in advance of the season beginning in nine days' time. The Weather Ready campaign had been launched, further information on which was published online.
- 8.5 **ACTION:** Members were asked to promote the Flood Action and Weather Ready campaigns within their organisations.
- 8.6 **Network Rail** – A reorganisation of emergency planning security structures had been completed, details of which would be discussed with LRG colleagues offline.
- 8.7 **Utilities Sector Panel (USP)** – Work on winter preparedness and Brexit planning continued.
- 8.8 **Business Sector Panel (BSP)** – The BSP was reflecting on the Government's announcement of revisions to the employee support schemes for businesses. It was noted that UK Finance had joined the panel.
- 8.9 **Voluntary Sector Panel (VSP)** – The VSP had been meeting virtually with the Voluntary and Community Sector Emergencies Partnership.
- 8.10 **Faith Sector Panel** – The Faith Sector was undergoing a slight restructure to ensure that the FSP was more representative of a broad range of faiths and beliefs. Use was being made of the ability of other pan-London faith networks to ensure communication with local communities was as wide as possible, enabling better engagement on aspects of LRF activity. The SCG had established a Faith, Communities, Voluntary Sector & Funding Group, with a faith sub-group. Mortality Management also had a faith and belief cell, within which a series of task and finish groups would be established for various pieces of work.
- 8.11 **London Resilience Communication Group** – The communications plan was being updated to include a changed approach to coordination and a dedicated resource for COVID-19. The plan would be considered for approval at the next LRF meeting.
- 8.12 **Government (MHCLG)** – The London Government Taskforce had been in place since March to provide support in response to COVID-19. The Taskforce's remit covered the SCG's wider focus on risks and issues across London this winter and would work with the SCG and DCG to unblock any issues at a local and national level.

## **9 Any Other Business**

- 9.1 A summary of the actions noted from today's meeting was read out. These would be circulated via email after the meeting.
- 9.2 **ACTION:** The actions from today's meeting to be shared via email with partners after the meeting.
- 9.3 There was no other business.

## **10 Dates of Next and Future Meetings**

- 10.1 The dates of the next and future meetings were noted as follows:

Thursday 25 February 2021, 2pm via Microsoft Teams  
Thursday 17 June 2021, 2pm at a venue to be confirmed  
Thursday 14 October 2021, 2pm at a venue to be confirmed  
Thursday 24 February 2022, 2pm at a venue to be confirmed