

MINUTES

Meeting: London Resilience Forum
Date: Thursday 14 October 2021
Time: 2.00 pm
Place: GO02 & G03, LFB HQ, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL

Ref	ACTION	OWNER
4b	LRG and DLUHC to discuss winter preparedness. (Complete)	John Hetherington
4b	Agencies to note that reporting may be required – based on the EU exit model.	All
7.5	Network Rail to discuss network and power disruption issues with LRG.	Guy Huckle
10.2	NAS to be included for discussion in a future agenda	Secretariat

Present:

Fiona Twycross, Chair
 Niran Mothada, Greater London Authority
 Col. Jeremy Bagshaw, HQ London District
 Pat Goulbourne, London Fire Brigade
 Natasha Wills, London Ambulance Service
 Don Randall, Business Sector Panel
 Christian Van Der Nest, Transport Sector Panel
 Guy Huckle, National Rail
 Joseph McDonald, Metropolitan Police Service
 Sean O’Callaghan, British Transport Police
 Keith Paterson, City of London Police
 Alison Griffin, London Councils
 Tony Bray, Department for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities
 Emma Spragg, Voluntary Sector Panel (via MS Teams)
 Kim Wright, Local Authorities Panel (via MS Teams)
 Bill D’Albertanson, Utilities Sector Panel (via MS Teams)
 Matt Woodhouse, London Resilience Communications Group (via MS Teams)
 Mark Rogers, Met Office (via MS Teams)

London Resilience Group (LRG):

Hamish Cameron, Deputy Head of London Resilience Group(via MS Teams)
 John Hetherington, Head of London Resilience
 Jeremy Reynolds, Deputy Head of the London Resilience Group

GLA:

Richard Kember, Board Officer (Clerk)

In Attendance:

Edit Nagy, LRG

Alice Reeves, Greater London Authority

Abubaker Adam, Voluntary Sector Panel

Christopher Rowbottom, City of London Police

1 Chair's Opening Remarks

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, which was taking place in a hybrid format, and noted that she hoped this would signal a return to more regular in-person meetings.

2 Introductions and Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from: Toby Gould, London Resilience Group; Stuart Love, Local Authority Panel; Andy Roe, London Fire Brigade; Pauline Cranmer, London Ambulance Service; Martin Machray, NHS England & NHS Improvement; Terry Leach, Maritime & Coastguard Agency; Father Luke Miller, Faith Sector Panel.
- 2.2 The Chair welcomed new members to the Forum including Tony Bray, Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities; Kim Wright, Local Authority Partnership; and Niran Mothada, GLA.
- 2.3 The Chair took the opportunity to thank Forum partners and officers for their work during Summer 2021 on the challenges presented by surface water flooding, the Afghan refugee programme and COVID-19. The Mayor of London's appreciation and thanks for the huge volume of work going on across the Partnership was also noted.

3 Minutes and Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

- 3.1 The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum (68 01) held on 17 June 2021 as an accurate record.
- 3.2 With reference to actions outstanding, the forum noted that:
 - 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 COVID-19 pandemic but an initial discussion had taken place.
 - The action from June 2021 for capability leads to develop annual workplans was ongoing. These would feed into the Partnership workplan for 2022-23, which was due to be submitted to the Forum in February 2022.

4 Current and Emerging Risks to London

- a) **Threats (Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)):** The MPS representative confirmed that the national threat level from international terrorism remained at substantial.
- b) **Hazards (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)):** the DLUHC representative confirmed that the current risks included:
- Winter preparedness, which was being discussed widely with preparations expected across the country. Formal discussions had taken place between DLUHC, LRG and the GLA. The Chair formally requested that data from government planning assumptions be shared to help shape resilience planning. It was agreed that LRG would meet with DLUHC to further discuss winter preparedness.
 - **ACTION:** LRG and DLUHC to discuss winter preparedness.
 - Severe weather and flooding, though it was noted that the current mid-term forecast was benign. Cross-government flood response planning was underway with exercises planned on response and early recovery processes.
 - Covid-19, represented an ongoing challenge to the NHS over the winter months especially alongside other winter challenges and long term overstretch in the health system. The vaccination programme was of top priority alongside public relations campaigns to help shape public behaviour.
 - Global supply chain and distribution challenges, had manifested in the recent fuel and food distribution issues seen nationwide. It was noted that a former Managing Director of Tesco was working with the Cabinet Office to advise on supply chain challenges. The Head of London Resilience added that a roundtable on fuel distribution had taken place on 10 October 2021 and recommended that a reporting method similar to that seen in the EU exit preparations under Operation Yellowhammer had been discussed, with data sharing and reporting from partner agencies.
 - **ACTION:** Agencies to note that reporting may be required over Winter – based on a similar principle to the contingency planning for a no-deal EU exit model.
- c) **Weather Forecast (Met Office):** The Met Office representative provided a brief on the weather forecast over the following seven to ten days where weather was expected to be settled with more spells of wind and rain towards the end of the period, though the worst conditions were expected to be further north and west. It was unclear how long the more unsettled weather would last. The longer term three month forecast suggested milder than usual conditions.
- d) **Covid-19 update (SCG Chair):** The Head of the London Resilience Group (LRG) noted that the last six to eight weeks had seen a fairly stable infection rate, with London reporting the lowest infection rate across the country. Hospital admissions remained significant but stable. The government's Winter Plan emphasised that restrictions and controls outlined under Plan B would be implemented as a result of cumulative pressures on the NHS, as opposed to Covid-19 infections alone. The Public Health England representative added that the infection

rate was disproportionately higher in school aged Londoners and significantly lower in the over-60 age bracket.

e) Other agency updates by exception: None

5 Special Agenda Items

a) Current ongoing reviews update

5.1 The Head of the London Resilience Group provided a verbal update on ongoing issues. The National Resilience Strategy consultation period had closed on 27 September 2021 and included specific questions on the Civil Contingencies Act. An initial set of recommendations was expected to be published in early 2022. The DLUHC representative added that a significant volume of submissions and evidence was under consideration and noted that the government intended to issue a response to key themes from the call for evidence.

5.2 Work continued on Lord Harris' review to further improve London's terror preparedness following the closure of the call for evidence in September 2021.

5.3 Work on the Chronic Incident Review continued following the approach agreed at the previous meeting.

5.4 DECISION:

That the Forum note the verbal update.

b) LRF Funding Pilot Scheme update

5.5 Alice Reeves, GLA was invited to provide a verbal update on progress. At the June 2021 meeting the Forum agreed direct £245,000 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government funding to create Resilience Coordinator and Data Consultant posts within the GLA Resilience Team to support, enhance and connect community programmes.

5.6 The funding for these posts had been agreed through the GLA's internal decision-making process. Recruitment for the Resilience Coordinator role was underway, while specific elements of the Data Coordinator role were still being considered.

5.7 On the distinct project-based elements discussed previously, it was noted that there was an opportunity to link into existing Building Stronger Communities work and funding. Doing so would allow for a more comprehensive picture of London resilience to be developed.

5.8 The DLUHC representative emphasised that the funding provided was on a one-year pilot status with specific feedback and data required to help determine future funding.

5.9 The Chair took the opportunity to thank Alice Reeves for her work with the GLA Resilience Team particularly on the response to Covid-19

5.10 DECISION: That the Forum note the verbal update

c) Update from London Asylum Task and Finish Working Group

5.11 The Chair noted that an update had been requested by London Resilience Programme Board (LRPB) partners.

5.12 The Head of the London Resilience Group explained that the work on the Afghan Relocation Assistance Policy had been led by London Councils and the GLA alongside the government. The Scheme was working across several stages from accommodation in bridging hotels to full resettlement and integration. As it stood around 3500 refugees were being housed temporarily in 14 bridging hotels across London.

5.13 Sub-groups had been established to address key issues arising at each stage of the Scheme.

5.14 The London Councils representative, Alison Griffin, thanked Forum partners for their work supporting the cross-organisation effort. Providing suitable accommodation for refugees would present a major challenge on resettlement, with housing outside of London being considered.

5.15 The GLA representative, Niran Mothada, asked whether DLUHC or government had any intention to publish a summary of lessons learned during the resettlement process. DLUHC confirmed that discussions had taken place across government to address learning and a report could be considered to the Forum for a future meeting. The Chair emphasised that resilience partners should be given due opportunity to feed into any review process.

5.16 DECISION: That the Forum note the verbal update

d) Follow up to the summer surface water floods in London

5.17 The Chair noted that several mayoral roundtables, led by herself and Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy Shirley Rodrigues, had taken place following the floods, from which an initial findings report would be shared with the Forum. Partners were thanked for their input and participation.

5.18 The Head of the London Resilience highlighted the Partnership Debrief. An interim report had been agreed to maintain pace and momentum from the roundtables. Multi-agency Flood Plans are being reviewed by DEFRA and results are expected in early 2022. Other work was underway on improving communications in flood situations and ensuring that response systems were better coordinated to ensure cross agency data and tools were better shared in the initial response phase.

5.19 The Environment Agency representative explained that a number of specific funding and resourcing points had been made to government.

5.20 DECISION: That the Forum note the verbal update.

6 Progress Against London Resilience Programme

a) Learning and Implementation Report (Paper 68 02)

6.1 The Deputy Head of London Resilience noted that since the last report 9 lessons had been closed, for a net reduction of 5 to 68 outstanding. An update on the LRP Debrief policy was also provided with aims to improve the timescales on debrief sessions and publication of lessons to the database.

6.2 DECISIONS:

That the Forum:

- **approve the report**
- **note the status of the lessons identified and implemented.**

b) Risk and Planning Assumptions update (Paper 68 03)

6.3 The Deputy Head of London Resilience provided a verbal update noting that 57 out of 91 risks identified on the London Risk Register had been reviewed. The Register was on course to be published at the February 2022 meeting of the Forum.

6.4 The London Resilience Planning Assumptions had been developed in consultation with the National Resilience Planning Assumptions. Partners were asked to consider their response on the London specific assumptions. The Assumptions did not represent a target but could be a useful tool in benchmarking exercises. The Assumptions would not be publicly available but could be accessed by practitioners through Resilience Direct.

6.5 Currently presented in a highest impact-lowest likelihood format. Will be refocused for highest occurrence vs lower impact.

6.6 DECISIONS:

That the Forum:

- **approve the latest iteration of the London Resilience Planning Assumptions**
- **note the ongoing work for London Risk Advisory Group and capability groups reaffirmed the previous direction to capability working groups to maintain annual work plans, affording each group the flexibility to determine if their focus this year or in any given year should be on a framework review.**

c) Training and Exercising update: Partnership T&E moving forward (Paper 68 04)

6.7 The Deputy Head of Resilience provided a short overview of the recommendations being made in the paper. Recommendations 1-5 were a restatement of previously agreed recommendations for noting.

- 6.8 On Recommendation 6 it was noted that the Partner Training and Exercise Programme had been paused during the Covid-19 pandemic. It was proposed to reconvene before the next meeting of the Forum.
- 6.9 On Recommendation 8 it was highlight that the MPS led Contest exercise presented an excellent opportunity for wider partnership engagement though there were capacity issues to be overcome.
- 6.10 On Recommendation 9 a FloodEx22 coordination group had been proposed
- 6.11 The Chair noted that a considerable volume of work was underpinning the recommendations. The timeline provided out to September 2022 should allow solutions to rebuild capacity and address fatigue levels while building long term plans.

6.12 **DECISIONS:**

That the Forum:

- **agree:**

- **Recommendation 1:** to approve the proposed direction of travel for partnership training and exercising over the next reporting period, as outlined in this paper.
- **Recommendation 2:** to reaffirm commitment to providing online briefings at a frequency appropriate to the subject, including within six months of the approval of a revised framework.
- **Recommendation 3:** that capability groups and partner organisations to contact LRG (Toby Gould) with suggestions for strategic coordination summit topics and offers of collaboration.
- **Recommendation 4:** that all capability groups to bid for partnership capability workshop slots and lead delivery supported by LRG as appropriate.
- **Recommendation 5:** that capability working groups to maintain ownership of capability specific training and exercise requirements and to put in place an annual programme making use of the opportunities afforded by the Partnership Training & Exercise Programme and undertaking bespoke activity as required.
- **Recommendation 6:** that capability working groups to confirm current training & exercising needs (and intentions) to LRG in advance of review by a reconvened Partnership Training & Exercising Group.
- **Recommendation 7:** that partner organisations to contact LRG (Jeremy Reynolds) with any intended or potential significant exercises that could provide opportunities to exercise LRP strategic response capabilities/arrangements.
- **Recommendation 8:** to consider potential wider partnership involvement in upcoming MPS-led Contest exercise (and appropriate leads for planning of wider partnership play).
- **Recommendation 9:** to consider initial proposal re. multi-LRF flood exercise in September 2022, with a view to organisations confirming a level of commitment by 28th October 2021.

- **note the ongoing work for London Risk Advisory Group and capability groups reaffirmed the previous direction to capability working groups to maintain annual work plans, affording each group the flexibility to determine if their focus this year or in any given year should be on a framework review.**

d) Partnership Priorities update (Paper 68 05)

6.13 In reference to the paper, the Deputy Head of London Resilience noted that a number of areas were being proposed for de-prioritisation in order to allow more effective and coordinated work across the Partnership.

6.14 Members agreed that regular review and reconsideration of priority workstreams was important and effective. However, a concern was raised over the inclusion of the Pan-London Tactical Coordination protocol within this. The Chair responded that work would continue on this area particularly as further stages of the Manchester Arena Inquiry were published.

6.15 **DECISIONS:**

That the Forum:

- **agree the proposed priorities and the timeframes for these to be completed**
- **approve the de-prioritisation of workstreams as detailed in section 7 of this paper**
- **reaffirm the previous direction to capability working groups to maintain annual work plans**
- **note the role of LRPB and LRF in reviewing capability group reporting of gaps and planning assumptions.**

7 Documents recommended for approval (Item 7)

a) Power Supply Disruption Framework (Papers 68 06 and 68 07)

7.1 The Chair noted that Black Start was no longer the correct terminology and had been superseded by Electricity System Restoration.

7.2 The Utilities Sector representative introduced the report, noting that the utilities sector had put plans in place but felt that the full impacts of a nationwide power outage was not fully understood across the partnership. He emphasised that this is a partnership plan and individual agencies should have their own plans to respond to the risk. There were several key points for further consideration for which a mid-term review was recommended to ensure work was kept up to date. This included a review of the Anytown power disruption diagram and a national power disruption exercise.

7.3 The Chair asked the DLUHC representative for the government's perspective on this issue. Tony responded that a follow up could be provided in writing.

- 7.4 The Network Rail representative explained that the Department for Transport had asked significant questions on this topic. He explained that in a worst-case scenario tens of thousands people could be stranded on railways in and around London and recommended a separate planning discussion.
- 7.5 **ACTION:** Network Rail to discuss network and power disruption issues with LRG.
- 7.6 The London Fire Brigade representative, recommended that further consideration was needed on the impact of power supply disruption to building management and building safety systems.
- 7.7 **DECISIONS:**
That the Forum;
- **note the Power Supply Disruption Framework Document approval report (Paper 68 06)**
 - **approve the Power Supply Disruption Framework (Paper 68 07)**
- b) **London Emergency Services Liaison Panel (LESLP) Major Incident Principles (Papers 68 08 and 68 09)**
- 7.8 The MPS representative introduced the report noting that it provided principles for handling major incidents. The Pan-London Tactical Coordination protocol could not be delivered within the LESLP principles and had been moved to a separate workstream. The Forum were asked to approve the Principles.
- 7.9 The Chair highlighted the importance of onward dissemination in the principles to ensure that responders were aware of changes.
- 7.10 **DECISIONS:**
That the Forum;
- **note the LESLP Document approval report (Paper 68 08)**
 - **approve the LELSP Major Incident Principles (Paper 68 09)**
- c) **Agreement on sharing data about people affected by an Emergency (Papers 68 10 and 68 11)**
- 7.11 The Head of the London Resilience explained that the Agreement was not for full approval at the meeting but asked the Forum to approve the direction of travel. Thanks were added to NHS partners for their work supporting the development of the Agreement. The NHS representative, Peter Boorman, added that the NHS was keen to promote the work.
- 7.12 The Local Authority Panel representative, Kim Wright, emphasised the importance of building visibility for the work across the Partnership. John Hetherington responded explaining that further work was still expected in securing formal approval across different organisations and building contact networks.

7.13 DECISION:

That the Forum:

- note the Agreement on sharing data about people affected by an emergency
- approve the current direction of travel.

d) Borough Resilience Forum (BRF) Guidance (Papers 68 12 and 68 13)

7.14 The London Resilience Manager introduced the paper noting that the updates were routine in nature to bring the Guidance up to date. He asked that the Forum approve the Guidance.

7.15 The Chair noted that a BRF Chair's Forum was scheduled for November 2021.

7.16 DECISIONS:

That the Forum:

- note the BRF guidance Document approval report noted (Paper 68 12)
- approve the updated BRF Guidance (Paper 68 13)

8 Agency and Sector Updates

8.1 **GLA** - There was no update.

8.2 Blue Light Panel and Emergency Services:

- Blue Light Panel:** The last meeting of the Panel was held during week commencing 27 September 2021. A discussion took place on developing a Joint Organisational Learning Team(JOLT) across the Blue Light Partners and governance arrangements for such. A review on JOLT was underway with recommendations expected in December 2021 and possible trials in March 2022.
- Metropolitan Police Service** - A combination of issues was affecting resilience in the Service. Internal concerns and environment linked protesting were being closely monitored.
- City of London Police** - There were no further items to update from CoLP.
- British Transport Police (BTP)**- The service was facing widespread challenges linked to COP26 and environment protests, with specific support being provided to Police Scotland ahead of the Conference. Many of the issues and criticisms being directed at BTP in the Manchester Arena Inquiry reflected a snapshot of the service in 2017. Action had already been taken on many areas highlighted.
- London Ambulance Service** - Specialist public order teams were being deployed to Scotland ahead of COP26.
- London Fire Brigade** - The LFB had provided evidence to the Harris Review. The LFB had also provided "critical friend" support to Scottish Fire & Rescue Service reviewing

all planning documentation which has been positively received by HM Fire Service Inspectorate in Scotland. Formally noted in the COP26 review of preparedness. Support will continue through the periods of delivery and closedown

vii. **Maritime Coastguard Agency** - There was no update

8.3 London Authorities:

- i. **Local Authorities Panel (LAP)** - A strategic review of the Panel was due to be commissioned with suppliers sought on a three-month contract. Covid-19 response arrangements had been finalised with London Local Authority Gold remaining responsible for the overview of the response. Discussions were due to be held on mortality management over the winter, with coroners expected to agree to reserving capacity. The Chair added thanks to John Barradell and Eleanor Kelly for their work chairing the LAP.
- ii. **London Councils** - There was no update.

8.4 Health:

- i. **London Local Health Resilience Partnership** - The Partnership's meeting in July 2021 considered horizon scanning and forward planning. The October 2021 session would look at future risk.
- ii. **NHS England and NHS Improvement (London)** - The NHS continued to face a very high level of demand which was forecast to increase over winter 2021. While vaccination programmes for flu and Covid-19 remained key focuses, service recovery was underway on elective and diagnostic pathways.
- iii. **UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)** - The Agency formally launched on 1 October 2021, taking over PHE Category One responsibilities. The London Gold system lead would retain their place in the Covid-19 response framework for the time-being. A memorandum of understanding had been agreed between UKHSA and the Department for Health and Social Care to deliver Covid-19 response. The Chair asked for further updates to the potential for more frequent pandemics at future meetings.

8.5 **Environment Agency** - There was no update. The Chair thanked Charlie Wood for her work in response to the surface water flooding.

8.6 **Met Office** - There was no further update.

8.7 Sector Panels:

- i. **Business Sector Panel** – There was no update.
- ii. **Thames Resilience Panel** – There was no update.
- iii. **Transport Sector Panel** – TfL services were beginning to run normal capacity with efforts underway to boost use of the system.
- iv. **Utilities Sector Panel** – Continued to hold weekly meetings moving into winter.
- v. **Faith Sector Panel** – There was no update.

vi. **Voluntary Sector Panel** – The Panel and partners had submitted evidence to the Harris Review. It was working to link in with planning preparedness systems. Conversations were taking place with Communities, Faith and Voluntary sector partners about a strategic review of resilience arrangements and joining up regional, local and national agencies. Partners had been active in the Afghan Resettlement response particularly in arrival and bridging scenarios.

8.8 **HQ London District** – Existing assumptions remained in place for defence enhanced resilience elements. Thanks, were noted for the assistance of partners supporting Operation Pitting and the Afghan Relocation Assistance Policy.

London Resilience Communication Group – A surface water flooding debrief was planned which would be reported back to the next meeting of the Forum. The MPS was also running testing on engaging and launching communications in response to major incidents.

8.9 **Government (DLUHC)** – There was no further update.

8.10 **London Resilience Group** - A No-notice activation test was run across the Partnership's contacts with an 89.3% successful delivery rate, with confirmation from all fifteen Category One responders within 13 minutes.

i. **Borough Resilience Forums** – The majority of BRFs had submitted multi-agency response plans.

9 Review of Actions

9.1 Afternote: A shortage of time meant that a summary of actions and decisions was not included in the meeting.

10 Any Other Business

10.1 The National Alert System and its implementation in London was raised as an item for future discussion by the Forum.

10.2 **ACTION:** Emergency Alerts capability to be included for discussion in a future agenda. The London Resilience Communications Group should note the development.

10.3 The Network Rail representative noted that the move from Network Rail to Great British Rail was underway and that a report would be provided in the resilience impact. It was also noted that the Rail Resilience Group was underway and was expected to last two to three years.

11 Date of Next Meeting

- 11.1 The next meeting of the Forum would be held on Thursday 24 February 2022 2.00pm. The Chair noted that the venue and whether the meeting would be in a hybrid format would be confirmed nearer the time.