

MINUTES

Meeting	London Resilience Forum
Date	Thursday 23 February 2023
Time	2.00 pm
Place	G02, LFB Headquarters, 169 Union Street, London, SE1 0LL

Ref	Action	Owner
4.1	Met Office, LFB and other relevant partners to meet to review the summer wildfire risk (forecast, prevention and preparedness activity).	Met Office; LFB; LRG
4.2	GLA and LFB to discuss Eurovision planning with relevant partners and share pertinent information with the wider partnership.	GLA; LFB
5.9	DLUHC to share further information in advance of the launch of Emergency Alerts, including public communications to enable London partners to amplify messaging.	DLUHC
5.14	GLA to share their experience and learning from the innovation funding projects with other LRFs via DLUHC.	GLA
7.5	GLA, LRG and LCEP to discuss how the public facing London Risk Register can be further developed as a tool to inform community resilience.	GLA; LRG; LCEP
7.16	MOPAC to discuss with NHS England (London) and London Ambulance Service their contributions to the review of Lord Harris Review recommendations.	MOPAC
8.11	DLUHC to escalate within Central Government the capability gaps against planning assumptions identified through the review of severe drought, fuel disruption, and reservoir failure frameworks.	DLUHC
8.12	DLUHC and LRG to meet to discuss the London capabilities where there are known gaps against planning assumptions as reported at this and previous LRF meetings [REDACTED].	DLUHC; LRG

Present:

Fiona Twycross, Chair

Sean O'Callaghan, British Transport Police

Don Randall, Business Sector Panel

Umer Khan, City of London Police

Tony Bray, Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities

Charlotte Wood, Environment Agency

Steve Miller, Faith Sector Panel
Jon-Paul Graham, GLA
Natasha Wills, London Ambulance Service
Kim Wright, Local Authorities Panel
Emily Coatham, London Communities Emergencies Partnership
Doug Flight, London Councils
Pat Goulbourne, London Fire Brigade
Jack Griffith, London Resilience Communication Group
Terry Leach, Maritime & Coastguard Agency
Mark Rogers, Met Office
Carl Lindley, Metropolitan Police Service
Mark Whitten, Metropolitan Police Service
Edward Watts, Military
Dawn Morris, MOPAC
Peter Boorman, NHS England - London
Cathryn Spain, Thames Resilience Panel
Christian Van Der Nest, Transport Sector Panel
Beth Reeves, Utilities Sector Panel
Marc Beveridge, UK Health Security Agency

London Resilience Group (LRG):

Toby Gould, Interim Head of LRG
Kelly Dallen, LRG
Caitlin James, LRG
Fiona Mair, LRG
Edit Nagy, LRG
Jeremy Reynolds, LRG
Matt Hogan, LRG

GLA:

Felicity Harris, Senior Board Officer (clerk)
Clare Kutona, Board Officer (shadowing clerk)

Also in attendance:

Peter Lavery, Business Sector Panel
Ellie Amondsen, City of London Police
Gill McManus, Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities
Steve Mulrooney, Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities
Hayley Bennett, Environment Agency
Clifford Fleming, GLA
Kristen Guida, GLA
Mary-Clare Walsh, GLA
Mark Sawyer, Local Authorities Panel
Alan Palmer, London Ambulance Service
Helen Smith, UK Health Security Agency
Rebecca Thorpe, UK Health Security Agency

1 Chair's opening remarks

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Members to the 72nd meeting of the Forum and thanked the London Fire Brigade for hosting.
- 1.2 The Chair acknowledged the considerable efforts of the partnership, noting the work that had gone into risk planning, supporting the response to industrial action, and responding to several incidents over recent months. It was emphasised that collaborative partnership was critical in supporting the resilience of London. The Chair also expressed thanks and best wishes to UK responders who had assisted with the response to the recent earthquakes in Syria and Turkey.
- 1.3 Looking ahead to 2023, the Forum noted a busy exercise period through March, that the launch of emergency alerts was forthcoming, and that DLUHC would be sharing details of the implementation plans relating to the national UK Government Resilience Framework, which had been launched shortly before Christmas.

2 Introductions and apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from: Deesha Chadha, Faith Sector Panel; Alastair Cutting, Faith Sector Panel; Alison Griffin, London Councils; Andy Roe, LFB; Martin Machray, NHS England (London); and Kevin Fenton, Office for Health Improvement and Disparities.

3 Minutes and matters arising from the previous meeting

- 3.1 The Forum confirmed the minutes of the meeting of the Forum (72 01) held on 13 October 2022 as an accurate record.
- 3.2 With reference to actions outstanding, the Forum noted that:
 - Item 4f – work on the communications plan to warn and inform the public in relation to potential winter impacts continued, with various aspects being coordinated by the London Resilience Communication Group. The Forum noted that additional meetings to coordinate messaging had been called during a number of instances of industrial action, particularly that affecting the London Ambulance Service.
 - Item 7c – The emergency services met to discuss JESIP training requirements and had established a position for London. Issues around the change to training requirements had been raised nationally and it was hoped that a resolution could be secured through amendments to the national requirements.
 - It was noted that a range of activities relating to utilities and transport providers would be progressed over the coming months and that the sectors would provide contributions to the monthly London Resilience Group updates on a quarterly basis. Representatives from the sectors would attend BRFs on request and would participate in LRF and BRF Chairs' forums.
- 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 representative updated the Forum on a number of threats and other issues. Recommendations from the House of Lords relating to the Public Order Bill were being considered prior to Royal Assent. It was noted that the Bill, if passed, would include a definition of serious disruption and could enhance police powers. It was noted that XR and Just Stop Oil would commence 100 days of action from 21 April, and that this period would encompass the King's coronation. Preparation for a series of events to be held over the summer, including Notting Hill Carnival, continued alongside planning for future civil emergencies. In relation to industrial action, a Gold Group was being held every two weeks. Police staff had not been on strike, though a ballot was expected to take place over the coming weeks. [REDACTED].
- b) **Hazards and industrial actions:** The DLUHC representative provided an update on a range of issues:
- Industrial action: strike action continued across a number of sectors, with a series of strikes to be held in the following weeks. [REDACTED] briefings on potential impacts and mitigations would continue to be provided.
 - NHS pressures: the health service had been under significant pressure through the winter, but the impacts had lessened more recently. Mitigations put in place to ease the impact of industrial action could have longer term implications for the NHS, particularly where elective surgeries had been postponed or cancelled.
 - Weather: aside from a cold spell before Christmas, it had been a benign winter. The first named storm had passed through the previous week.
 - Utilities disruption: no major systemic power outage had been seen to date this winter.
 - Exotic animal disease: African swine fever and bird flu infection rates were being monitored, as was the related impact on rural economies, supply chains and animal welfare standards.
 - Migrants: as the weather becomes milder, it was noted that the number of small boats bringing migrants across the Channel may increase, which could lead to additional pressure on local services and the demand for accommodation.

It was noted that while industrial action organised by the Royal College of Nursing had been stood down, planning continued while the outcome of ongoing talks remained unknown. The current key focus for the NHS was the outcome of the British Medical Association (BMA) ballot, and the likely announcement of industrial action by junior doctors. This was likely to be 72 hours in duration, though it was unclear whether this would be over one period or split. It was noted that further action by employees of the London Ambulance Service was expected on 8 March 2023.

The Chair thanked all partners, particularly the military, for the work that had gone into planning for industrial action and mitigating the impact.

- c) **Met Office Seasonal Forecast:** The Met Office representative provided a brief update on the expected forecast over the following months, noting that winter had been varied, with a very dry February. High pressure would be dominating in March, and there was a high likelihood of drier and colder than average conditions, with possible snow and frost. Dry conditions were likely to continue, with warmer temperatures expected in April.

- d) **Drought update:** The Environment Agency representative noted that with rainfall above average over the last several months, water resources were returning to normal and London was no longer within drought status. Reservoir storage had improved but it would take time to fully rebuild resources. Another long, dry period could move London back into a drought situation quickly so partners were urged to remain cautious. The Thames Water representative agreed with the need to remain cautious, noting that the situation changed rapidly during an extended period of high temperatures last summer. A continued lack of rainfall could lead to challenges. Work on the London Drought Framework continued to focus on preparedness.

The Forum noted it would be useful to see long term forecasts, as a long dry spell followed by heavy or flash rainfall would likely result in flooding. Partners discussed concerns around wildfires and whether it would be possible to predict a long period of dry weather. The Met Office representative confirmed that hot conditions were not currently forecast but the situation would continue to be monitored. The Chair suggested that partners meet at an appropriate juncture to assess whether wildfires would be likely and to consider how best to approach the potential threat.

- 4.1 **ACTION:** Met Office, LFB and other relevant partners to meet to review the summer wildfire risk (forecast, prevention and preparedness activity).

- e) **Infectious diseases:** The UKHSA representative noted that rates of seasonal flu had spiked rapidly and much earlier than usual in December 2022 but levels had decreased just as quickly. Strep A infection rates had reduced to background levels. A watching brief was being kept on avian flu outbreaks, which were considered to be significant. In depth-monitoring continued to track any potential transfer from wildfowl to humans. There had been an uptick in COVID-19 infections reported in the previous week, which had a subsequent impact on hospital admissions and fatalities. A small measles outbreak in Tower Hamlets had been reported, which was thought to be associated with unvaccinated adults.

- f) **Other agency updates by exception:** The Forum discussed the final of the Eurovision Song Contest, which was due to be held in Liverpool. Partners were urged to be cognisant of some related events planned in London, the potential for some disruption and associated impacts on the LGBTQ+ community. DLUHC had written to local authorities outlining issues for consideration if viewing screens were to be installed in their areas. [REDACTED].

- 4.2 **ACTION:** GLA and LFB to discuss Eurovision planning with relevant partners and share pertinent information with the wider partnership.

5 Special Agenda Items

a) UK Government Resilience Framework

- 5.1 The Chair invited Tony Bray, Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, to provide an overview of the UK Government Resilience Framework, which had been published in December 2022.

- 5.2 The Forum heard that the Framework sets out an ambition to develop a ‘whole of society’ approach, with a much greater focus on prevention through planning, preparedness, training and exercising, skills development, ownership and communication of risks, and greater community engagement. The emergency response function would remain a strong focus within the Framework, as would continual development and assessment of lessons.
- 5.3 The Cabinet Office would take the overall lead on implementation of the actions within the Framework and would pursue legislative change if required. A co-design approach would be taken with local resilience forums (LRFs) in order to strengthen leadership, accountability and the integration of resilience into wider place-based strategies. It was agreed that DLUHC would work closely with London partners to develop a programme that would progress particular issues identified as priorities, including recommendations from public inquiries. There would be a focus on building skills and capability more broadly across organisations in order to recognise and mitigate risks, ultimately with a view to reducing the need for significant emergency responses. London specific arrangements, in line with the Civil Contingencies Act, would be considered, alongside a broader redrawing of the guidance. It was suggested that legislation may be required to more clearly set out the role and responsibilities of LRFs, both in terms of governance and leadership. Resourcing would be discussed with ministers, while the changes outlined would be piloted with a number of LRFs. A draft prospectus would be published shortly, and an LRF Chairs Conference would be held on 22 March 2023.
- 5.4 The Interim Head of London Resilience confirmed the LRG was keen to support the Partnership in work to better understand the ambition of the Resilience Framework, noting it was important to confirm what resources would be required to engage in and implement programmes of work. The Chair noted that this had been discussed with the deputy chairs of the LRF.
- 5.5 **DECISION:**
That the update be noted.

b) Emergency Alerts update

- 5.6 The Forum heard that the Emergency Alerts system was due to be launched imminently. The Cabinet Office anticipated launching the pilot in March 2023, with a national communications campaign to be launched five days prior. The focus of the pilot would be on how the Environment Agency would use the alerts system in severe flood warning events where there was immediate risk to life. The launch of the system would commence with a national welcome message going out on a Sunday evening, which would be sent to all mobile devices across the UK.
- 5.7 LRF train the trainer sessions would be provided, and partners were asked to consider identifying a representative from their organisations to partake in the training. Guidance would be provided to LRFs in advance of the pilot launch and the Environment Agency was working closely with the Cabinet Office on the implementation of the service. Briefing material would be available on Resilience Direct.
- 5.8 It was noted that as the pilot for the alerts system would likely only be used to issue severe flood warnings, it was unlikely to impact London.

5.9 **ACTION: DLUHC to share further information in advance of the launch of Emergency Alerts, including public communications to enable London partners to amplify messaging.**

5.10 **DECISION:**
That the update be noted.

c) LRF innovation funding projects; resilience communications and resilience data (GLA)

5.11 The Chair invited Jon-Paul Graham, Head of City Operations, GLA, to provide an update on innovation funding projects, resilience communications and resilience data.

5.12 To provide some context, the Forum heard that a DLUHC funded pilot project was launched in 2021-22 in recognition of the increasing pressures and expectations placed on LRFs following more frequent incidents testing resilience. The funding for London had been administered by the GLA and had to date been used to fund an Engagement Officer within the resilience team, in addition to a community resilience fund, which awarded grants to London boroughs to enable enhanced partnership. Projects on resilience communications and data were in the scoping phase, funding for which had been set aside. In early 2022, DLUHC confirmed the pilot had been successful. Capacity for additional funding had been increased for a further three years, until 2025. On the two projects in scope, a number of partners had been approached and asked to take part in surveys and discussion groups. If partners had not yet been approached, they were encouraged to request additional information. Once the projects had been scoped, a further discussion would be held at the London Resilience Programme Board (LRPB) to agree how to take the work forward.

5.13 The Chair thanked colleagues from the GLA and DLUHC. The Chair suggested sharing learning from the pilot across different LRFs would be useful.

5.14 **ACTION: GLA to share their experience and learning from the innovation funding projects with other LRFs via DLUHC.**

5.15 **DECISION:**
That the update be noted.

6 Agency and Sector Updates

6.1 The Chair invited partners to comment on the updates outlined in the paper and provide any further updates where necessary. Further updates were noted as below:

- the Local Authorities Panel acknowledged the need to engage with the GLA/DLUHC review
- the Fire Brigade Union was now balloting on an improved pay offer
- Jon Simpson had left the MPS
- the Met Office would officially become Category 2 responders the following week.

- 6.2 Thanks were expressed to Jon Simpson for his support of the Forum, his role on the Blue Lights Panel and involvement in the response to Operation London Bridge.

- 6.3 **DECISION:**
That the updates be noted.

7 London Resilience Programme

a) London Risk Advisory Group and Planning Assumptions update (Papers 72 03 and 72 04)

- 7.1 In referring to the paper circulated with the agenda, the Deputy Head of London Resilience, Jeremy Reynolds, thanked partners for feeding into the process on updating risk assessments throughout the year. It was noted that there were no major changes from the previous year's iteration of the London Risk Register (LRR), no new risks and no risks removed.
- 7.2 The Forum heard that the National Security Risk Assessment (NSRA) had been published in October 2022, and that the London Risk Advisory Group (LRAG) had focused on the methodology within, particularly in relation to the separation of chronic and acute risks, assessment timelines, multiple risk scenarios and new risks. The Forum noted the risk management guidance and planning assumptions that should have accompanied the NSRA had not yet been made available, but it was hoped this would be received over the coming months in order to better align with the national methodology. There had been some positive dialogue with the Cabinet Office and DLUHC colleagues in relation to the National Risk Register, which would be published soon. Partners would contribute towards those conversations and it was proposed that this would be reviewed more closely the following week, once the London Risk Register had been revised against the NSRA methodology.
- 7.3 In addition, a key activity for LRAG over 2023 would be to prioritise outstanding risks not reviewed in time for this publication. There were no particular concerns about the outstanding risks and officers were confident they would be prioritised and reassessed over the course of the year.
- 7.4 It was acknowledged that the London Risk Register may not reach all communities or be in the most effective format, so it would be worthwhile having further conversations around risk communication. It was suggested that the GLA's Principal Community Resilience Officer liaise with LRG colleagues regarding making the London Risk Register more accessible.
- 7.5 **ACTION: GLA, LRAG and the London Community Emergencies Partnership (LCEP) to discuss how the public facing London Risk Register can be further developed as a tool to inform community resilience.**
- 7.6 **DECISION:**
That:
- **the London Risk Register be approved; and**
 - **the additional work required to reflect the NSRA methodology changes be noted.**

b) Partnership training and exercising update (Paper 72 05)

- 7.7 In referring to the paper circulated with the agenda, the Deputy Heads of London Resilience, Fiona Mair and Jeremy Reynolds, provided an update on partnership training and exercising.
- 7.8 A survey had been undertaken in December 2022 to assess demand for MAGIC training courses, which found that while the MAGIC Lite courses met demand, the full courses scheduled only met approximately half the demand. Demand was met for the emergency services and the GLA but there were a number of organisations for whom demand was not met, including the NHS, transport, utilities, voluntary and community services, the City of London Police, UKHSA and local authorities. The shortfall had been raised at the LRPB, where it was agreed that a meeting of relevant organisations would be convened in order to agree how to take this forward, noting that additional funding would be required in order to provide sufficient courses to meet demand.
- 7.9 A series of exercises were being planned over the coming months, most notably a flood exercise, rescheduled from November 2022 to September 2023, and Op Spring Resolve, a national exercise being led within London by the MPS. The LRG would be supporting some of the strategic coordinating group (SCG) planning, with a series of events being held across different locations. A further power outage exercise, Mighty Oak, was scheduled for the end of March 2023.
- 7.10 **DECISION:**
- That:**
- **the proposed partnership training and exercising activity be approved;**
 - **the recommendations set out in the paper be approved; and**
 - **recommendation 2 to consider the demand for additional MAGIC courses should include local authorities be noted.**

c) Learning and implementation update (Paper 72 06)

- 7.11 The Deputy Head of London Resilience, Jeremy Reynolds, introduced this item, noting that a formal report would be brought to the next meeting. It was noted that an agreement had been made to reduce the frequency of reporting to enable better progress against lessons. Learning capture had been instigated following the recent incident at the O2 Brixton Academy, for which there would be a debrief in March. Progress was being made on the review of the process of partnership lessons, with an internal LRG workshop conducted. A similar workshop for partners would be held in April, the main themes of which would be to consider how to improve the quality of lessons, feeding lessons in, a review of the Learning and Implementation Group and the workstreams of other capability groups.

i. Manchester Arena Inquiry

- 7.12 The Forum heard that the LRG had been asked in 2022 to look at the recommendations from the Manchester Arena Inquiry concurrently with the Lord Toby Harris review with a view to assessing London's preparedness for an attack. Work to look at the commonalities between the two reports was ongoing. The LRF had been asked to report on 20 lessons arising from the

Lord Harris review, but a further 10 had been identified that officers felt it would be beneficial to assess. These included lessons relating to public communications, resilience to withstand departure of individuals, testing public order, linking to specific communities, survivor centres, and transport, faith and business sectors. An update on this would be provided at the next meeting of the Forum.

ii. Lord Harris review recommendations

- 7.13 The Chair invited Dawn Morris, Consultant – Lord Harris Review, MOPAC, to provide an update.
- 7.14 The Forum heard that multi-agency work to progress the recommendations continued, with thanks to many of those across the partnership. A one-year on report for the Mayor and London Assembly would be produced and shared with the LRF once completed. It was noted that the recommendations were being cross-referenced with the proposed Martyn's Law and work to incorporate this across all agencies was ongoing, with the support of the MPS and the Home Office.
- 7.15 NHS England (London) had asked to contribute towards the review and be updated as and when appropriate, but the request had not yet been met. Contact would be made with NHS England (London) due to the number of recommendations relating to NHS England and the London Ambulance Service. The conversation would be held outside the meeting to ensure all partners could contribute.
- 7.16 **ACTION: MOPAC to discuss with NHS England (London) and London Ambulance Service their contributions to the review of Lord Harris Review recommendations.**
- 7.17 **DECISION:**
That the learning and implementation update be noted.

d) Partnership Work Plan (Paper 72 07)

- 7.18 The Chair invited the Interim Head of London Resilience to provide an overview of the paper circulated with the agenda.
- 7.19 The Forum heard that the work programme had evolved over a series of meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic, while efforts were made to prioritise and re-prioritise. There were a number of activities the partnership were keen to pursue but had not been able to due to resource limitations. The list of workstream delays and gaps set out in the paper were highlighted to the Forum. A revised London Resilience Partnership strategy would be developed for consideration at the next LRF meeting. The revised Strategy and Work Programme would take into account the UK Government Resilience Framework and the London City Resilience Strategy, which had both been published since the last LRF strategy was developed three years ago.
- 7.20 **DECISION:**
That:

- the Partnership Work Plan be approved; and
- the intended future work of the Partnership, the workstream delays and known gaps be noted.

8 Documents recommended for approval

a) Drought Response Framework (Papers 72 08 and 72 09)

- 8.1 The Forum was asked to approve the updated framework, which had required updating in preparation for the summer months. While the framework was valid, it was noted that there remained actions to be taken to fully update it, including a full restructure of protocol, a review of contents, clearer escalation points and making sure the framework is workable and scalable. A workshop to identify tangible actions to bridge gaps and to inform and update a new communications strategy had been held that week.
- 8.2 It was noted that the approval of the updated document was sought on the basis that some of the planning assumptions were beyond the capability and requirements of responders. It was agreed that this would need to be escalated, with further assistance sought in order that partners could meet planning assumptions.

8.3 DECISION:

That the revised Drought Response Framework be approved, noting that some planning assumptions were beyond the capability and requirements of responders.

b) Excess Deaths Framework (Papers 72 10 and 72 11)

- 8.4 The Forum was asked to approve the updated framework, and also note thanks to Westminster Council for their role in leading this work. Management would be handed over in due course and the LRF would be advised when a new lead agency had been agreed.

8.5 DECISION: That the revised Excess Deaths Framework be approved.

c) Fuel Disruption Framework (Papers 72 12 and 72 13)

- 8.6 The Forum was asked to approve the updated framework, noting that London's current capability does not meet the requirements set out in the relevant planning assumptions. It was also noted that the paper stated that the MPS was the lead agency for public communications but that was not the case. The LRCG would confirm the lead agency.

8.7 DECISION:

That the revised Fuel Disruption Framework be approved, noting that:

- some planning assumptions were beyond the remit of the Partnership
- the lead for communication (section 5.4 of the Framework) be updated to state LRCG will determine this rather than referencing MPS as the lead.

d) Strategic Reservoir Response Framework (Papers 72 14 and 72 15)

8.8 The Forum was asked to approve the updated framework, noting that London's current capability does not meet the requirements set out in the relevant planning assumptions.

8.9 DECISION:

That the revised Strategic Reservoir Response Framework be approved, noting that further work would be required to understand the capability gap to meet the planning assumptions, which primarily relates to evacuation and shelter.

8.10 It was agreed that a conversation was needed regarding London's current capability and the gap between that and the government's expectations as set out in the planning assumptions.

8.11 **ACTION: DLUHC to escalate within Central Government the capability gaps against planning assumptions identified through the review of severe drought, fuel disruption, and reservoir failure frameworks.**

8.12 **ACTION: DLUHC and LRG to meet to discuss London capabilities where there are known gaps against planning assumptions as reported at this and previous LRF meetings [REDACTED].**

e) Terms of Reference (Paper 72 16)

8.13 Matt Hogan, Deputy Head of London Resilience noted that minor administrative changes had been made to the LRF and LRPB Terms of Reference and that this was a routine review.

8.14 DECISION:

That the LRF and LRPB Terms of Reference be approved, noting that the Met Office will be added to both membership lists.

9 Any Other Business

9.1 There was no other business.

10 Dates of Next and Future Meetings

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

- Thursday 29 June 2023, 2-4pm, LFB HQ, 169 Union Street, London
- Thursday 2 November 2023, 2-4pm, LFB HQ, 169 Union Street, London
- Thursday 29 February 2024, 2-4pm, LFB HQ, 169 Union Street, London