

# MINUTES

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

**Date**            **Thursday 17 June 2021**

**Time**            **2.00 pm**

**Place**            **Virtual Meeting**

Ref	ACTION	OWNER
7.8	Capability leads to develop annual workplans relating to the Partnership Work Programme and Priorities.	Capability leads

**Present:**

Fiona Twycross, Chair  
 Sarah Spencer, GLA  
 Robin Merritt, MOPAC  
 Joseph McDonald, Metropolitan Police Service  
 John Osibote, City of London Police  
 Sean O’Callaghan, British Transport Police  
 Natasha Wills, London Ambulance Service  
 Jonathan Smith, London Fire Brigade  
 Terry Leach, Maritime & Coastguard Agency  
 Eleanor Kelly, Local Authorities Panel  
 Doug Flight, London Councils  
 Chloe Sellwood, NHS England & Improvement (London)  
 Deborah Turbitt, Public Health England  
 Jeanne Capey, Environment Agency  
 Paul O’Connor, Transport Sector Panel  
 Guy Huckle, Network Rail  
 Bill D’Albertanson, Utilities Sector Panel  
 Don Randall, Business Sector Panel  
 Alex Milne, Voluntary Sector Panel  
 Sarah Streete, HQ London District  
 Bernadette Ford, London Resilience Communications Group  
 Matt Woodhouse, London Resilience Communications Group  
 Paul Phipps-Williams, MHCLG  
 Mark Rogers, Met Office

**London Resilience Group (LRG):**

Hamish Cameron, LRG  
 Toby Gould, LRG  
 John Hetherington, Head of LRG  
 Jeremy Reynolds, LRG

**GLA:**

Felicity Harris, Board Officer (clerk)

**Also in attendance:**

Luca Barnes, Metropolitan Police Service

Leah Colwell, MHCLG

Risha Dhrona, Public Health England

Barry Emerson, NHS

Steve Feely, Metropolitan Police Service

Matthew Herrington, London Fire Brigade

Peter Lavery, Business Sector Panel

Edit Nagy, LRG

Alan Palmer, London Ambulance Service

Alice Reeves, GLA

Mark Sawyer, Local Authorities Panel

Ray Shields, British Transport Police

## **1 Chair's opening remarks**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Members to the Forum and expressed her congratulations to Colonel Jeremy Bagshaw, who had been awarded a CBE in the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2021 for his role in resilience support throughout the pandemic.

## **2 Introductions and apologies for absence**

- 2.1 Apologies were received from: Jon-Paul Graham, GLA; Diana Luchford, MOPAC; Keith Paterson, City of London Police; Pauline Cranmer, London Ambulance Service; John Barradell, Local Authorities Panel; Martin Machray, NHS; Peter Boorman, NHS; Monica Cooney, Transport Sector Panel; Emma Spragg, Voluntary Sector Panel; Father Luke Miller, Faith Sector Panel; and Col. Jeremy Bagshaw, HQ London District.

## **3 Minutes and matters arising from the previous meeting**

- 3.1 The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum (67 01) held on 25 February 2021 as an accurate record.
- 3.2 With reference to actions outstanding, the Forum noted that:
  - The action to develop an approach on data sharing from June 2018 was in progress. Officers aimed to produce a data sharing agreement for the purpose of sharing personal data about people affected by an emergency. It was expected that the proposed agreement would be shared with partners for consideration in Autumn 2021.
  - The action from February 2020 for the Chair to discuss the future direction and purpose of the Community Resilience Steering Group had been delayed due to the pandemic but an initial discussion had taken place.

- 3.3 All other actions had either been closed or would be covered during the meeting.

## 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. Potential attacks continued to be disrupted throughout the pandemic, but officers remained concerned that the reemergence of crowds and crowded places posed an increased risk.
- b) **Hazards:** The MHCLG representative confirmed that current risks included:
- African swine fever, which had been spreading across Asia since 2020 with cases reported in Germany, eastern Europe and neighbouring countries. The spread would continue to be monitored and it was noted that the risk to the UK was medium.
  - Avian flu, though it was noted that the situation had improved since the last update. Risk levels for wild birds remained low, while the risk to poultry and captive birds had reduced from medium to low.
- c) **Weather forecast:** The Met Office representative provided a brief update on the forecast over the following 7-10 days, noting that showers were to be expected, with heavy rain accompanying thunderstorms in some areas. A weather warning had been issued for possible surface water flooding in some areas of the country. In the medium-term, westerly winds would bring showers and there was no sign of further prolonged dry, hot weather. The winds would bring temperatures closer to average for the time of year. The longer-term forecast suggested near average conditions were expected with a slightly higher probability of warmer than average conditions across the UK over the next three months.
- d) **COVID-19 update:** The Head of the London Resilience Group (LRG) noted the delay to the conclusion of the Government's roadmap of a further four weeks and confirmed that the main focus for London remained the vaccine rollout and monitoring any new variants. The Programme Board and related governance structures remained in place and would continue feeding into the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG) as required. The SCG Steering Group continued to meet weekly, with the full SCG having met two weeks prior. The next full meeting of the SCG would take place on 7 July 2021. The Chair noted her and the Mayor's gratitude to everyone in the partnership for the work they had carried out over the past 18 months and for their ongoing commitment to the response effort.
- e) **Other agency updates by exception:** There were no further updates.

## 5 Special Agenda Items

### a) LRF Chronic Incident Review Group Update (Paper 67 02)

- 5.1 A paper was presented to the Forum relating to the Chronic Incident Review which had been commissioned at the start of 2021. The review aimed to assess how best to enhance support for the SCG and how to communicate effectively with an independent voice for London

throughout chronic incidents. Nineteen recommendations were included within the report, and it was noted that various partners had regularly been consulted as part of this process. The Forum was asked to give particular consideration to the first two overarching recommendations which related to funding mechanisms for Category 1 responders and to staffing arrangements for the SCG and supporting functions prior to future incidents. Blanket approval was not being sought but it was hoped that the Forum would approve the principles and direction of travel outlined in the report. Should this be agreed, further work would be carried out on each of the recommendations.

5.2 Members were broadly supportive of the direction of travel but were also keen to have more in-depth conversations about the level of funding and resources partners would be expected to contribute. A particular concern was raised about the ability of some partners to contribute financially as they were national providers that would not necessarily be in a position to contribute to regional measures. It was acknowledged that different partners and sectors would have different things to offer, whether that be expertise, personnel, funding or premises, and members were assured that the report did not commit partners to any spend. The funding element would be worked through in consultation with the relevant organisations.

5.3 **DECISIONS:**

**That the Forum:**

- **approve the recommendations outlined in the report in principle; and**
- **agree the direction of travel, subject to concerns around funding being considered in more detail.**

**b) Protect Duty Consultation (Paper 67 03)**

5.4 The Forum noted that the Government was conducting a consultation on the use of legislation to enhance the protection of publicly accessible locations in the UK from terrorist attacks and ensure organisational preparedness. A draft consultation response had been circulated with the agenda and the Forum was asked to approve the response, noting that LRFs should not be part of the delivery process for this work. Partners and agencies were encouraged to comment and respond to the consultation individually in addition to agreeing the collective response from the LRF.

5.5 **DECISION: That the Forum approve the proposed response to the Protect Duty consultation.**

**c) Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) Migration (Paper 67 04)**

5.6 Further to the briefing the LRF received on PSTN migration in February 2020, an update report had been circulated with the agenda for this meeting. The Government had asked LRFs to support the switch-over process, though it was noted that the process could have significant implications for a number of agencies, and it was not entirely clear what duties would be expected of partners beyond raising awareness of the switch.

5.7 It was noted that this was a commercial venture between Openreach and Virgin, and that there would be a number of impacts across the network, including the potential reduction of

resilience across the service. The representative from MHCLG confirmed that questionnaires would be distributed to local authorities and LRFs, and that officers would continue to work closely with London Resilience colleagues to clarify and iron out any potential issues.

**5.8 DECISION: That the PSTN Migration report be noted.**

**d) LRF Funding Pilot (Paper 67 05)**

- 5.9 The Forum heard that MHCLG had recently announced funding to be allocated to LRFs across the country to increase capacity via strategic resources and to build or enhance LRF capability to address national and local resilience priorities. The funding formed part of the wider integrated review process in addition to ongoing work that would feed into revisions to the Civil Contingencies Act. The details of this spend would be reported back to MHCLG and would help inform discussions on what LRF funding may look like in the future. London's share of the funding was £245,000.
- 5.10 The Forum received an outline of the proposals to divide the grant received between staffing costs and funding for a number of standalone pieces of work. It was suggested that this combination of spend was intended to cut across different critical areas of resilience, thereby maximising the benefits for London by improving capacity to manage and enhance resilience as well as improving understanding of new and future challenges.
- 5.11 It was proposed that a Community Resilience Coordinator could be recruited on a one year fixed term contract to sit within the GLA's resilience team. The role would be focused on widening the link between community groups and the resilience community, enhancing communications on resilience, promoting grass roots community resilience projects, supporting the aims of the City Resilience Strategy and engaging with other LRFs and MHCLG on community resilience building. It was also proposed that a data consultant could be recruited on a fixed term contract to build understanding of the use of data and information, how it can be used to improve resilience, to identify any data gaps, to consider how best to manage data during emergencies, and to identify any further information that would be of use in a wider resilience context.
- 5.12 In addition to potential recruitment opportunities, a number of specific projects were being considered relating to public risk communications, seed funding for community and volunteers projects, a project to enhance understanding of cross-sectoral risk and one to quantify the cost of risk. It was noted that MHCLG was also welcoming bids for allocations from the Shared Innovation Fund, which it was noted was entirely separate from the £245,000 specifically allocated to London. Officers suggested making a bid to complete further work on cyber resilience in order to address an LRF capability need. The suggested work would look at deconflicting efforts on cyber security and cyber resilience, and reviewing whether the current level of preparedness was appropriate for the LRF. Further work would be required to understand the full scope, extent and cost of the project.
- 5.13 Members welcomed news of the funding and agreed that additional capacity to deal with historical challenges would be beneficial. It was suggested that the community resilience recruitment proposal would need to be triangulated with the work ongoing within community faith and voluntary sector groups in addition to the ongoing conversations about the Building Strong Communities mission being pursued as part of the London Recovery Programme.

5.14 Members discussed the proposal to bid for additional funds to work on cyber resilience and it was queried whether this work should be incorporated within core resilience spend rather than waiting for potential funding via a bid into the Shared Innovation Fund. It was suggested that a conversation on national priorities in relation to cyber resilience work would be useful but that that could take place alongside work to progress the other workstreams proposed.

5.15 The Chair thanked officers for the effort that was put into collating these proposals and also noted her thanks to MHCLG for the funding.

5.16 **DECISIONS:**

**That the Forum:**

- **agree the proposal in principle;**
- **approve the appointment of funded posts; and**
- **note that discretionary expense should proceed in light of discussion of a national project on cyber resilience.**

## **6 Agency and Sector Updates**

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

6.2 **Blue Lights Panel and Emergency Services:**

- i. **Blue Light Panel** – The panel continued to meet quarterly and had last met in early June. The review of the LESLP Major Incident Procedure Manual had been delayed due to several factors, including Operation Forth Bridge and a steep increase in Public Order events. The working group aimed to have a new version ready by September 2021 so that final approval could be sought at the October meeting of the LRF. Partners and agencies were encouraged to complete their reviews and contributions as quickly as possible due to the tight timeframe. A training programme would be established post-publication to bring relevant agencies and key stakeholders up to date on the changes.
- ii. **Metropolitan Police Service** – There was no further update.
- iii. **City of London Police** – It was noted that the review of the Mass Evacuation Framework had been delayed due to reduced capacity within the Emergency Planning and Resilience team.
- iv. **British Transport Police** – Despite ridership on the underground still only reaching 40%, calls for assistance were back up to 80%, matching 2019 levels. There had been a notable increase in sexual offences taking place on the network, in addition to alcohol-fuelled incidents of antisocial behaviour. Resilience planning was focused on keep the network safe and on the potential for a greater number of people than usual visiting the capital in place of going abroad for holidays. Officers had noted some nervousness amongst passengers about not being COVID-19 compliant or confident in using the network while social distancing became more difficult to enforce as passenger numbers increased.

Volume 1 of the Manchester Arena Inquiry had been published, and it was noted that the British Transport Police had received criticism for its response to the incident. The recommendations from the report would be reviewed in due course.

- v. **London Ambulance Service** – Officers thanked London Fire Brigade colleagues for their continued support in meeting demand throughout the pandemic. It was noted that there had been a significant increase in demand for services over the past few days, with the number of calls to 111 and 999 services reaching levels usually expected on New Year's Eve. This represented a 30% increase on 2019 levels. A restructure was being considered within the ambulance service.
- vi. **London Fire Brigade** – Officers continued to support the London Ambulance Service given the challenging operational context within which they were working. The service remained resilient, and had retained an ongoing ability to deliver core services. Officers had heavily supported the Cornwall Fire and Rescue Service during the recent G7 summit, noting that the geography of the location made it a challenging operation. A number of lessons would be learnt from the event. A similar level of support would be provided to Scottish fire and rescue services during COP 26, which was due to take place in November 2021. A preliminary report relating to the New Providence Wharf fire had been published, with lessons expected to be learnt from the operational response. These would be presented to the National Fire Chiefs Council in due course.
- vii. **Maritime Coastguard Agency** – There was no update.

### 6.3 Local Authorities:

- i. **Local Authorities Panel** – A fundamental review of local authority arrangements was due to be initiated and it was expected that the funding of resilience planning and response activity would be incorporated into the review to ensure continued ability to address future challenges. It was noted that John Barradell and Eleanor Kelly, Chair and Deputy Chair of the Local Authorities Panel respectively, would be standing down. Arrangements for their replacements were ongoing. The Chair expressed her thanks to both John and Eleanor for their leadership of and commitment to the Panel and noted that they would both remain involved in resilience planning to varying degrees.
- ii. **London Councils** – John O'Brien had stood down as Chief Executive Officer of London Councils. His replacement, Alison Griffin, would be taking up the role towards the end of July.

### 6.4 Health:

- i. **London Local Health Resilience Partnership** – The Partnership had been re-established and had met a couple of times, with a focus on non-COVID-19 activities that had slowed throughout the pandemic. The Partnership would be looking at the London Risk Register and specific risks to health and social care, while also looking ahead to the formal establishment of Integrated Care Systems and what that would mean from a response perspective.
- ii. **NHS England and NHS Improvement (London)** – COVID-19 response and activity was ongoing. Thanks were expressed to all partners for their agility in supporting the

vaccination programme. Significant pressures were being seen across the NHS, with around 15,000 accessing emergency departments on a single day that week. It was noted that this was not a London-specific issue and that social care colleagues had been working hard to keep patients out of emergency departments as far as possible. Looking ahead to the third wave of COVID-19, officers were hopeful that the impact on health services would be lessened by the take up of vaccinations.

iii. **Public Health England (PHE)** – The third wave of COVID-19 was ongoing, with infection rates in all London boroughs continuing to rise. It was expected that rates would continue to rise over the coming weeks, though there were a few factors that would distinguish this from previous waves, most notably the vaccination programme. It was noted that the Delta variant was now present in 96% of new cases in London and while it was considered more transmissible, the outcomes were not thought to be more serious than those of other variants. Members heard that the risk of symptomatic infection appeared reduced by 70-90% for individuals who had received two doses of the vaccine, with the risk of asymptomatic infection reduced by 94%. Two doses of the vaccine reduced the chances of hospital admission by between 88-98%, and the chance of death had been reduced by 98-99%. With the older population now being relatively protected, it was expected that there would be far greater transmission amongst younger people, so work would be needed to encourage widespread take up of the vaccine. A series of mass vaccination events had been scheduled for the coming weekend and it was confirmed that everyone over the age of 18 would be able to book an appointment for their vaccination the following week. PHE would be going through a period of transition over the coming months, with other agencies formally delivering services from 1 October 2021.

6.5 **Environment Agency** – Borough Resilience Forums (BRFs) were being encouraged to submit their multi-agency flood plans to DEFRA for a health check by 24 September 2021. The next review would take place in 2024.

6.6 **Met Office** – There was no further update.

6.7 **Sector Panels:**

i. **Business Sector Panel** – The SCG economic subgroup continued to meet and would be focused on support and funding for businesses at the next meeting. The night time economy was discussed in detail at the previous meeting, where it was noted that the industry had suffered greatly and was experiencing particular problems with a lack of security personnel as major security providers had been looking to cut costs. Further issues would likely emerge later in the year following the conclusion of the roadmap.

ii. **Thames Resilience Panel** – There was no update.

iii. **Transport Sector Panel** – The Panel was working with key delivery partners on planning during Euro 2020. Adverse weather plans for the summer were in place and ready to be deployed. The e-scooter trial taking place in a number of London boroughs was being monitored and planning for the next phase of lockdown easing continued. The Panel was not sufficiently resourced to attend all BRFs, but local authority partners were encouraged to flag any specific agenda items that would require a response.



- iv. **Network Rail** – The Williams Rail Review had been published. Officers were looking into what that would mean in terms of Civil Contingencies Act categorisation of the rail network. The National Emergency Plan had been published on Resilience Direct. The industry was looking at the Rail Resilience Review, which had concluded and had been reported to the Rail Delivery Group’s main board. A programme of improvements would be put in place, with a focus on the industry improving engagement with LRFs and other national resilience structures.
  - v. **Utilities Sector Panel** – The Panel continued to meet weekly, and was reviewing the Power Failure Disruption Framework, which would be considered at the next LRF meeting.
  - vi. **Faith Sector Panel** – There was no update.
  - vii. **Voluntary Sector Panel** – Capacity was a challenge across the sector, with organisations needing to prioritise support for areas where the Panel could make the greatest impact. Support for mass vaccination centres was being dialled down in favour of a more targeted community approach. Support was offered with communications and messaging via Panel members, in addition to support with heatwave planning.
- 6.8 **HQ London District** – Officers were moving back towards business as usual, albeit with a maintained focus on COVID-19, following a series of events including Operation Forth Bridge and Trooping the Colour.
- 6.9 **London Resilience Communication Group** – The Group continued to contribute to the SCG communications subgroup. Learning from Operation Forth Bridge was being reviewed with a view to ensuring Operation London Bridge planning was up to date. A session would be held in July to bring partners up to speed on the framework agreed at the last meeting.
- 6.10 **Government (MHCLG)** – Around 34,400 applications for visas from British Nationals returning overseas from Hong Kong had been made during the first quarter of the year. A £43m welcome programme had been established to help with english language provision, destitution support through local authorities and support to help tackle hate crime implications. **This information has been redacted.** Partners were thanked for their roles following the death of HRH the Duke of Edinburgh.
- 6.11 **Borough Resilience Forums** – BRFs continued to meet across London. Discussions were ongoing in relation to links to the utilities and transport sector panels.

## **7 Progress Against London Resilience Programme**

### **a) Learning and Implementation Report (Paper 67 07)**

- 7.1 In referring to the paper circulated with the agenda, the Deputy Head of London Resilience, Jeremy Reynolds, noted that the pace of lessons being added to the database outstripped the pace of completion over the last period (since the last LRF meeting) but that the number of lessons over two years old continued to be reduced. Twenty lessons had been closed since the last report.

7.2 **DECISION: That the Learning and Implementation Report be noted.**

**b) Risk and Planning Assumptions (Paper 67 08)**

7.3 The Deputy Head of London Resilience, Jeremy Reynolds, noted that work on risk and planning assumptions had not officially been a LRF priority at the start of the year, although work continues, and that work was expected to increase over the coming months. It was therefore proposed that this was reinstated as an LRF priority. The London Risk Advisory Group were supportive of the Resilience Pilot proposal, in particular the public communications elements. Thanks were expressed to MHCLG colleagues with whom dialogue had been instigated with other LRFs about good practice, particularly relating to utilisation of planning assumptions.

7.4 **DECISION: That the Risk and Planning Assumptions report be noted.**

**c) Training and Exercising Update (Paper 67 09)**

7.5 The Deputy Heads of London Resilience (Toby Gould and Jeremy Reynolds) noted that the update paper outlined a series of recommendations, including a recommendation for wider partnership involvement at the large multi-agency counter terrorism exercise due to take place in Autumn 2021. The focus of the exercise was likely to be on the recommendations and lessons to be learnt from the Manchester Arena Inquiry.

7.6 **DECISIONS:**

**That the Forum:**

- **note the Training and Exercising update; and**
- **approve the recommendations set out in the report.**

**d) Partnership Work Programme and Priorities Update (Papers 67 10 and 67 11)**

7.7 The Head of London Resilience spoke to the paper, noting the ambitious plan, which set out a series of priorities for the coming year. It was noted that updates to the Mass Evacuation and Mass Shelter frameworks would be deprioritised and it was suggested that all working groups continued looking to establish an initial set of 'quick wins' and details of what longer-term successes would look like over the next year.

7.8 **ACTION:** Capability leads to develop annual workplans.

7.9 **DECISION:**

**That the Forum:**

- **note the Partnership Work Programme and Priorities update; and**
- **approve the recommendations set out in the report.**

## **8 Documents recommended for approval**

### **a) Structural Collapse Response and Recovery Framework (Papers 67 12 and 67 13)**

8.1 The Forum were asked to approve the updated framework, which reflected learning from the Grenfell Tower fire as well as other incidents which had taken place outside of London. The Chair thanked all those involved in updating the framework.

8.2 **DECISION: That the revised Structural Collapse Response and Recovery Framework be approved.**

### **b) London Resilience Programme Board (LRPB) Terms of Reference (Paper 67 14)**

8.3 The Deputy Head of London Resilience noted that minor administrative changes had been made to the LRPB Terms of Reference and that this was a routine review.

8.4 **DECISION: That the LRPB Terms of Reference be approved.**

### **c) LRF Terms of Reference (Paper 67 15)**

8.5 The Deputy Head of London Resilience noted that minor administrative changes had been made to the LRF Terms of Reference and that this was a routine review.

8.6 **DECISION: That the LRF Terms of Reference be approved.**

## **9 Review of Actions**

9.1 The Deputy Head of London Resilience provided an overview of the decisions and actions agreed throughout this meeting. The decisions and actions are all incorporated within these minutes.

## **10 Any Other Business**

10.1 It was expected that recommendations aimed at LRFs would be included in the outcomes of the Manchester Arena Inquiry. The Chair noted that it would be important to consider the seniority of attendees at LRF meetings.

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

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

- Thursday 14 October 2021, 2pm, LFB HQ, Union Street, London
- Thursday 24 February 2022, 2pm, LFB HQ, Union Street, London