

# MINUTES

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

**Date**            **Thursday 25 February 2021**

**Time**            **2.00 pm**

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

Ref	ACTION	OWNER
5.5	Forum members to nominate representatives for the respective subgroups to support the review of chronic incident response arrangements	All
5.9	MHCLG to confirm release date for Brexit planning assumptions. <i>Post-meeting note: MHCLG has confirmed the End of Transition RWCS were released on 11 February 2021.</i>	MHCLG
6.3	LRG to consult with GLA Comms before publication of the latest London Risk Register.	LRG
6.12	LRG to amend the wording of the phrase ‘wide range of gaps’ in relation to training and exercising on the capability assessment report to better reflect the nature, severity and number of gaps.	LRG
6.14	LRG to consider drafting formal communication to Central Government on significant capability gaps, as referenced in the Capability Assessment report, that are deemed to be outside of the remit of the LRF to resolve and that require national contingency arrangements.	LRG
8.5	PHE to bring a more substantial update on the future of public health to the next Forum meeting in June 2021.	PHE
8.18	MHCLG to circulate the link to the reasonable worst case scenario on Resilience Direct.	MHCLG
8.20	The Borough Resilience Forums (BRF) update to be circulated following the meeting. <i>Post-meeting note: BRF update also included in the minute.</i>	LRG / Secretariat
9.2	The actions from today’s meeting to be shared via email with partners after the meeting.	Secretariat

**Present:**

Fiona Twycross, Chair

Sarah Spencer, GLA

Claire Aubrey-Robson, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

William Duffy, City of London Police

Sean O’Callaghan, British Transport Police (BTP)

Pauline Cranmer, London Ambulance Service

Patrick Goulbourne, London Fire Brigade

Terry Leach, Maritime & Coastguard Agency  
John Barradell, Local Authorities Panel  
Doug Flight, London Councils  
Martin Machray, NHS England & Improvement (London)  
Deborah Turbitt, Public Health England  
Anna Sexton, Public Health England  
Jeanne Capey, Environment Agency (EA)  
Jason Diffenthal, Transport Sector Panel  
Guy Huckle, Network Rail  
Cathryn Spain, Thames Resilience Panel  
Bill D’Albertanson, Utilities Sector Panel  
Peter Lavery, Business Sector Panel  
Emma Spragg, Voluntary Sector Panel  
Luke Miller, Faith Sector Panel  
Jeremy Bagshaw, HQ London District  
Ruth Shulver, London Resilience Communications Group  
Gill McManus, MHCLG  
Mark Rogers, Met Office

**London Resilience Group (LRG):**

Hamish Cameron, LRG  
Toby Gould, LRG (present from 15.00)  
John Hetherington, Head of LRG  
Jeremy Reynolds, LRG

**GLA:**

Felicity Harris, Board Officer (clerk)

**Also in attendance:**

Alistair Ayres, Local Authorities Panel  
Kelly Dallen, LRG  
Barry Emerson, NHS  
Steve Feely, MPS  
Edit Nagy, LRG  
Alan Palmer, London Ambulance Service (LAS)  
Rebecca Short, LRG  
Sarah Streete, HQ London District  
Juliet Tewungwa, MOPAC  
Joe Tidman, MPS  
Denise Welch, MHCLG  
Harry Williamson, EA  
Matt Woodhouse, London Resilience Communications Group

## **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. It had been a year since the Forum agreed to the Novel Coronavirus Framework, and it was noted that an incredible amount of work had been carried out by all partners since then.

- 1.2 The Chair also noted her thanks to Cantor Mocke, who had recently left the EA, for being a huge support to the Forum. Congratulations were also given to Alex Milne MBE for her recognition in the New Year's Honours List for her commitment to resilience.

## 2 Introductions and Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from: Monica Cooney, Transport Sector Panel; Jon-Paul Graham, GLA; Diana Luchford, MOPAC; Joseph McDonald, MPS; John O'Brien, London Councils; Keith Paterson, City of London Police; and Andy Roe, London Fire Brigade (LFB).

## 3 Minutes and Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting

- 3.1 The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum (66 01) held on 22 October 2020 as an accurate record.
- 3.2 With reference to actions outstanding, the Forum noted that:
- a project to develop an approach to data sharing within the partnership would be progressed once a lead agency had been identified, and when pressures on resources due to COVID-19 had eased;
  - activity to review the future direction and purpose of the Community Resilience Steering Group had been delayed by the ongoing COVID-19 response but an initial conversation had taken place;
  - partner agencies had been asked to continue sharing virtual training and exercising tips and learning on an ongoing basis; and
  - an update on the Structural Collapse Framework would be covered within this agenda.

## 4 Current and Emerging Risks to London

- a) **Threats:** The MPS confirmed that the national threat from international terrorism remained substantial, meaning that an attack was likely, but that the threat for Northern Ireland had been increased to severe since the last meeting, meaning that an attack was highly likely.
- b) **Hazards:** The MHCLG representative confirmed that current risks included:
- Potential disruption identified in the clinical waste disposal sector, about which weekly meetings were taking place to share data and coordinate contingency activities across the four nations;
  - The potential threat of industrial action across all sectors, particularly within the transport sector, relating to pay restraints, job losses and changes to terms and conditions, including changes to pension schemes;
  - UK food supply - no significant impact on UK food supply reported so far but this could change if further restrictions were placed on UK exports. Most UK food imports from countries with travel restrictions arrive unaccompanied by sea or via the Channel Tunnel from Portugal, therefore there had been little impact on UK food supply to date;
  - Risk of severe weather; and
  - Avian flu, which had been confirmed in 23 sites across the UK.

- 4.1 It was noted that while food supply had been included as a potential hazard, the majority of food imports into the UK from countries with ongoing travel restrictions arrived by sea or by the Channel Tunnel so there not been a notable impact on supply to date. On avian flu, it was noted that Public Health England had advised that the risk to public health from all four strains of the virus was considered very low. Cases of ebola had also been identified in the Democratic Republic of Congo and south-east Guinea, but it had been determined that the risk to the UK was negligible to low.
- c) **Weather forecast:** The Met Office representative provided a brief update on the forecast over the following 7-10 days, noting that high pressure conditions would lead to fine and dry weather, with daytime temperatures around or slightly above average. More unsettled conditions may be expected from mid-March, with more rain expected than in the first half of the month. The longer term outlook suggested there was a higher likelihood of warmer conditions than usual, though cooler interludes could not be ruled out.
- d) **COVID-19 update:** The Chair of the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG) noted that the current key focus was on the impact of the roadmap published by the Government, which would have an impact on how the SCG worked as a partnership, as well as its relationships with other agencies and central Government. The Delivery Coordination Group (DCG) continued to operate, with a focus on moving away from a central coordinating function to one where working groups would take a greater coordinating role. The rhythm of meetings and the feedback cycle was under consideration, but it was not expected that a change of tempo would be agreed imminently. The Chair of the SCG thanked colleagues for their continued commitment to this work, and thanks were also expressed by the Chair of the Forum for the SCG's continued efforts.
- e) **British Nationals returning overseas from Hong Kong (MHCLG):** The MHCLG representative noted that recent analysis from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), which had been drawn on recent and projected visa applications, suggested that the potential number of British Nationals returning overseas from Hong Kong (BNOs) could be between 123,000 to 154,000 in the first 12 months. In order to qualify for BNO status, applicants would need to show that they had sufficient funds to support themselves and any dependents for up to six months. Letters had been sent to local authorities and local resilience forums (LRFs) in early January 2021 with additional information and planning scenarios that it was hoped would support proportional local planning. Some local authorities would be more greatly impacted than others, based on the communities currently living within those areas, and it was noted that 25 local authorities with larger communities of Hong Kong citizens had been identified, nine of which were London boroughs.
- 4.2 Policy responsibility had recently been transferred from the Home Office to MHCLG, and a new team had been established to work on this activity in collaboration with the Treasury, Home Office and FCO. Queries about data sharing had been raised by local government colleagues, and it was noted that MHCLG was working with the Home Office to ascertain what data could be shared, and how often that data could be provided to local authorities and LRFs. It was suggested that data would be released quarterly but Members felt that the first release of data scheduled for May seemed unnecessarily late and that quarterly data would be insufficient. The Forum noted that the newly established team would be putting pressure on colleagues in other Government departments to provide data on a more regular basis and colleagues would be updated as those conversations progressed. The Forum also noted the need for MHCLG to send bilateral meeting invites with more notice to allow partners to attend.

- 4.3 The Forum was keen to have a better understanding of the potential impact on local authorities and it was agreed that assurance from Government that adequate funding would be in place to support the local authorities most affected would be vital. It was noted that while there was an expectation that the majority of applicants would have sufficient funds to support themselves, some were likely to slip through the net and would seek care and support from the voluntary and faith sectors as they would have no recourse to public funds. The MHCLG representative confirmed that discussions on funding were ongoing with the Treasury.
- f) **Other agency updates by exception:** Adding to the MHCLG representative's comments on the potential for industrial action, the Network Rail representative noted that the TSSA union representing managerial staff was not happy about the lack of a pay offer from Network Rail. While balloting was not yet taking place, it was expected that relations would likely deteriorate. The Strategic Crisis Management team had discussed this at a recent meeting, and it was suggested that a formal dispute was unlikely at this stage, while passenger numbers were low, but that formal action may be progressed once more people returned to the rail network.

## 5 Special Agenda Items

### a) **Review of chronic incident response arrangements (Paper 66 02):**

- 5.1 A paper was presented to the Forum outlining the need to review chronic incident response arrangements in London. It was noted that it had been a year since the SCG had first been stepped up to respond to COVID-19 but that SCG protocol had never envisaged such prolonged incidents. The Forum heard a proposal to bring together five sub-groups sitting underneath an overarching Chronic Incident Review Group, which would produce a set of proposals outlining how London would respond to chronic incidents in the future. It was proposed that the review would cover a series of specific themes including:
- Governance arrangements;
  - Financial, contractual and procurement arrangements;
  - The scope and remit of an SCG;
  - Facilities, both physical and technological; and
  - Staffing, training and succession planning.
- 5.2 The next steps would be to review the Terms of Reference and scope of the review, identify members and theme leads, and to task the leads with specific areas of investigation. It was suggested that this first phase would be completed by around mid-March 2021. Forum members were asked to nominate individuals for the respective subgroups as appropriate.
- 5.3 The Chair supported the proposals, noting that although the pandemic response continued, it would be important to carry out such a review now in order to identify and record the major issues. In the national context, it was noted that other LRFs were considering similar proposals and that there would be an integrated review led by MHCLG to look at the nation's issues around security and the way that the UK engaged with resilience colleagues in other countries. It was not yet known whether the Civil Contingencies Act would change to reflect lessons learned throughout this crisis but that the national framework would be reviewed. The Chair was clear that this work should be carried out in partnership with Government, that whatever was being done nationally would need to fit in with LRF plans, and that a degree of flexibility would be required, noting that London's response could not be compared to that of other LRFs across the country.

- 5.4 **DECISION:** That the chronic incidents arrangements review be approved.
- 5.5 **ACTION:** Forum members to nominate representatives for the respective subgroups to support the review of chronic incident response arrangements.

**b) Bridges planning**

5.6 **This information has been redacted.**

5.7 **DECISION:** This information has been redacted.

**c) End of EU Transition impacts:**

5.8 The Forum heard that partners had not reported any short term impacts arising from Brexit, but that some agencies were looking at potential longer term issues. The process around customs arrangements would not be completed until the end of June 2021, and further changes were expected. It was noted that MHCLG had indicated that there would be an updated set of planning assumptions for Brexit, with an imminent release expected. The representative from MHCLG believed that that was the expectation but that the dates would be checked and confirmed.

5.9 **ACTION:** MHCLG to confirm release date for Brexit planning assumptions\*.

*\*Post-meeting note: MHCLG has confirmed the End of Transition RWCS were released on 11 February 2021.*

## **6 Progress Against London Resilience Programme**

**a) London Risk Register (Papers 66 03 and 66 04):**

- 6.1 The Forum received an overview of the revisions made to the London Risk Register following significant changes to the methodology aligning with the National Security and Risk Assessment (Aug 2019). Jeremy Reynolds thanked Caitlin James (LRG) and partners for their work in this regard, and for making significant progress despite COVID-19 disruption. It was recommended that the Forum approve the revised Register for publication to the public pending the removal of additional detail on cyber and terrorism risks. It was noted that there would be two versions of the Register; one published publicly containing redacted information on these threats, and a second detailed version for practitioners only. The Chair noted that public publication would likely lead to some interest from the media and it was suggested that any comms relating to the Register would need to link into GLA comms.
- 6.2 It was also recommended that the risk review cycle be changed so that high and very high risks were assessed annually, and all others assessed every two years.
- 6.3 **ACTION:** LRG to consult with GLA Comms before publication of the latest London Risk Register.
- 6.4 **DECISIONS:** That the Forum:

- Approved the London Risk Register for publication, pending removal of extra detail on cyber and terrorism risks;
- Agreed to a possible additional publication of the London Risk Register later in 2021, which would incorporate additional assessments for outstanding risks; and
- Noted the change to the risk review cycle.

**b) Learning and Implementation Report (Paper 66 05):**

- 6.5 Jeremy Reynolds thanked Natalia Proctor (LRG) and partners for their work in this regard, in making progress and reporting despite COVID-19 disruption. The Forum heard that the Learning and Implementation Review Group had met in January 2021 to review and update this report. 11 new lessons had been captured and 79 lessons had been closed since the last report in October. The process of identifying lessons and adding them to the database had been slower but work to review and complete lessons was moving more quickly. A number of debriefs were outstanding and would be chased, and partners were asked to support the team with this. Lessons over two years old had decreased from 132 lessons in October 2020 to 73 lessons from 17 incidents.
- 6.6 It was noted that some lessons from Grenfell were yet to be completed but that stage four of the public inquiry was fast approaching. There would likely be an expectation that the lessons captured from the incident had been turned into action, so it was suggested that these were progressed urgently. The Blue Lights Panel had been reviewing these lessons and was assessing who had responsibility for the recommendations.
- 6.7 In light of the Manchester Arena attack inquiry, where the partnership lessons process had been a focus, LRF members were reminded of the importance of identifying and implementing lessons, and that individuals attending related meetings were to do so as representatives of their respective chief officers.
- 6.8 **DECISION:** That the Learning and Implementation Report be approved.

**c) Partnership Capabilities Assessment (Papers 66 06, 66 07 and 66 08):**

- 6.9 The Forum received an overview of the latest London Capability Assessment Report, which had been revised since an original version had been presented to the Forum in February 2020. The assessment had not been approved at the February 2020 meeting and it was agreed that the methodology should be amended to better reflect London's capabilities. The overall assessment of each capability was now based on a judgement by the lead organisation Senior Responsible Owner supported by the LRG capability coordinator. This was a change from the previous assessment which had been determined by an algorithm where a certain number of capability elements rated as R/A/G determined the overall capability rating.
- 6.10 The recommendations in the assessment were described. Amongst the high-level findings, it was noted that improvements could be made in most capabilities if additional resources were put in. It was however recommended by the London Resilience Programme Board (LRPB) that additional resources weren't invested but that existing resources should be prioritised. The report also recommended that working groups establish annual work plans to cover the review of the respective framework as well as work on detailed planning where required, training, exercising and awareness raising, in addition to providing further guidance on BRF level planning requirements.

- 6.11 On training and exercising, the paper noted that there were ‘wide ranging gaps’ across the majority of London’s capabilities, in response to which it was suggested that further analysis of the gaps would be required. Members suggested that if gaps had been identified in various areas across the landscape, but were not thought to be significant, it was important to use the correct language when describing said gaps. It was agreed that the wording would be amended to better reflect the nature, severity and number of gaps.
- 6.12 **ACTION:** LRG to amend the wording of the phrase ‘wide range of gaps’ in relation to training and exercising to better reflect the nature, severity and number of those gaps.
- 6.13 It was suggested that addressing some of the red or purple rated gaps was not necessarily within the capability of London partners, and that it might be worth writing to central Government to formally note that some significant capability gaps would be outside the remit of the Forum and would require national contingency arrangements such as regional or national power failure.
- 6.14 **ACTION:** LRG to consider drafting formal communication to Central Government on significant capability gaps, as referenced in the Capability Assessment report, that were deemed to be outside of the remit of the LRF to resolve and that required national contingency arrangements.
- 6.15 **DECISIONS:** That the Forum:
- Noted the high-level findings of the report;
  - Approved the recommendations subject to the amendments discussed;
  - Agreed to commission capability working groups to update their assessment following the review of each capability; and
  - Agreed to commission the next full assessment in 2022;
  - Agreed to direct capability working groups to put in place an annual work plan covering awareness raising, training, exercising, and where required more detailed planning (i.e. below the level of the capability framework). Noting this will be challenging to achieve given resource limitations but that current resourcing is a proportionate investment in capability development;
  - Agreed that additional local and single agency assurance is not desirable, but that capability working groups should provide further guidance on BRF level planning requirements. BRFs and individual organisations should continue to set their own priorities, work programmes, and allocate resources accordingly;
  - Agreed to engage with MHCLG, CCS and relevant Lead Government Departments to;
    - review the limitations of London’s capabilities in relation to power disruption, telecoms disruption, severe drought, large-scale water disruption;
    - consider the status of national preparedness/contingency arrangements;
    - consider collaborative opportunities to improve overall (national/local) preparedness;
    - confirm the status and intention to address gaps in relation to legislation, regulations, and guidance;
  - Noted the current prioritisation of red and orange capabilities, and the need to keep this under continuous review, including the future revision of pandemic influenza arrangements; and

- Agreed to convene a senior stakeholder panel to review training and exercise requirements, current provision, and to make recommendations to the LRF in June 2021. To note the proposed interim solution to deliver on-line capability briefings for the Strategic Coordination Protocol and other recently revised Frameworks.

**d) Planning Assumptions progress update (Paper 66 09):**

- 6.16 Jeremy Reynolds thanked Magdalena Koluzs (LRG) and partners for their work in this regard, and for making significant progress despite COVID-19 disruption. The Forum received an overview of the paper circulated within the agenda pack.
- 6.17 The paper provided clarity on current London Resilience Planning Assumptions (ie. Listing those taken directly from the National Security Risk Assessment, Aug 2019 and those adapted for London context).
- 6.18 Full details of the assessments provided by capability groups was not included because this was a work in progress. Furthermore, consideration would be given to how best this could be presented in conjunction with wider capability assessment reporting.
- 6.19 There was still a reasonable amount of consultation work to go into assessing against the new planning assumptions (as provided by the National Security Risk Assessment, Aug 2019), but the initial review presented did not indicate any major gaps to be highlighted. The Forum was asked to note the review and progress made.
- 6.20 **DECISION:** That the Forum noted the Planning Assumptions progress update paper.

**e) Training and Exercising update:**

**i. Multi Agency Gold Incident Command (MAGIC) courses going forward**

- 6.21 A full MAGIC course had been run successfully with support from BTP colleagues in December 2020. A course scheduled for January 2021 had to be cancelled due to lockdown, but a MAGIC-lite course would run in early March with a full complement of trainees. A further full course was being planned at the LFB HQ, and it was expected a further two full and two lite courses would be run over the next year subject to budget as the College of Policing had increased the cost of courses significantly. This would be discussed with the current London funding partners for MAGIC courses
- 6.22 **DECISION:** That the MAGIC courses update be noted.

**ii. Partnership Notification Testing (Paper 66 10)**

- 6.23 A test had been carried out in September 2020, through which technological issues had been identified. A further test was carried out in February 2021, which highlighted another technical issue with the mass messaging system. A further test would be run in the next few months to ensure any remaining issues had been ironed out.
- 6.24 **DECISION:** That the Partnership Notification Testing paper be noted.

**iii. T&E requirements with COVID restrictions (Paper 66 11)**

6.25 The Forum received an overview of the paper which set out a proposal to deliver online capability briefing sessions in lieu of in-person events cancelled due to COVID-19 work priorities and social distancing restrictions. Three sessions were scheduled for March and April, and around 70 people had already booked their places. The aim of the scheduled sessions was to raise awareness of London's Strategic Coordination Protocol and it was intended that capability workshops could also be rolled out for the Humanitarian Assistance and London Resilience Communication Group frameworks. It was agreed that having one-hour sessions would enhance accessibility and it was noted that the sessions that had taken place to date had been well received. Also note last bullet at 6.15 relating to T&E.

6.26 **DECISION:** That the proposal to delivery capability briefing sessions be approved.

**f) Partnership Work Programme (Paper 66 12):**

- **Partnership Priorities Update (Paper 66 13)**

6.27 The Forum received an overview of the paper, which sets out a proposed list of priorities for the partnership, as well as details of which projects and capabilities had been subject to delays.

6.28 **DECISIONS:** That the Forum:

- Approved the proposed priorities and timeframes for completion; and
- Approved the delay of several workstreams as set out in the paper.

**7 Documents recommended for approval**

**a) London Resilience Communication Group Framework (Papers 66 14 and 66 15):**

7.1 The London Resilience Communication Group Framework had been updated to incorporate lessons from 2017 incidents and initial learning from the COVID-19 response. The Forum was asked to approve the revised Framework.

7.2 The Chair noted her thanks to the London Resilience Communication Group colleagues for their work to update the document.

7.3 **DECISION:** That the revised London Resilience Communication Group Framework be approved.

**b) Humanitarian Assistance (Papers 66 16 and 66 17):**

7.4 The Humanitarian Assistance Framework had last been updated formally in 2017, immediately prior to the Grenfell Tower fire. An updated version of the Framework, which incorporated the full lessons of Grenfell, had been presented to the Forum for consideration. It was noted that this was an interim version of the Framework and that a further version (which would include additional guidance for Humanitarian Assistance Liaison Officers and the Humanitarian Assistance Steering Group) would be brought back to the LRF in late 2021/early 2022.

7.5 **DECISION:** That the Humanitarian Assistance Framework be approved noting the further work ongoing to further develop the framework in 2021.

c) **Structural Collapse, Response and Recovery Framework Update (Paper 66 18):**

7.6 The City of London had been identified as the Capability Lead in November 2020, but the COVID-19 response meant that finalising the Framework for the meeting had been impossible to achieve. The Forum was asked to endorse an extension of the review period for the Framework to June 2021.

7.7 **DECISION:** That the delays to the Framework be noted and an extension to the review period be endorsed.

## 8 Agency and Sector Updates

8.1 **Greater London Authority** – There was no update.

### 8.2 **Blue Lights Panel and Emergency Services:**

- i. **Blue Light Panel** – The panel was working on a joint protocol with partners to develop a business case for a joint testing and exercising team. The London Control Room Operating Group was going through JESIP training, and control rooms across all emergency services were now in communication throughout major incidents.
- ii. **MPS** – The MPS continued to prepare for ceremonial, sporting and festival events going ahead, with planning being carried out as if there would be no restrictions in place. Planning would be scaled up or down in accordance with the restrictions as and when changes were implemented. Cyber security threats were being reviewed, particularly in light of how much more reliant partners had been on technology throughout the pandemic.
- iii. **City of London Police** – No significant issues were reported but it was confirmed that work was ongoing to plan for future service delivery.
- iv. **BTP** – A strategic threat assessment had been launched to review the safety of the transport network in and around London in advance of more people returning to public transport later in the year. Those who had travelled throughout the pandemic were used to the regulations and the expected continued requirement to wear a mask, but passengers who had not been travelling regularly through the pandemic were likely to be less aware of the regulations.
- v. **LAS** – The LAS representative expressed their thanks to colleagues from the MPS and LFB for their support with patients across London throughout the pandemic. The current focus was on collating an action review from the second wave and on summer events that could go ahead later in the year as the restrictions are eased.
- vi. **LFB** – LFB had received its latest HMICFRS (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services) progress report, and it was expected that another inspection would be carried out in June 2021. Partners were thanked for their contribution to the inspection.
- vii. **Maritime Coastguard Agency** – There was no update.

8.3 **Local Authorities:**

- i. **Local Authorities Panel** – There was no update.
- ii. **London Councils** – Leading members continued to be engaged in resilience work and were interested in the work on lessons learnt.

8.4 **Health:**

- i. **NHS England and NHS Improvement (London)** – There was no update, but partners were thanked for their ongoing support to the NHS and the social care system throughout the pandemic.
- ii. **Public Health England (PHE)** – PHE had been working under new leadership since August 2020, and work was ongoing in terms of priorities and an operating model. From 1 April 2021, PHE would close and a new public health landscape would take shape. It was expected that all functions should be in place by October 2021. It was agreed that a more substantial update would be brought to the next LRF meeting in June 2021.

8.5 **ACTION:** PHE to bring a more substantial update on the future of public health to the next Forum meeting in June 2021.

8.6 **EA** – There had been increased rainfall and localized flooding in Hillingdon, but the weather was beginning to look more settled. The Thames Barrier had been used five times over the winter, and it was expected that the Spring tide over the next few months would bring more closures. A communications piece would be released on the 200<sup>th</sup> closure of the Barrier, and it would be linked to long term plans on tides and flooding in the Estuary.

8.7 **Met Office** – An online course had been developed to train over 500 responder partners around the UK over the last year. The number of online courses provided would soon be expanded to include topics such as climate change, atmospheric dispersion and space weather. Further details would follow in the coming weeks.

8.8 **Transport Sector Panel (TSP)** – The TSP continued to run a full service, with some partly suspended coach and river services likely to return over the coming months. The TSP would be supporting the bus network as students returned to school, and efforts to support the vaccine roll out continued. Preparations were also being made for the return of events over the summer.

8.9 **Network Rail** – The rail industry was carrying out a review into its resilience capability.

8.10 **Thames Resilience Panel** – The next meeting of the Panel would be on 15 March 2021, at which the priority would be to develop a risk assessment. The Port of London Authority had recently appointed a new Emergency Planning Officer, Jamie Gilbert, who would be coordinating the meetings going forward.

8.11 **Utilities Sector Panel** – The Panel continued to meet weekly.

8.12 **Business Sector Panel** – The Panel was busy supporting the Business and Economic Impact group at the DCG.

8.13 **Voluntary Sector Panel** – The Panel was considering how best to embed the work that had developed over the last year with the wider VCS Emergencies Partnership, the learning from COVID-19 and mobilisation structures that had been developed. Further updates to the

Voluntary Sector Capabilities Document were likely this year to capture learning from COVID-19, new partnerships and subsequent wider capabilities. The VCS Emergencies Partnership in London had been developing a system to capture requests for support with vaccinations and the British Red Cross was supporting communications to address vaccination hesitancy.

- 8.14 **Faith Sector Panel** – The Panel had been engaged in the COVID-19 response, with the key areas of work focusing on bereavement and vaccines. The sector was also engaged in recovery work, and work to embed lessons learned from the pandemic was ongoing. Beyond COVID-19, work continued on Cold Spaces and registering places of worship for the programme, water points in places of worship (grounds and buildings), and welcoming Hong Kong British Nationals from Overseas.
- 8.15 **HQ London District** – Military Command London remained activated and support to partners would continue.
- 8.16 **London Resilience Communication Group** – COVID-19 continued to dominate communications activity with a series of key focuses: consideration underway of how to mark the anniversary of lockdown; messaging for when the major incident is stood down; vaccine roll out and confidence; maintaining adherence to current restrictions; and looking ahead to any issues that may arise through the summer once restrictions had been lifted.
- 8.17 **Government (MHCLG)** – The latest reasonable worst-case scenario modelling had been uploaded to Resilience Direct on 11 February 2021. The link would be circulated in due course.
- 8.18 **ACTION:** MHCLG to circulate the link to the reasonable worst-case scenario on Resilience Direct.
- 8.19 **BRFs** – All BRFs meet. The focus of work in the last year has been Covid and there has been limited opportunity to consider issues such as training and exercising. Forums report generally good engagement from agencies at a local level, including the Faith and Voluntary sector, although this is often outside of formal meetings. A challenge reported by some BRFs is the consistency of representation from agencies which has been affected by staff turnover.
- 8.20 **ACTION:** The BRF update to be circulated following the meeting\*.

*\*Post-meeting note: this action has been completed.*

## 9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 It was noted that a consultation on the Protect duty arrangements would be forthcoming. All agencies were encouraged to contribute.
- 9.2 **ACTION:** The actions from the meeting to be shared via email with partners after the meeting.

## 10 Dates of Next and Future Meetings

- 10.1 The dates of the next and future meetings were noted as follows:
- Thursday 17 June 2021, 2pm via Microsoft Teams
  - Thursday 14 October 2021, 2pm at a venue to be confirmed

- Thursday 24 February 2022, 2pm at a venue to be confirmed