

# Leaders' Committee

9 July 2019 – 11:30 am

At London Councils offices, 59½ Southwark St., London SE1 0AL

Refreshments will be provided

London Councils offices are wheelchair accessible

**Labour Group:** Room 2 and 3 9:30

Political Adviser: 07977 401955)

**Conservative Group:** Room 5 9:30

(Political Adviser: 07903 492195)

**Liberal Democrat Group:** Room 4 9:30

(Political Adviser: 07858 924941)

**Contact Officer:** David Dent

**Telephone and email:** 020 7934 9753 David.dent@londoncouncils.gov.uk

**Lunch will be provided in Room 4 for Members after the meeting**

Agenda item	Page
1. Apologies for absence and Announcement of Deputies	
2. Declarations of Interest*	
3. Minutes of the Leaders' Committee held on 4 June 2019 (Both AGM and Main Business Minutes)	1
4. Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children	21
5. Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: Progress Report	33
6. Pledges to Londoners – Update on Progress in Supporting Business and Inclusive Growth	119
7. Feedback from Joint Boards:	Verbal Update
• London Economic Action Partnership (LEAP)	
8. Urgency report	127

- GLPC – 21 March 2019
- CAB – 15 May 2019
- Executive – 21 May 2019
- Executive – 18 June 2019

---

**\*Declarations of Interests**

If you are present at a meeting of London Councils' or any of its associated joint committees or their sub-committees and you have a disclosable pecuniary interest\* relating to any business that is or will be considered at the meeting you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your disclosable pecuniary interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

It is a matter for each member to decide whether they should leave the room while an item that they have an interest in is being discussed. In arriving at a decision as to whether to leave the room they may wish to have regard to their home authority's code of conduct and/or the Seven (Nolan) Principles of Public Life.

\*as defined by the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012

---

The Chairman to move the removal of the press and public since the following items are exempt from the Access to Information Regulations. Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12(a) (as amended) Section 3 Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Agenda item		Page
E1	Exempt Minutes of Leaders' Committee from 4 <sup>th</sup> June 2019	1
E2	Exempt Minutes and Summaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CAB – 15 May 2019</li></ul>	

---

# London Councils

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the London Councils Leaders' Committee held on 4 June 2019

Cllr Peter John OBE chaired the meeting from item 3

## Present:

BARKING AND DAGENHAM  
BEXLEY  
BRENT  
CAMDEN  
CROYDON  
EALING  
ENFIELD  
GREENWICH  
HACKNEY  
HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM  
HARINGEY  
HARROW  
HAVERING  
HILLINGDON  
HOUNSLOW  
ISLINGTON  
KENSINGTON & CHELSEA  
KINGSTON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
MERTON  
NEWHAM  
REDBRIDGE  
RICHMOND UPON THAMES  
SOUTHWARK  
SUTTON  
TOWER HAMLETS  
WALTHAM FOREST  
WANDSWORTH  
WESTMINSTER  
CITY OF LONDON

Cllr Darren Rodwell  
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE  
Cllr Margaret McLennan  
Cllr Georgia Gould  
Cllr Tony Newman  
Cllr Julian Bell  
Cllr Nesil Caliskan  
Cllr Danny Thorpe  
Mayor Philip Glanville  
Cllr Sue Fennimore  
Cllr Joseph Ejiofor  
Cllr Graham Henson  
Cllr Damien White  
Cllr Roger Ramsey  
Cllr David Simmonds  
Cllr Steve Curran  
Cllr Richard Watts  
Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cllr Liz Green  
Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite  
Cllr Chris Best  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis  
Mayor Rokhsana Fiaz  
Cllr Jas Athwal  
Cllr Gareth Roberts  
Cllr Peter John OBE  
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE  
Mayor John Biggs  
Cllr Clare Coghill  
Cllr Ravi Govindia  
Cllr Nickie Aiken  
Ms Catherine McGuinness

CO-PRESIDENT  
CO-PRESIDENT

Lord Harris of Haringey  
Lord Tope of Sutton

## Apologies:

BARNET  
BRENT  
BROMLEY  
HILLINGDON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM

Cllr Daniel Thomas  
Cllr Muhammed Butt  
Cllr Colin Smith  
Cllr Ray Puddifoot  
Cllr Jack Hopkins  
Mayor Damien Egan

Cllr John Gray and Officers of London Councils were in attendance.

The Chief Executive welcomed Members and introduced Lord Harris of Haringey, and Lord Tope of Sutton, two of London Councils' Co-Presidents: Baroness Hanham of Kensington had sent her

apologies as she was unable to attend. He thanked all the Co-Presidents for their work on behalf of London local government and to London Councils and for their work on the organisation's behalf in Parliament.

Lord Harris briefly addressed Leaders, recognising the importance of ensuring that the distinctive voice of London continued to be heard, specifically in terms of how London and the rest of the country should recognise their mutual dependencies.

### **1. Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. Apologies for absence and notification of deputies**

Apologies are listed above.

### **3. Election of Chair**

Lord Tope called for nominations for the position of Chair of London Councils and Cllr Peter John OBE (Southwark, Labour) was nominated by Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE (Bexley, Conservative) and seconded by Cllr Ruth Dombey (Sutton, Liberal Democrats). In the absence of any other nominations: Cllr Peter John was elected Chair and took over chairing the meeting.

The Chair thanked Lord Harris and Lord Tope for their work.

### **4. Election of Deputy Chair and up to three Vice-Chairs**

The Chair then invited nominations for the Deputy Chair and up to three Vice-chairs and he nominated the following who were seconded by Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth, Conservative) and in the absence of any other nominations were returned unopposed:

Deputy Chair	Cllr Georgia Gould (Labour, Camden)
Vice-Chair	Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE (Conservative, Bexley)
Vice-Chair	Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE (Lib Dem, Sutton)
Vice-Chair	Ms Catherine McGuinness (City of London)

### **5. Minutes of the meeting of the AGM Leaders' Committee on 5 June 2018**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the minutes of the meeting of the AGM of Leaders' Committee on 5 June 2018 already agreed by Leaders' Committee on 10 July 2018.

## **6. Appointment of London Councils Co-Presidents for 2019/20**

The Chair asked for nominations for the posts of Co-Presidents and Cllr Gould nominated and Cllr Aiken seconded the following: Lord Tope, Baroness Hanham and Lord Harris. Leaders' Committee agreed to appoint them as London Councils' Co-Presidents.

## **7.-14. Composition of London Councils' member bodies and appointment of office-holders**

The Chair proposed to take items 7-14 *en bloc*; items 7-9 (a) were the noting of the members of Leaders' Committee, the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC), the Grants Committee and the Greater London Employment Forum on the nomination of boroughs. Items 9 (b) – 14 were the appointment of the Employers side of the Greater London Provincial Council, London Councils Executive (including Portfolios), the appointment of party group lead members, the Group Whips, the appointment of the Audit Committee and election of its Chair, the appointment of the Capital Ambition Board as well as the election of its Chair and Deputy Chair, and the appointment of YPES board members. These are listed on the pages that follow and all were agreed by Leaders' Committee.

In the tables on the following pages all those listed are councillors unless otherwise specified.

## 7. LEADERS'

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Darren Rodwell	Lab	Saima Ashraf	Lab	Sade Bright	Lab
Barnet	Daniel Thomas	Con	Cllr. D Longstaff	Con	Barry Rawlings	Con
Bexley	Teresa O'Neill	Con	Louie French	Con	David Leaf	Con
Brent	Muhammed Butt	Lab	Margaret McLennan	Lab		
Bromley	Colin Smith	Con	Peter Fortune	Con	Kate Lymer	Con
Camden	Georgia Gould	Lab				
Croydon	Tony Newman	Lab	Alison Butler	Lab	Stewart Collins	Lab
Ealing	Julian Bell	Lab	Yvonne Johnson	Lab	Bassam Mahfouz	Lab
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Ian Barnes	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab
Greenwich	Danny Thorpe	Lab	David Gardner	Lab	Jackie Smith	Lab
Hackney	Philip Glanville	Lab	Anntoinette Bramble	Lab	Feryal Demirci	Lab
Hammersmith & Fulham	Stephen Cowan	Lab	Sue Fennimore	Lab	Adam Connell	Lab
Haringey	Joseph Ejiofor	Lab	Zena Brabazon	Lab	Charles Adje	Lab
Harrow	Graham Henson	Lab	Keith Ferry	Lab		
Havering	Damian White	Con	Robert Benham	Con	Roger Ramsey	Con
Hillingdon	Ray Puddifoot	Con	David Simmonds	Con	Philip Corthorne	Con
Hounslow	Steve Curran	Lab	Lily Bath	Lab	Katherine Dunne	Lab
Islington	Richard Watts	Lab	Janet Burgess	Lab	Paul Smith	Lab
Kensington & Chelsea	Elizabeth Campbell	Con	Kim Taylor-Smith	Con		
Kingston upon Thames	Liz Green	LD	Malcolm Self	LD		
Lambeth	Jack Hopkins	Lab		Lab	Jennifer Braithwaite	Lab
Lewisham	Damien Egan	Lab	Kevin Bonavia	Lab		
Merton	Stephen Alambritis	Lab	Mark Allison	Lab		
Newham	Rokhsana Fiaz	Lab	John Gray	Lab	Charlene McLean	Lab
Redbridge	Jas Athwal	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab		
Richmond upon Thames	Gareth Roberts	LD	Liz Jaeger	LD	Alexander Ehmann	LD
Southwark	Peter John	Lab	Rebecca Lury	Lab	Victoria Mills	Lab
Sutton	Ruth Dombey	LD	Jayne McCoy	LD		
Tower Hamlets	John Biggs	Lab	Rachel Blake	Lab	Asma Begum	Lab
Waltham Forest	Clare Goghill	Lab	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Grace Williams	Lab
Wandsworth	Ravi Govindia	Con	Jonathan Cook	Con	Guy Senior	Con
Westminster	Nickie Aiken	Con	Tim Mitchell	Con		
City of London	Catherine McGuinness	Ind	Simon Duckworth	Ind	Tom Sleigh	Ind

## 8. TEC

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Syed Ghani	Lab	Cameron Geddes	Lab		
Barnet	Dean Cohen	Con	Peter Zinkin	Con	Alan Schneiderman	Con
Bexley	Peter Craske	Con	Alex Sawyer	Con	Melvin Seymour	Con
Brent	Krupa Sheth	Lab	Shama Tatler	Lab	Krupesh Hirani	Lab
Bromley	William Huntington-Thresher	Con	Will Rowlands	Con	Will Harmer	Con
Camden	Adam Harrison	Lab	Danny Beales	Lab	Meric Apak	lab
Croydon	Stuart King	Lab	Paul Scott	Lab		
Ealing	Julian Bell	Lab				
Enfield	Guney Dogan	Lab	Ian Barnes	Lab	Chris Bond	Lab
Greenwich	Denise Scott-McDonald	Lab	Sizwe James	Lab	Gary Parker	Lab
Hackney	Jon Burke	Lab	Guy Nicolson	Lab		
Hammersmith & Fulham	Wesley Harcourt	Lab	David Morton	Lab		
Haringey	Kirsten Hearn	Lab	Seema Chandwani	Lab	Matthew White	Lab
Harrow	Varsha Parmar	Lab	Jerry Miles	Lab	Chloe Smith	Lab
Havering	Osman Dervish	Con	Jason Frost	Con	Viddy Persuad	Con
Hillingdon	Keith Burrows	Con				
Hounslow	Hanif Khan	Lab	Guy Lambert	Lab		Lab
Islington	Claudia Webbe	Lab	Roulin Khondoker	Lab	Phil Graham	Lab
Kensington & Chelsea	Johnny Thalassites	Con	Cem Kemahli	Con	Malcolm Spalding	Con
Kingston upon Thames	Hilary Gander	LD	Liz Green	LD	Malcolm Self	LD
Lambeth	Claire Holland	Lab	Nigel Haselden	Lab		
Lewisham	Brenda Dacres	Lab	Sophie McGeevor	Lab		
Merton	Martin Whelton	Lab	Mark Allison	Lab		
Newham	Zulfiqar Ali	Lab	James Asser	Lab	Mas Patel	Lab
Redbridge	John Howard	Lab	Sheila Bain	Lab	Ross Hatfull	Lab
Richmond upon Thames	Alexander Ehmann	LD	Martin Elengorn	LD		
Southwark	Richard Livingstone	Lab	Johnson Situ	Lab		
Sutton	Manuel Abbelan	LD	Ben Andrew	LD	Hanna Zuchowska	LD
Tower Hamlets	David Edgar	Lab	Rachel Blake	Lab	Dan Tomlinson	Lab
Waltham Forest	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Naheed Asghar	Lab	Grace Williams	Lab
Wandsworth	Richard Field	Con	Paul Ellis	Con	Guy Humphries	Con
Westminster	Tim Mitchell	Con	Richard Elcho	Con		
City of London	Alistair Moss	Ind	Christopher Hayward	Ind	Jeremy Simons	Ind
TfL	Alex Williams		Colin Mann			

## 8. GRANTS

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Saima Ashraf	Lab	Sade Bright	Lab		
Barnet	John Hart	Con	Daniel Thomas	Con	D Longstaff	Con
Bexley	David Leaf	Con	Alex Sawyer	Con		
Brent	Tom Miller	Lab	Krupesh Hirani	Lab		
Bromley	Colin Smith	Con	Peter Fortune	Con	Diane Smith	Con
Camden	Jonathan Simpson	Lab	Angela Mason	Lab	Richard Olszewski	
Croydon	Hamida Ali	Lab	Oliver Lewis			
Ealing	Jasbir Anand	Lab	Julian Bell	Lab	Bassam Mahfouz	Lab
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Ian Barnes	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab
Greenwich			Denise Scott-McDonald			
	Miranda Williams	Lab	Caroline Selman	Lab	Christine Grice	
Hackney	Philip Glanville	Lab	Sharon Holder	Lab	Antionette Branble	Lab
Hammersmith & Fulham	Adam Connell	Lab	Charles Adje	Lab	Kaushika Amin	Lab
Haringey	Mark Blake	Lab	Keith Ferry	Lab	Graham Henson	Lab
Harrow	Sue Anderson	Lab	Jason Frost	Con		Con
Havering	Viddy Persaud	Con	J Bianco	Con		
Hillingdon	Douglas Mills	Con	Shantanu Rajawat	Lab		
Hounslow	Katherine Dunne	Lab	Andy Hull	Lab	Asima Shaikh	
Islington	Una O'Halloran	Lab	Sarah Addenbrooke	Con		
Kensington & Chelsea	Anne Cyron	Con	Malcolm Self	LD	Liz Green	LD
Kingston upon Thames	Sam Foulder-Hughes	LD	Mo Seedat	Lab		
Lambeth	Andy Wilson	Lab	Amanda De Ryk	Lab		
Lewisham	Jonathan Slater	Lab			Caroline Cooper-Marbiah	
Merton						Lab
	Edith Macauley	Lab	Caroline Cooper	Lab		
Newham	Charlene McLean	Lab	Muzibur Rehman	Lab		
Redbridge	Helen Coomb	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab	Elaine Norman	Lab
Richmond upon Thames	Gareth Roberts	LD	Michael Wilson	LD		
Southwark	Evelyn Akoto	Lab	Rebecca Lury	Lab		
Sutton	Marian James	LD	Ruth Dombey	LD		
Tower Hamlets	Candida Ronald	Lab	David Edgar	Lab	Asma Begum	
Waltham Forest	Louise Mitchell	Lab	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Ahsan Khan	Lab
Wandsworth	Paul Ellis	Con	Melanie Hampton	Con	John Locker	Con
Westminster	Iain Bott	Con	Tim Mitchell	Con		
City of London	Dhruv Patel	Ind	Alison Gowman	Ind		



## 9 (a) GLEF

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Sade Bright	Lab	Irma Freeborn	Lab
Barnet	Daniel Thomas	Con	D. Longstaff	Con
Bexley	Steven Hall	Con	Nick O'Hare	Con
Brent	Margaret McLennan	Lab	Amer Agha	Lab
Bromley	Pauline Tunncliffe	Con	Stephen Wells	Con
Camden	Danny Beales	Lab		
Croydon	Simon Hall	Lab	Patsy Cummings	Lab
Ealing	Jasbir Anand	Lab		
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab
Greenwich	Christine Grice	Lab	Chris Kirby	Lab
Hackney	Carole Williams	Lab	Philip Glanville	Lab
Hammersmith & Fulham	Ben Coleman	Lab		
Haringey	Kaushika Amin	Lab	Makbule Gunes	Lab
Harrow	Adam	Lab		
Havering	Swerksy	Con	Viddy Persuad	Con
	Robert Benham			
Hillingdon	Philip Corthorne	Con		
Hounslow	Katherine Dunne	Lab		
Islington	Tricia Clarke	Lab		
Kensington & Chelsea	Catherine Faulks	Con		
Kingston upon Thames	Malcolm Self	LD	Liz Green	LD
Lambeth	Andy Wilson	Lab	Jacqui Dyer	Lab
Lewisham	Joe Dromey	Lab	Amanda de Ryk	Lab
Merton	Mark Allison	Lab	Caroline Cooper-Marbiah	Lab
Newham	Mayor Rokhsana Fiaz	Lab	John Gray	Lab
Redbridge	Jas Athwal	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab
Richmond upon Thames	Geoff Acton	LD		
Southwark	Kieron Williams	Lab	Leo Pollak	Lab
Sutton	Richard Clifton	LD	Sunita Gordon	LD
Tower Hamlets	Mayor John Biggs	Lab	Candida Ronald	Lab

Waltham Forest	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Simon Miller	Lab
Wandsworth	Guy Senior	Con		
Westminster	Nickie Aiken	Con	Rachael Robathan	Con
City of London	Edward Lord, OBE, JP	Ind	Kevin Everett	Ind

#### **9 (b) Appointment of Greater London Provincial Council Employers Side**

Barking & Dagenham	Cllr Sade Bright (Labour)
Camden	Cllr Richard Olszewski (Labour)
Croydon	Cllr Simon Hall (Labour)
Enfield	Cllr Nesil Caliskan (Labour)
Greenwich	Cllr Christine Grice (Labour)
Hackney	Cllr Carole Williams (Labour)
Hounslow	Cllr Katherine Dunne (Labour)
Kingston	Cllr Malcolm Self (Liberal-Democrat)
Lewisham	Cllr Joe Dromey (Labour)
Tower Hamlets	Mayor John Biggs (Labour)
Waltham Forest	Cllr Asim Mahmood (Labour)

**Four Conservative members – TBC**

## **10. Appointment of London Councils Executive (including Portfolios)**

Leaders' Committee agreed to establish an Executive comprising twelve members

- **Cllr Peter John OBE** (Southwark – Labour) Chair of London Councils
  - Public Service Reform and Devolution
  - Finance & Resources
- **Cllr. Georgia Gould** (Camden – Labour) Deputy Chair and Skills & Employment
- **Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE** (Bexley – Conservative) Vice Chair
- **Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE** (Sutton – Liberal Democrat) Vice Chair
- **Ms Catherine McGuinness** (City of London Corporation – Independent) Vice Chair
- **Cllr Muhammed Butt** (Brent – Labour) Welfare, Empowerment & Inclusion
- **Cllr Clare Coghill** (Waltham Forest – Labour) Business Engagement, Brexit and Good Growth
- **Cllr Julian Bell** (Ealing – Labour) Transport & Environment
- **Cllr Darren Rodwell** (Barking & Dagenham – Labour) Housing & Planning
- **Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE** (Hillingdon – Conservative) Health & Care (including Adult Care Services)
- **Cllr Jas Athwal** (Redbridge – Labour) Crime & Public Protection
- **Cllr Nickie Aiken** (Westminster – Conservative) Schools & Children's Services (including Education, Children's Social Care and Safeguarding)

**Substitutes:** **Labour:** Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney), Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets), Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest); **Conservative:** Cllr. Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth); **Liberal Democrat:** Cllr Liz Green (Kingston).

## 11. Appointment of party group lead members and Portfolio holders

Policy area	Portfolio Holder/Chair	Party Lead and or Committee Vice Chair (Labour)	Party Lead (Conservative)	Democrat)
Chair including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finance and Resources;</li> <li>Devolution and Public Service Reform</li> </ul>	Cllr Peter John OBE (Southwark)		Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE (Bexley)	Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE (Sutton)
Welfare, Empowerment & Inclusion	Cllr Muhammed Butt (Brent)		Cllr. Damian White (Havering)	Cllr Emily Davey (Kingston)
Business, Europe and Good Growth (including high streets, lead liaison with wider South East, leisure, sport & culture)	Cllr Clare Coghill (Waltham Forest)		Cllr. David Harvey (Westminster)	Cllr. J-F Burford (Richmond)
Transport & Environment	Cllr Julian Bell (Ealing)	Cllr. Claire Holland (Vice Chair, Lambeth)	Cllr Tim Mitchell (Vice Chair, Westminster)	Cllr Manuel Abellan (Vice Chair, Sutton)
Housing & Planning	Cllr Darren Rodwell (B&D)		Cllr Damian White (Havering)	Cllr Jayne McCoy (Sutton)
Crime & Public Protection	Cllr Jas Athwal (Redbridge)		Cllr Nickie Aiken (Westminster)	Cllr Gareth Roberts (Richmond)
Health & Care (including Adult Care Services)	Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE (Hillingdon)	Cllr Richard Watts (Islington)		Cllr Piers Allen (Richmond)
Skills & Employment	Cllr Georgia Gould (Camden)		Cllr Catherine Faulks (RBK&C)	Cllr Alison Holt (Kingston)
Schools & Children's Services (including Education, Children's Social Care and Safeguarding)	Cllr Nickie Aiken (Westminster)	Cllr Danny Thorpe (Greenwich)		Cllr Penny Frost (Richmond)
Greater London Employment/ Greater London Provincial Council	Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets)		To be confirmed	Cllr Malcolm Self (Kingston)
Capital Ambition	Cllr Steve Curran (Chair, Hounslow))	Cllr Victoria Mills (Vice Chair, Southwark) Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Merton)	Cllr David Simmonds CBE (Vice Chair,) (Hillingdon) Cllr Kevin Davis (Kingston)	

Audit Committee	Cllr Roger Ramsey (Chair, Havering)	Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Deputy Chair, Merton) Cllr Victoria Mills (Southwark) Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Ealing)		Cllr Robin Brown (Richmond)
Grants	Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney)	Cllr Saima Ashraf (Vice Chair, B&D)	Cllr Paul Ellis (Vice Chair, Wandsworth)	Cllr Gareth Roberts (Vice Chair, Richmond)
Digital Lead	Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney)		Cllr Damian White (Havering)	Cllr Jon Tolley (Kingston)

#### 11. Appointment of Party Group Whips:

- **Labour:** Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest);
- **Conservative:** Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth);
- **Liberal Democrat:** Cllr Liz Green (Kingston).

#### 12. Appointment of Audit Committee and election of its Chair and Deputy Chair - Five members:

Cllr Roger Ramsey (Chair, Havering - Conservative), Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Deputy Chair, Merton - Labour), Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Ealing - Labour), Cllr Victoria Mills (Southwark- Labour), Cllr Robin Brown (Richmond- Liberal Democrat)

**Substitutes:** Labour: Cllr. David Gardner (Greenwich)  
Conservative: Cllr. Damian White (Havering)

#### 13. Appointment of Capital Ambition Board and election of its Chair and Vice Chairs- Five members:

Cllr. Steve Curran (Chair – Hounslow, Labour), Cllr Victoria Mills (Vice Chair – Southwark, Labour), Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Merton Labour), Cllr. Kevin Davis (Kingston Conservative), Cllr. David Simmonds CBE (Vice Chair - Hillingdon Conservative)

**Substitutes:** Labour: Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney), Cllr. Yvonne Johnson (Ealing);  
Conservative: Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth)

#### 14. YPES Board

##### Two Members:

- Cllr Georgia Gould (Chair - Camden, Labour)
- Cllr Nickie Aiken (Westminster, Conservative)

#### 15. Constitutional matters

Leaders Committee agreed the variations set out in the reports to:

B: Terms of Reference for Sub Committees and forums

C: Standing Orders

D: Amendments to London Councils Financial Regulations

## **16. London Councils Policies and Protocols which apply to Leading Members**

Leaders' Committee noted the policies and protocols, which applied to Members undertaking leading roles on behalf of London local government through London Councils, and which had undergone minor drafting changes as well as the conventions on how London Councils did business.

## **17. Papers for Committee meetings**

The Chair introduced the paper as one which set out the aspiration to send Committee papers electronically rather than by hard paper copy. Cllr O'Neill asked that the item be given further consideration in terms of the ability for members to make digital notes as part of the solution, and that Members should be included in the discussions. Mayor Rokhsana Fiaz also felt that the work should be time limited.

Leaders Committee noted the points made by Cllr O'Neill, and it was agreed that a further report on this be brought back to the October meeting of the Committee.

## **18. London Councils meeting dates 2019/20**

Leaders' Committee agreed the meeting dates for 2019/20 set out in the appendix to the report, with one change: the meeting of the Leaders' Committee shown as 15 October 2019 would, in fact, move to 8 October.

## **19. Business Plan 2019/20**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the Business Plan.

## **20. London Councils Annual Review 2018/19**

Leaders' Committee noted the tabled Annual Review.

The meeting ended at 11:45.

Item		Action	Progress
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Papers for Committee meetings</b> – further report to be brought back to October meeting</li> </ul>	<b>Director of Corporate Governance</b>	In progress

## London Councils

Minutes of the London Councils Leaders' Committee held on 4 June 2019  
Cllr Peter John OBE chaired the meeting

### Present:

BARKING AND DAGENHAM  
BEXLEY  
BRENT  
CAMDEN  
CROYDON  
EALING  
ENFIELD  
GREENWICH  
HACKNEY  
HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM  
HARINGEY  
HARROW  
HAVERING  
HAVERING  
HILLINGDON  
HOUNSLOW  
ISLINGTON  
KENSINGTON & CHELSEA  
KINGSTON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
MERTON  
NEWHAM  
REDBRIDGE  
RICHMOND UPON THAMES  
SOUTHWARK  
SUTTON  
TOWER HAMLETS  
WALTHAM FOREST  
WANDSWORTH  
WESTMINSTER  
CITY OF LONDON

Cllr Darren Rodwell  
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE  
Cllr Margaret McLennan  
Cllr Georgia Gould  
Cllr Tony Newman  
Cllr Julian Bell  
Cllr Nesil Caliskan  
Cllr Danny Thorpe  
Mayor Philip Glanville  
Cllr Sue Fennimore  
Cllr Joseph Ejiofor  
Cllr Graham Henson  
Cllr Damien White  
Cllr Roger Ramsey  
Cllr David Simmonds  
Cllr Steve Curran  
Cllr Richard Watts  
Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cllr Liz Green  
Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite  
Cllr Chris Best  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis  
Cllr John Gray  
Cllr Jas Athwal  
Cllr Gareth Roberts  
Cllr Peter John OBE  
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE  
Mayor John Biggs  
Cllr Clare Coghill  
Cllr Ravi Govindia  
Cllr Nickie Aiken  
Ms Catherine McGuinness

### Apologies:

BARNET  
BRENT  
BROMLEY  
HILLINGDON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM

Cllr Daniel Thomas  
Cllr Muhammed Butt  
Cllr Colin Smith  
Cllr Ray Puddifoot  
Cllr Jack Hopkins  
Mayor Damien Egan

Officers of London Councils, and Co-President Lord Tope of Sutton were in attendance.



## **1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies**

The apologies and deputies listed above were noted.

## **2. Declarations of interest**

No interests were declared.

## **3. Minutes of the Leaders' Committee meeting 19 March 2019**

The minutes of the Leaders' Committee meeting on 19 March 2019 were agreed.

## **4. London Councils' finance lobbying strategy**

London Councils' Director of Local Government, Performance and Finance introduced the report, informing Members that:

- In 2018 Members had agreed a finance lobbying strategy structured to anticipate a forthcoming spending and proposed local government Fair Funding review. The report summarised the activity over the year
- The timing and scale of the review and any reforms was now less clear although the assumption was still being made that there would either be a one or three year spending review in the autumn
- The report highlighted the priorities for London under various scenarios - namely Children's and Adult Services, homelessness, Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children and people with no recourse to Public Funds
- The two year pilot on the business rates retention pool would end in March 2020, and a decision on the future of the pool would need to be taken at a future meeting

Members made the following responses to the report:

- The forthcoming Conservative Party Leadership election presented an opportunity to lobby regarding the spending review
- In respect of Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children, it was important that any commitment made in terms of numbers was covered by sufficient Government funding
- Any suggestions in the wider debate that London is 'overfunded' should be challenged

- An assurance should be sought from Government about London's minimum requirement being no detriment to existing overall funding levels

Members agreed to note the report and agree to write to local MPs to reinforce the priorities in the London Councils' finance lobbying strategy, using a template provided by London Councils.

## **5. Feedback from Joint Boards**

### London Crime Reduction Board

Cllr Athwal reported back on the most recent meeting of the LCRB, which had focused on the prevention of violent crime via firm enforcement, visible policing and the drug intervention programme.

### London Health Board

Cllr Watts reported back on the last meeting of the LHB which had covered:

- The renewed health and care vision for London
- The health and care estates strategy
- Changing attitudes to mental health and support
- Health inequalities

### Skills for Londoners

Cllr Gould fed back from the second meeting of the Board. The following had been discussed:

- The need for Leaders to be strategically involved in setting a London Skills and Employment vision
- The limit of the draft Skills and Employment vision with the London Industrial strategy and the impact of these on future funding
- The need to identify how to work with boroughs at both a regional and sub regional level – a meeting had been organised for 18 June to discuss this
- The establishment of sub boards
- Post 16 Special Educational Needs, disabilities provision and support for disadvantaged children into higher education

In response to a question from the Chair regarding the impact for boroughs on proposals around Adult Community Learning, Cllr Gould commented that there was a move towards outcome-based commissioning, but that ACL was not currently under consideration.

## Homes for Londoners Board

Cllr Rodwell welcomed Cllr Damien White who was now shadowing for HfL Board, and thanked Cllr Cornelius for his contribution. The most recent meeting of the Board had discussed:

- G15 activity 2018/19
- NHS London Estates Board work, which would be reported to the London Health Board in July 2019
- The Land Fund
- The London property portal
- The housing delivery report
- The position regarding cladding on blocks

### **6. Pledges to Londoners – Update on Progress in Transport and Environment**

Cllr Bell updated Leaders on the Transport and Environment aspects of the London Councils pledges, noting that the Transport and Environment Committee were overseeing delivery of many of the aspects of this work. Leaders were informed that:

- Charging infrastructure had progressed, with over 1,100 charging points established, and work was taking place with the GLA on their draft Emission Reduction Bill
- There had been good engagement with DEFRA on the Environment Bill
- Similarly, there had been engagement with TFL on the bus network and their business plan
- The first phase of ULEZ had been successfully rolled out
- There had been a commitment from the GLA to consider London Councils arguments regarding borough representation on the TFL Board as part of the Governance review being undertaken by Transport for London Board.

Cllr Bell asked Leaders in turn to engage with their officers to brief them about pledges and respond to any requests made of them.

Members made the following points:

- There was concern that the Crossrail 1 route should be finished as a priority

- In relation to the extension of the ULEZ zones, that TfL should not re-locate older buses to operate in outer London boroughs
- A more straightforward approach to the diverse options for charging systems should be adopted, as well as better access to hydrogen fuel stations (eg for vehicles operating near Heathrow airport where such fuel was more readily available)
- Environmental consideration should also be given to preserving grassland areas as well as trees
- There should be more support for enforcement of prosecuting 'idling' motorists
- It should be made clear how the income generated from ULEZ was utilized
- Further devolution of suburban rail to TfL should be a lower priority than xxx and financial stability

Cllr Bell responded to the points made confirming: that both he and the TEC vice chairs held regular quarterly meetings with TfL which could be used to channel issues from boroughs; there was to be a further report due to TEC regarding the delivery of Crossrail; the issues of restricting older buses in outer London as a result of ULEZ would be reiterated; there was a commitment to increase residential charge points and meet the commitment to rapid charge points.

## **7. London Blueprint on Female Offenders**

Cllr Athwal introduced the report, commenting that the work had been presented to the London Crime Reduction Board, and had been produced in collaboration with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MoPAC). Around 60% of all women in prison had experienced abuse, and those released from prison often accessed multiple services such as housing, drug and alcohol services etc. The blueprint set out the framework to support London partners to improve outcomes for female offenders and reduce the risk of re-offending. He hoped that the blueprint would be endorsed collectively and by individual boroughs.

Cllr Dombey endorsed the report but felt that the impact of the turbulence around Community Rehabilitation Companies and significant challenges about how those services would contribute them. Cllr Dombey also expressed concern regarding future funding and the lack of reference to housing. She indicated that other officers would be willing to contribute to the further development of the Blueprint.

Members endorsed the shared vision outlined in the Blueprint and commended it to individual London boroughs, subject to the comments received from Cllr Dombey.

## **8. Urgency Report**

Leaders noted the Urgency report in relation to the funding of the London Leadership Programme.

## **9. Minutes and Summaries**

Leader's Committee agreed to note the minutes and summaries of:

- TEC – 7 February 2019
- YPES – 28 February 2019
- Grants – 20 March 2019
- TEC – 21 March 2019
- Audit Committee – 21 March 2019
- CAB – 15 May 2019

The meeting agreed to exclude the press and public.

The meeting ended at 12:40.

<b>Item</b>		<b>Action</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>London Councils' Finance Lobbying Strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members to write to local MPs to reinforce the priorities in the London Councils' finance lobbying strategy, using a template provided by London Councils.</li></ul>	<b>Leaders Committee</b>	In progress

# London Councils' Leaders' Committee

## Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children      Item    4

**Report by:** Clive Grimshaw      **Job title:** Strategic Lead for Health and Social Care

**Date:** 9 July 2019

**Contact Officer:** Clive Grimshaw

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9830      **Email:** [Clive.grimshaw@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Clive.grimshaw@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

### Summary

This report summarises the background to the system for receiving and caring for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children in London and the developments in national arrangements. It sets out the significant pressures – in both service and financial terms – that London is now facing. The report seeks guidance on the possible steps to take to ensure the London arrangements can be sustainable in the short term, summarises steps being taken to develop medium term operational solutions to the current challenges and plans for lobbying to recognise the need for adequate funding and a functioning national transfer scheme for UASC.

---

### Recommendations

The Leaders' Committee is invited to –

- Agree that London Councils take steps to seek urgent additional financial support for London boroughs to ensure that the London rota remains functional during the forthcoming summer pressures.
- In partnership with the professional leadership, including Chief Executives and Directors of Children's Services, support lobbying by London Councils to seek cross-departmental focus, involving MHCLG, the Home Office and Department for Education, to:
  - Press for full funding of costs incurred in the support of UASC and former UASC Care Leavers.
  - Identify reform to the National Transfer Scheme in order to put it on a functional and sustainable footing.

- Comment on the potential for a legal claim in respect of the national arrangements, and any role for London Councils to support, co-ordinate and/or fund raise in respect of such a claim.
- Agree that sustained lobbying, including a significant media campaign, be undertaken by London Councils to:
  - Highlight the crisis facing London boroughs and the UASC and former UASC Care leavers boroughs support.
  - Make the case to Government to fully fund the cost to councils associated with caring for UASC and former UASC Care Leavers in as an essential step in order to reach agreement on any future arrangement for the more equitable distribution of UASC.

## **Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children**

### **Background**

1. UASC arrive in the UK through a range of methods, including:
  - Spontaneous arrivals – most UASC arrive in the UK by their own means and are encountered at their port of entry, at the Asylum Intake Unit in Croydon, or are otherwise encountered by police/social services. The local authority in which the child first presents is normally responsible for their care. This group of children represents the substantial majority of UASC arriving in the UK.
  - Dubs amendment – resettlement of UASC already in European refugee camps in France, Greece or Italy. Transfer to the UK must be determined to be in the best interest of the child.
  - Dublin III regulation – children/close family/dependents reuniting to have their asylum claim dealt with together. While the local authority is responsible for undertaking family assessments to ensure the placement is suitable, the local borough has no further duty of care – unless the family relationship breaks down before the child turns 18 years old.
2. Children who arrive as UASC become the legal responsibility of the local authority they present at under Section 17 of the Children Act 1989 as a Child in Need in their area. The Local Authority will then be responsible for accommodating the child under Section 20 of the Children Act. This confers all of the responsibilities that Local Authorities and partner agencies have as corporate parents to all children in care. For most children this will also mean the ongoing responsibilities to them as Care Leavers.
3. The numbers of children presenting in the United Kingdom depend on a wide range of factors that are not within the control of local authorities, including wider geopolitical factors.

### **UASC – The Current System**

4. For a number of years, boroughs have been running a Pan London rota for dealing with UASC in London. This is a collective agreement across London boroughs in recognition of the unique pressures that face the London Borough of Croydon, which hosts the Home Office Screening Unit for asylum registration.



Although the historic and current pressures on Croydon are significant, other London boroughs also act as ports of entry and, therefore, care for very significant number of UASC and UASC Care Leavers. Those other boroughs include Hillingdon, Westminster and Camden.

5. Key aspects of the London rota include –
  - The rota operates for children aged 16 and 17. Children presenting as younger than 16 have remained the responsibility of Croydon.
  - The rota is jointly operated through Croydon and the London Asylum Seeking Consortium. The Consortium is jointly funded through the Home Office and contributions from London Authorities.
  - Children aged 16 and 17 are allocated to participating Local Authorities on a simple rota basis.
6. Through the rota, between April 2018 and April 2019, 486 children were transferred. However, as boroughs have increasingly reached their 0.07% threshold and come off the rota, there have been periods when there has been no capacity at all.
7. Children aged 16 and 17 are allocated to participating Local Authorities on a simple rota basis. Since the implementation of the National Transfer Scheme (see below) only those authorities with a UASC population less than 0.07% of their overall child population have been on the rota. This rate changes (mainly due to children reaching the age of 18) and the system has consequently become more complex.

### **The National Transfer Scheme**

8. In more recent years, the Home Office has introduced a National Transfer Scheme (NTS). The introduction of the NTS was intended to ensure that the responsibility for accommodating UASC was shared nationally as part of new system. This was a positive step forward and, in the initial period of operation helped to disperse several hundred UASC across the country.
9. There are, however, currently significant problems with the NTS. Just four children are known to have been transferred from London under the NTS in Q4 2018, according to Home Office figures. This was down from 25 in Q3 2018. No

referrals are currently being distributed for inter-regional transfers through the Home Office.

10. The failure of the NTS to fulfil its purpose has meant that the number of UASC cared for by London boroughs has steadily increased, with nearly all authorities now over the 0.07% threshold. The only capacity being created is as a consequence of children reaching the age of 18 years and ceasing to be a looked after UASC by becoming a former UASC Care Leaver.
11. The delay in dispersing UASC through the NTS is exacerbated by the significant delay in assessments which are provided by the Home Office following the arrival of UASC in Local Authorities other than Croydon.
12. The issues destabilising the National Transfer Scheme are, in some cases, complex. However, a very significant issue is the lack of adequate funding provided to meet the costs to local authorities in other parts of the country. Concerns about the financial settlement have reduced the numbers of authorities willing to participate. Although the findings of the Home Office's Financial Review have now been published and do give an uplift for 16 and 17 year old UASC - this still does not represent full cost recovery and made no change to the funding arrangements for former UASC Care Leavers.
13. Other reasons for the failure of the NTS include:
  - In many regions, some authorities have made 'in principle' pledges for a particular number of placements but not at any specified time, so each placement has to be negotiated. This causes delay.
  - Delays in identifying placements have led to young people and their representatives objecting to moves as the young person has become settled.
  - Such delays have led to some difficult experiences for receiving authorities, further impacting on their motivation to participate.
  - The fact that regions must be over 0.07% before inter-regional transfers can take place restricts this process to London, which potentially reduces the national commitment.
  - There have been concerns about the ability of some authorities with less experience of caring for unaccompanied children to meet their needs.
  - The inclusion and prioritisation of children transferring into the United Kingdom through Section 67 (i.e. the 'Dubs amendment') of the Immigration Act 2016 and the VCRS.

- Some regions have raised the context of varying rates of adult asylum seekers – where numbers may well be higher than London - and the need to take this into account as part of any overall picture.

14. The current breakdown of UASC cases in London – along with the proportion of total child population that this represents – is shown at Appendix 1.

15. There are around 140 children currently awaiting transfers from entry local authorities. As of February 2019, all but 3 London local authorities reported that they were caring for more UASCs than 0.07% of their total child population.

### **Financial Gap Analysis**

16. Currently, boroughs make a substantial collective contribution:

- London boroughs spent £53.7 million in support of an estimated 2,881 households with NRPF (No Recourse to Public Funds) in 2016/17. It is estimated that they supported around 3000 children from NRPF households.
- London Councils' research found that there were 1,502 UASC Looked After Children (LAC) across 26 London boroughs in 2018-19 (this is the total year-end UASC population). It is estimated that there were approximately 1,827 UASC LAC across all 33 London boroughs in 2018-19, representing at least one third or more of all UASC in England (comparable data is not available for councils outside of London).
- Across the 26 boroughs, the total number of UASC has increased by 17% from 2016-17 to 2018-19 (from 1,280 to 1,502).
- Total spend on UASC was £55.9 million in 2018-19 (based on 26 boroughs). Estimated total spend across all 33 boroughs is approximately £68.1m.
- There were 2,405 former UASC Care Leavers across 26 London boroughs in 2018-19 (start of year population). It is estimated that there were approximately 2,917 former UASC Care Leavers across all 33 London boroughs in 2018-19. Spend on former UASC Care Leavers was £24.5 million in 2018-19, an increase of 39% since 2016-17 (based on 26 boroughs).

17. The Home Office grant income that boroughs receive to care for UASC Looked After Children (including former UASC care leavers) does not cover the total costs. Imputing figures for the seven boroughs which did not complete the survey (based on their start of year UASC numbers) provides a total estimated funding gap across London for UASC of £14.1 million, and of £17.8 million for former

UASC care leavers. The total estimated funding gap in 2018-19 was therefore £31.9 million.

### **Summary of Lobbying Activity**

18. At the meeting of Leaders' Committee on 19 March, members reaffirmed London Councils' position in respect of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children. This position states that –

- Future financial support from Government must fully fund the costs of caring for all UASC.
- That there must be a single, consistent national response to this issue which is equitable, proportionate and ensures no council remains above its 0.07% threshold of their total child population - the threshold above which central government considers the pressure upon local authorities to be unreasonable.
- That the Home Office should engage with London boroughs to reform the current processing arrangements in the Capital in order to ensure the more efficient assessment and transfer of UASC.

19. Since the Leaders' Committee in March, the Chair of London Councils and the Executive Member for Children's Services have approached the LGA to seek a joint meeting with Home Office ministers. On 18 June, London Councils' Executive met with Nick Hurd MP in his capacity as London Minister.

20. London Councils' Spending Review (SR) publication 'London's Local Services: Investing in the Future' included an emphasis on the financial pressures associated with caring for UASC. This was circulated to all London MPs, as well as being sent to Government Ministers.

21. London Councils' recently published Pledges also includes a focus on UASC issues, specifically stating that London Councils will "*Press for government recognition of the unique cost demands on Britain's cities which in London include 34% of all unaccompanied asylum seeking children, two thirds of all people in temporary accommodation and £54 million on those with no recourse to public funds*".

22. Work is going on to seek additional support to highlight the issue with ministers. Media work is also being undertaken in order to escalate this issue.

23. ALDCS has also lobbied Government officials, in writing and in meetings. That lobbying has been focused on:

- Insufficient funding to cover local authority costs and ongoing delays in announcing the result of the UASC funding review. This not only increases the cost of looking after UASCs in London, it undermines the participation of receiving local authorities.
- Substantial delays in the provision of screening interviews, which are required before local authorities can refer young people onto the NTS. It is not uncommon for it to take three weeks, meaning that children become settled in London, substantially reducing the chances of a successful transfer.
- The inclusion of Dubs and Vulnerable Children Resettlement Scheme cases in the NTS, as well as the prioritisation of these cases by the Home Office over UASC from local authorities over the 0.07% threshold.

### **Medium Term Approaches**

24. It is recognised that reliance upon the current model of the NTS will not currently realise London's objectives.

25. The Association of London Directors of Children's Services is working with colleagues through the national Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS) to develop an alternative model, in particular working with colleagues in other regions where effective rota arrangements are also in place, to develop an alternative model based upon these successful examples.

26. This emerging model has been discussed by ADCS at its Council of Reference on 5th June, attended by Directors of Children's Services from across England. The Council of Reference responded to the proposals positively as a fairer and more practical approach. It has asked for additional factors to be considered, which officers will continue to work on. However, there was a recognition that operational improvements to the dispersal arrangements will remain subject to political agreement from across local government, especially in the absence of a full cost recovery model funding model.

27. In parallel, the UASC Governance Board, which is jointly chaired by the Home Office and the Department for Education, agreed to establish a Working Party in March 2019 to look at new arrangements for the NTS. This was an

acknowledgement that the current Scheme is not functioning as intended, particularly in terms of inter-Regional transfers.

28. The proposals in development by Directors of Children's Services were discussed at the UASC Governance Board on 12th June. The Board broadly welcomed the work and agreed that the Working Party should now focus on further developing the suggestions, including giving additional capacity in the form of access to data and data analysis in order to develop the new scheme in more detail.
29. In the event that alternative proposals for the NTS do not gain the wider agreement that is required to enable the numbers of children to move required to alleviate demand on entry authorities, London boroughs will need to consider other steps to ensuring there is an equitable arrangement for the dispersal of UASC.

### **Matters for Consideration**

30. The number of UASC arriving in London has increased steadily over the past few years. London's share of UASC remains stubbornly fixed at around 1 in 3. The declining functionality of the NTS is placing over greater service and financial pressure on London local government. The financial shortfall for caring for UASC and UASC Care Leavers is substantial, in the region of £32 million per year
31. London Councils has taken, and will continue to take, steps to lobby Government to seek a more sustainable funding arrangement, which it is believed would make a significant contribution to putting national dispersal arrangements back on a functional footing. Joint work with LGA will also be pursued.
32. Discussions are also continuing within London and with the Home Office and Department for Education about potential medium-term approaches to resolving the challenges faced in the operation of the NTS.
33. However, in the meantime, there remain significant short-term challenges in London, notably the very sharp pressures being faced by port of entry councils. While not the only short term consideration, an injection of funding might assist in maintaining London rota arrangements in the short-term while discussions continue with national partners to reach a conclusion on solutions to resolving the medium and long term challenges. In parallel, London Councils is taking steps to raise the profile of the difficulties faced by London boroughs and UASC as a result of the deficiencies in the national system, including through the media.

## Recommendations:-

The Leaders' Committee is invited to –

- Agree that London Councils take steps to seek urgent additional financial support for London boroughs to ensure that the London rota remains functional during the forthcoming summer pressures.
- In partnership with the professional leadership, including Chief Executives and Directors of Children's Services, support lobbying by London Councils to seek cross-departmental focus, involving MHCLG, the Home Office and Department for Education, to:
  - Press for full funding of costs incurred in the support of UASC and former UASC Care Leavers.
  - Identify reform to the National Transfer Scheme in order to put it on a functional and sustainable footing.
- Comment on the potential for a legal claim in respect of the national arrangements, and any role for London Councils to support, co-ordinate and/or fund raise in respect of such a claim.
- Agree that sustained lobbying, including a significant media campaign, be undertaken by London Councils to:
  - Highlight the crisis facing London boroughs and the UASC and former UASC Care leavers boroughs support.
  - Make the case to Government to fully fund the cost to councils associated with caring for UASC and former UASC Care Leavers in as an essential step in order to reach agreement on any future arrangement for the more equitable distribution of UASC.

---

### **Financial Implications for London Councils**

There are no financial implications for London Councils resulting from this report.

### **Legal Implications for London Councils**

There are no legal implications for London Councils resulting from this report.

### **Equalities implications for London Councils**

There are no equalities implications for London Councils.

**UASC Data at 31<sup>st</sup> May 2019**

Authority	0.07% threshold*	The number of UASC children based on June 2019 returns to LASC	0.07% Threshold +/-
Barnet	64	66	+2
Barking and Dagenham	44	44	At Threshold
Bexley	40	35	-5
Brent	54	55	+1
Bromley	52	47	-5
Camden	34	64	+30
City of London	1	22	+21
Croydon	66	276	+210
Ealing	57	57	At Threshold
Enfield	59	74	+15
Greenwich	48	45	-3
Hackney	44	44	At Threshold
Hammersmith and Fulham	25	36	+11
Haringey	42	54	+12
Harrow	40	38	-2
Havering	40	43	+3
Hillingdon	51	98	+47
Hounslow	45	50	+5
Islington	29	38	+9
Kensington & Chelsea	20	31	+11
Kingston Upon Thames	27	23	-4
Lambeth	44	43	-1
Lewisham	48	47	-1



Merton	33	29	-4
Newham	60	49	-11
Redbridge	53	55	+2
Richmond Upon Thames	32	34	+2
Sutton	33	29	-4
Southwark	45	50	+5
Tower Hamlets	48	46	-2
Waltham Forest	47	45	-2
Wandsworth	44	43	-1
Westminster	32	177	+145

\*0.07% Figures from Home Office April 2019

NB: The Home Office does not regularly publish the number of UASC per borough, so official statistics are out of date. In the absence of an official statistical release, new arrivals and age changes among the existing UASC cohort, any data circulated in respect of UASC numbers per borough are, therefore, inevitably prone to becoming out of date.

# Leaders' Committee

## Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: Progress Report

Item no: 5

**Report by:** Doug Flight      **Job title:** Strategic Policy Lead  
**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019  
**Contact Officer:** Doug Flight  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9805      **Email:** [doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** Leaders' Committee received the report of an independent Peer Challenge, on London's collective resilience arrangements, in February 2018 and went on to agree that the London Resilience Forum - Local Authorities' Panel would oversee implementation of the recommendations emerging from the Challenge.

Leaders' Committee endorsed the Panel's detailed implementation plan in July 2018 and requested a progress report on implementation for consideration in summer 2019.

This report provides an overview of progress, including work which London Councils has led to develop guidance and training for Elected Members. The detailed progress report is **attached as Appendix A: Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: EP2020 Enhancement Programme**.

**Recommendations:** Leaders' Committee is asked to:

1. Receive the Local Authorities' Panel progress report, **attached as Appendix A**.
2. Note the guidance set out in the *Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors*, **attached as Appendix B** and the pilot training programme.
3. Note the '*Resilience Standards for London*', **attached as Appendix C**.
4. Confirm the expectation that Leaders' Committee will receive a further report on progress in 2020.



## Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: Progress Report

1. Leaders' Committee received the report of an independent Peer Challenge, on London's collective resilience arrangements, at its meeting in February 2018. The review was designed to inform a reflection on the effectiveness of the collective resilience arrangements, particularly in the light of a number of emergency events throughout 2017.
2. The review noted the importance of work which London local government undertook in 2016/17 to review and to begin to strengthen its emergency planning capacity. The outcome of the work – the Emergency Planning (EP) 2020 Prospectus – set out ways in which both individual and collective resilience arrangements between boroughs and sub-regional partnerships could be strengthened.
3. Leaders' went on to agree that the Local Authorities' Panel (*LAP – which has managerial oversight of the collective borough resilience arrangements*) would oversee implementation of the combined recommendations of the Peer Challenge and the EP 2020 review. The Panel worked up a detailed implementation plan, which was received by Leaders' in July 2018. There was an expectation that a progress report on implementation would be brought to Leaders' Committee in 2019.

## Recent Activity

4. The Local Authorities' Panel, chaired by John Barradell (Town Clerk & Chief Executive of the City of London Corporation), has overseen progress to implement the consolidated recommendations, as detailed in the progress report: '*Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: EP2020 Enhancement Programme*', **attached as Appendix A**. The key initiatives that have been delivered during the last year, to strengthen collective resilience arrangements, include:
  - Development of 'Resilience Standards for London', **attached as Appendix C** which were approved by LAP on 13 June 2019. These standards will form the core of a new assurance approach based on a sector-led improvement philosophy, which will rely on three tiers of assurance: regular self-assessments, sub-regional challenge sessions and a programme of external peer challenge delivered in partnership with the LGA. Elected Members were consulted at an early stage in the development of the standards, through London Councils, and a series of interviews were arranged with leading members.

- Delivery of an interim assurance approach in 2018, which was used to better understand the status of response capabilities and target improvement where necessary in advance of the new approach to assurance.
- Establishment of a standardised approach to key aspects of borough-level operational response capabilities to enhance the ability to share resources through mutual aid.
- Establishment of new local authority sub-regional arrangements to enhance collaboration and improve delivery. These are supported by a lead chief executive for each sub-region, who is also a member of LAP. Some of these chief executives are new to LAP following a refresh of membership.
- Joint work with local government professional groups including Directors of HR, Directors of Adult Social Care, Directors of Communications and Directors of Housing, to deepen resilience across service areas.
- Completion of a community resilience review overseen on behalf of LAP by Kim Smith, Chief Executive LB Hammersmith and Fulham, in her capacity as Chair of the London Community Resilience Steering Group. The review highlighted examples of good practice and identified challenges. It also highlighted some practical ways in which local government can make a difference. Work is now underway to create programmes designed to help local communities, both by geography and by interest, to be prepared through promoting community resilience and supporting development of a safe and effective community response during emergency situations.

5. London Councils officers continue to work with LAP colleagues, to assist delivery of the implementation plan. In the last year, this support has focussed on:

- Establishment of a Directors of Communications mutual support network including procedures, guidance and training, and maintenance of a cadre of Press Officers available to enhance capacity in affected boroughs when required.
- Responding to the Peer Challenge recommendation that London embeds a common approach towards the role of Leaders and members, with an emphasis on assurance, civic leadership, community cohesion, engagement and communication.

6. Elected Members played a leading role in the development of a project which London Councils commissioned, to ensure that there is clarity about Members' roles in civil resilience and an understanding of how to exercise these roles effectively. An experienced, senior emergency planning adviser was commissioned to carry out the

work. He began the project by interviewing Leaders and senior members, as nominated through London Councils' political groups, to shape the guidance.

7. After liaison with chief executives and practitioners, a final version of the guidance, which took the form of a '*Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors in London Local Authorities*' was endorsed by LAP approved by London Councils' Group Leaders. The Handbook is **attached as Appendix B** and is available at:  
<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/members-area/civil-resilience-handbook-london-councillors>.
8. The Handbook includes guidance for officers, so that they can ensure that appropriate support is provided for members, both in advance of, and during an incident.
9. London Councils went on to commission the development of training materials and a comprehensive training programme, intended to support councillors through the process of putting the guidance into practice. The programme includes:
  - A generic course for all councillors, which authorities can deliver locally.
  - A more detailed, role-specific course for local Ward Councillors, which authorities may wish to deliver in partnership with neighbouring councils.
  - A course which is focused on role of Leaders/Directly Elected Mayors and other nominated Lead Cabinet Members.
10. The training will be piloted in the course of 2019/20, prior to preparation of a final package of training materials that will be made available to all London local authorities.
11. The pilot training for Leaders/ Directly Elected Mayors and Lead Cabinet members will be hosted by London Councils and open to all boroughs. It will focus on the political leadership role of Leaders/Mayors and other senior councillors in civil resilience. Two half-day sessions are planned, one in October 2019 and one in January 2020. Further details will be circulated shortly. The contact at London Councils is Anna Wright:  
[anna.wright@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:anna.wright@londoncouncils.gov.uk).

## Conclusion

12. The Local Authorities' Panel and individual councils have made significant progress over the last year and will continue their work to strengthen local and collective resilience capabilities in the year ahead. There are 10 recommendations in the attached report (Appendix A) which are shown as outstanding and these have been incorporated into the Panel's Business Plan for 2019/20. There will be a particular focus on work to strengthen the capability of authorities to deliver humanitarian assistance and

community engagement/support. LAP will receive regular progress reports and utilise a programme management approach to drive progress.

13. The new Resilience Standards for London provide a firm basis for sector led improvement in the future. As noted above, the Standards will be accompanied by a new assurance approach, which will introduce a programme of independent peer reviews, delivered in partnership with the LGA. This is designed to embed a culture of openness, mutual support and the sharing of good practice. Delivery of training for Members at a local level, supplemented by training for Leaders through London Councils, will build on the guidance set out in the Civil Resilience Handbook.

14. Leaders' Committee is asked to:

1. Receive the Local Authorities' Panel progress report: '*Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: EP2020 Enhancement Programme*', **attached as Appendix A.**
2. Note the guidance set out in the *Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors*, **attached as Appendix B** and the pilot training programme.
3. Note the '*Resilience Standards for London*', **attached as Appendix C.**
4. Confirm the expectation that Leaders' Committee will receive a further report on progress in 20120.

#### **Financial implications for London Councils**

No immediate implications.

#### **Legal implications for London Councils**

None

#### **Equalities implications for London Councils**

None

#### **Attachments**

**Appendix A:** Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: EP2020 Enhancement Programme.

**Appendix B:** Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors in London Local Authorities.

<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/members-area/civil-resilience-handbook-london-councillors>

**Appendix C:** Resilience Standards for London.



# Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: EP2020 Enhancement Programme.

## Progress Report – July 2019

Appendix A, to London Councils Leaders' Committee Report



## **1. Introduction**

This report provides an update on the resilience related recommendations presented to Leaders Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2010. These were designed to offer a clear framework for chief executives to apply in their local authorities, to efficiently reinforce services and ensure they can continue to provide effective individual and collective leadership on resilience into the 2020's.

## **2. Background**

In 2018 the Local Authorities' Panel (LAP) endorsed a high-level enhancement programme (Refreshed EP2020 Report) based on recommendations included in the following reviews:

- Recommendations for Local Government Emergency Planning and Resilience for the 2020's – (EP 2020)
- London Local Government's Collective Resilience Arrangements Independent Peer Challenge Tom Riordan and Mary Ney, February 2018
- An assurance framework for London Local Government 'Providing individual and collective assurance' - Sean Ruth, February 2018

LAP routinely monitors the progress of the recommendations through a LAP Business Plan.

## **3. Key Areas Progressed in 2018/19**

- The publication of a Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors in London Local Authorities (Appendix B to the Leaders' Committee Report and via the following link: <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/members-area/civil-resilience-handbook-london-councillors> ), and development of associated training which will be rolled out to Leaders and Ward councillors later this following a number of pilot sessions.
- Establishment of a standardised approach to aspects of borough level operational response capabilities designed to enhance the ability to share resources through mutual aid.
- Delivery of an interim assurance approach with particular focus on strengthening response capabilities.
- Development of 'Resilience Standards for London', (Appendix C to the Leaders' Committee Report), which have been signed off by LAP and will be shared with chief executives at a launch event on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- Establishment of new local authority sub-regional programme boards designed to enhance collaboration, with a focus on mutual support and increasing capacity.
- Establishment of a Directors of Communications mutual support network including procedures, guidance and training, and maintenance of a cadre of Press Officers available to enhance capacity in affected boroughs as necessary.
- Enhanced engagement with local government professional groups including Directors of HR, London ADASS, London Directors of Communications and Directors of Housing, designed to extend ownership of resilience across services and into the heart of organisations.
- Completion of a community resilience review which highlighted examples of good practice, where there are challenges and identified some practical ways in which local government can make a difference.

## **4. Key Priorities for 2019/20**

- Further develop sub-regional collaboration and engagement of Directors and professional groups to increase ownership and enhance capacity in the system.
- Continue to promote the principles of the Gold Resolution and Mutual Aid Agreement, and how they are applied.

- Roll-out of comprehensive 'Resilience Standards for London', including an external and independent peer review approach, based on a sector led improvement, delivered in partnership with the LGA. This is designed to further develop a culture of openness, mutual support and the sharing of good practice.
- Delivery of Ward Councillor training at the local level and Leader/Directly-elected Mayor and nominated lead Cabinet Member training delivered centrally to build on the publication of the Civil Resilience Handbook in April 2019.
- Completion of plans for addressing the death of a public figure, Operation 'London Bridge', to ensure London local government is prepared to meet its obligations in support of a dignified event.
- Through engagement with the Directors of HR Group, establish a common set of standards for London Emergency Planning/Resilience professionals, the means of increasing confidence in operational response capabilities and increasing the pool of officer volunteers.
- Provide support to:
  - the Humanitarian Assistance Programme, including the development of plans to enhance 'wrap-around' support to survivors and those directly affected by a major incident.
  - Housing Directors to develop guidance on managing large scale loss of housing stock and the means of ensuring effective support from the private sector.
- Further support to the community resilience initiative to ensure boroughs are appropriately supported to create a culture of mutual support at the micro-level in the context of a major incident.

## 5. Status of Recommendations

### Overarching Priority Recommendations for London Borough Resilience Arrangements

**Rec 1.** Refresh EP2020 to incorporate the work of the independent peer challenge on London's collective resilience arrangements, into an agreed implementation plan.

**Status:** Complete - all recommendations have been incorporated into the LAP Business Plan and a robust programme management approach supports LAP to maintain oversight.

**Rec 2.** All London Local Authorities adopt the assurance framework recommended in the *Sean Ruth Review 2018* and commit to credible self-assessment locally led by chief executives and overseen by Members which focuses on capacity and capability and organisational commitment to the resilience agenda. This local assurance is supported by sub-regional peer challenge and external independent peer review.

**Status:** Complete - agreement has been reached following consultation with Chief Executives at CELC and with Directors with strategic responsibility for resilience and emergency planning at Sub-Regional Programme Boards. See Rec 3 for details of the three-staged approach being applied.

**Rec 3.** The Local Authorities' Panel should oversee the development and implementation of a clear assurance framework to set expected and consistent standards at borough and regional levels, across all relevant aspects of resilience, and provide an annual assurance report to regional and national partners. This should utilise peer challenge and improvement partner arrangements to ensure all boroughs operate to a high and consistent standard with the right level of capacity and capability.

**Status:** Complete - Resilience Standards for London have been endorsed by LAP and will be launched on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019, see Annex A. The approach based on a sector-led improvement principle, comprises:

1. local self-assessment
2. sub-regional challenge sessions to share good practice and determine areas where a collaborative approach would be beneficial to increasing levels of resilience both locally and at the sub-regional level
3. independent and external peer review delivered in partnership with the LGA.

**Rec 4.** Develop and agree the role of councillors in preparation for (e.g. assurance role), response to and recovery from (e.g. community leadership role rather than operational role) emergencies.

**Status:** Complete – a Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors in London Local Authorities has been published, with training to be rolled out across London in 2019/20. Training to support councillors in understanding their roles and responsibilities in relation to the Civil Contingencies Act will be delivered in 3 phases, two aimed at all councillors and one specifically aimed at Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and nominated lead Cabinet members:

Generic, in-house civil resilience training for all councillors to provide an awareness of the statutory responsibilities of their local authority in relation to civil resilience, and the means by which they are discharged – with a particular focus on the role of officers. The London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Hounslow and Kingston have agreed to pilot the session in June/July and once finalised, the package will be made available to all London Boroughs.

Role-specific to provide Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members with an opportunity to explore how they will exercise their defined civil resilience roles in practice. Sessions delivered centrally are planned for 29<sup>th</sup> October and a date to be confirmed in January 2020.

Role-specific training for Ward councillors to provide an opportunity to explore how they will exercise their defined civil resilience roles in practice.

**Rec 5.** A review of the Gold Resolution and Addendum should be commissioned to consider options to make triggers and the escalation process clearer.

**Status:** Complete – A review was conducted in 2018, as reported to Leaders' Committee in July 2018. To inform the review, legal advice was obtained on the ability of London authorities to enter into an arrangement whereby another authority could in certain circumstances intervene without that authority's consent. The advice confirmed the following:

*'An arrangement is not possible as the delegating authority would, and indeed must, retain the ability to exercise its statutory powers and to withdraw any delegation it has granted to others.*

*S.138 of the Local Government Act 1972 confers extensive powers on a local authority to take action to avert, alleviate or eradicate an emergency or disaster involving destruction of or danger to life or property. It is this power that the Gold Resolution delegates to the authority of the relevant Gold CX.*

*S.138 is a power. As such an authority has considerable discretion as to how it exercises that power, and indeed whether to exercise it at all. Furthermore, where an authority delegates a power it does not lose that power. It remains able to exercise the power itself and can revoke the delegation at any time. It is trite law that an authority with a statutory discretion cannot fetter that discretion by policy or other device i.e. it cannot place itself in a position where it is precluded from considering whether to exercise the discretion in any given case.*

*This means that it is simply not possible in law to create a situation where an authority can allow intervention by others against its will, because even if such a delegation could be formulated lawfully the authority would always retain the right to simply remove the delegation through the appropriate decision maker at any time. Thus, at the very least passive consent will always be required in such an arrangement.*

In light of this advice, LAP developed guidance for chief executives that:

- 1) Made the Gold resolution triggers and escalation points clearer and
- 2) Reinforced the importance of embedding a London-wide culture of mutual aid and support.

This has been further reinforced through training and exercise programmes and underpinned by the strengthening of peer support to boroughs dealing with major incidents by LAP members and the Duty London Local Authority Gold (LLAG).

**Rec 6.** A review should be commissioned to consider options for enhancing, where appropriate, the mutual aid policy which is underpinned by the memorandum of understanding (MoU).

**Status:** Ongoing – a review concluded that the principles underpinning mutual aid were sound. Leaders Committee support for this policy further confirmed the importance and value of London supporting itself in a collaborative manner during major incidents, where necessary. Work is now underway to enhance operational effectiveness when identifying and then deploying any required resource.

### Corporate Policy

**Rec 7.** All London Local Authorities should maintain a corporate resource of professional advice, support and oversight. This is best achieved by developing and broadening the role of Emergency Planning Teams to encompass support and oversight of:

Organisational compliance with the Civil Contingencies Act (2004);

b) Organisational compliance with Minimum Standards for London;

c) The organisation's ability to effectively respond to a localised incident;

- d) The organisation's ability to maintain critical services in the lead up to and during emergencies as required by the Civil Contingencies Act and supported by the International Standard for Business Continuity ISO 22301.

To support this aim, consideration should be given to locating emergency planning teams within central directorates or ensure effective lines of reporting and communication are in place to enable them to deliver effective professional corporate level support.

**Status:** Ongoing – Directors of HR Group are in the process of commissioning a review of the role, positioning and capabilities of Emergency Planning Teams. Initial work is likely to start soon with guidance developed and published for London Local Authority Directors of Human Resources on effective resourcing of emergency planning/resilience arrangements.

It must also be noted that the application and value of this recommendation will be better understood following the completion of this year's Resilience Standards for London assurance process, which will be undertaken by all boroughs. The results will inform further discussions between Chief Executives and their Directors.

**Rec 8.** Common Standards for London Local Authority Emergency Planning Professionals, reflecting core competencies, should be developed and then adopted as a matter of policy by all local authorities and then continuously reviewed to support staff recruitment, development and service delivery.

**Status:** Ongoing – see status of recommendation 7.

**Rec 9.** Ensure boroughs recognise the importance of community resilience and have clear community engagement and liaison plans in place, with strong relationships across each sector, that are well connected to emergency plans. Ensure that boroughs understand the impact of incidents (both local and other) on their communities. Test the robustness of these plans and arrangements locally with key community and faith groups

**Status:** Ongoing – This is linked to Rec 23. Boroughs have multiple touchpoints with their communities and the community resilience standard within the Resilience Standards for London will allow assessments of the level and effectiveness of engagement at the local and micro-level. The London Resilience Partnership Community Resilience Steering Group, chaired by the Chief Executive of LB Hammersmith and Fulham, will be providing advice, guidance and support to boroughs. This will include the means of helping local communities, both by geography and by interest, to be prepared through promoting community resilience and supporting development of a safe and effective community response during emergency situations.

**Rec 10.** To support a co-ordinated and efficient approach to maintaining organisational resilience at a time when efficiencies are imperative, consideration should be given to incorporating business continuity functions into the core duties of emergency planning teams, where this is not already the case.

**Status:** Ongoing – see status of recommendation 7

### C. Governance

**Rec 11.** London Local Authority Chief Executives should reaffirm the Local Authorities' Panel (LAP) and Implementation Group (LAP IG) as the accountable body to drive the refreshed EP2020 Implementation Plan, with the immediate priority of clarifying, simplifying and strengthening the sub-regional arrangements with a lead chief executive for each area.

**Status:** Complete – support to LAP and LAP IG has been enhanced, including reinforcing programme management principles to ensure the LAP Business Plan, including refreshed EP2020 recommendations, remains on track. Sub-Regional Programme Boards, each Chaired by a Director with strategic responsibility for resilience, have now been established to support collaboration and the implementation of capabilities at the local level. All Chief Executives remain engaged through CELC and participation in sub-regional strategic-level meetings as necessary.

**Rec 12.** The role of Local Authorities' Panel members, who are nominated by chief executive peers within each sub-regional grouping to represent their views, should include:

- a) Taking a lead chief executive role on resilience in their respective sub-regional grouping.
- b) Maintaining oversight of collective assurance.
- c) Championing the principle of all boroughs contributing equally to sub-regional and regional planning in support of the LAP business plan, and local initiatives, for equal benefit

**Status:** Complete – ToR have been updated and LAP members are actively taking the lead for resilience in their areas. Deputy Chair of LAP and the Chair of LAP IG also take specific responsibility for engaging with all chief executives.

**Rec 13.** Multi-Agency Sub-Regional Resilience Fora (SRRF) should be replaced by local authority sub-regional group meetings chaired by the respective LAP Member and comprising strategic level representatives, such as chief executives or Directors with responsibility for emergency planning, from each borough and supported by Emergency Planning Managers. Partners should be invited as necessary. Secretariat support should be provided by a central resource to reduce the burden on boroughs. The new group meetings should focus on:

- a) Assurance
- b) Fostering collaboration to enhance resilience
- c) Overseeing the equal contribution to sub-regional and regional operational and contingency planning.

Note: this does not dispense with the need for LAP members to engage with emergency planning managers in their areas.

**Status:** Complete - two rounds of meetings have been completed resulting in opportunities to enhance collaboration developing. Sub-regional actions plans are now in place to strengthen arrangements both locally and at the sub-regional level.

**Rec 14.** Local Authority Panel Implementation Group (LAP IG) members to take a leading role in:

- a) Managing the three-year Local Authority Panel Business Plan and offering advice to LAP members on implementation approaches and a balanced distribution of work;
- b) Working with central support; agree with respective peers in each sub-regional group the appropriate means of delivering allocated workstreams in accordance with established pan-London working practices.

**Status:** Complete – ToR updated and LAP IG members actively delivering this recommendation. A key development is agreement that all capabilities will now have a Borough Implementation Checklist produced to support local delivery.

#### Planning

**Rec 15.** Local Authorities' Panel should engage with the LRF to simplify, joint plans and support arrangements between blue light partners and councils.

**Status:** Complete – London Resilience Group, on behalf of the London Resilience Partnership, are in the process of simplifying all Regional Frameworks and Protocols, including those associated to the London Local Authority Gold (LLAG) arrangements.

**Rec 16.** Local Authorities' Panel should engage central government departments, securing a single and efficient point of contact through MHCLG.

**Status:** Complete - good engagement is maintained with MHCLG Resilience and Emergencies Division (RED) as the primary contact for London boroughs, and Cabinet Office Civil Contingencies Secretariat (CCS).

**Rec 17.** London local authorities should formally recognise in plans the role of Mayor of London as the voice of London and Londoners, and for the communications and advocacy role rather than having a direct operational role in response and recovery.

**Status:** Complete – London Local Authority Gold Procedures reflect the Mayors role. This has also been incorporated into briefings and training provided to Chief Executives and their support staff.

**Rec 18.** Building on learning from the experiences of the humanitarian and welfare response in 2017 provided to victims and survivors, the Local Authorities' Panel should commission a review of current plans and exercising, including: the robustness of the initial response; arrangements for longer term response; information sharing; a consistent approach to case management; role of the key worker; achieving consistency of service over a prolonged period; specialist skills; clear well understood and published arrangements for a standing charity for effective collection and distribution to those affected by tragedies; and co-ordination across agencies.

**Status:** Ongoing – a Humanitarian Assistance (HA) Programme has been created to progress all aspects of this recommendation. This HA programme is supported by London ADASS. The scope of the work includes developing policies and procedures for local authorities in providing 'wrap-around' support to survivors and those directly affected by major incidents. It is expected that this extensive project, involving a significant number of stakeholders, will gain momentum through the commissioning of additional resource. This is expected to lead to tangible results later this year.

**Rec 19.** Local Authorities' Panel should commission work to develop plans and procedures to address learning from incidents in 2017 with specific reference to:

- a) Short to medium term accommodation to those made homeless by an incident
- b) Community Engagement
- c) Family and Friends Assistance Centre
- d) Physical donations
- e) Trusts and foundations
- f) Communications – delivery of an effective response in the age of social media
- g) Recovery phase coordination – infrastructure and people

**Status:** The communications element of this recommendation is complete with the establishment of a Directors of Communications Peer Support Network and establishment of a cadre of press officers available to provide support to affected boroughs via mutual aid. This was launched in May 2019. All other learning has been incorporated into the LAP Business Plan, with work being progressed as quickly as possible. The HA learning will benefit from the establishment of the HA programme, See Rec 18. The community engagement learning has been taken forward by a Community Resilience Steering Group, chaired by the Chief Executive of LB Hammersmith and Fulham, which will publish at the end of June a good practice guide based on research undertaken in the last few months. This will assist boroughs and other partner agencies in activities designed to support community resilience. This aspect is also addressed in Rec 23..

**Rec 20.** All chief executives and their deputies should attend periodical training events delivered by accredited trainers and participate in a structured exercise programme to prepare them to undertake London Local Authority Gold (LLAG) duties

**Status:** Complete – an annual training programme is delivered by London Resilience Group, which is underpinned by a service level agreement with the London Fire Commissioner. In addition to LLAG training. All Chief Executives and Directors with strategic responsibility for resilience/emergency planning, are invited to attend London Strategic Resilience Summits which consider key threats and risks. They are also invited to attend Multi-Agency Gold Incident Commanders training delivered by the National College of Policing.

#### Borough Response Capability

**Rec 21.** All local authorities should support the standardisation work, including principles detailed in the concept of operations, currently being progressed and adopt consistent protocols and procedures for core response functions when published.

**Status:** Ongoing – a Concept of Operations was published in June 2018 which for the first time sets out in one place how local authorities support their communities and partner organisations in the response to and recovery from an emergency as defined by the Civil Contingencies Act. The Concept of Operations is now being reviewed following its application over the last year. Standardisation work to embed the principles and capabilities in all boroughs continues with full London-wide validation planned for late 2019 / early 2020.

**Rec 22.** To mitigate any reduction in resource available to support an organisational response, a further piece of work should be initiated, linked to the current Standardisation initiative, to consider the means of:

- a) identifying local authority roles which possess the requisite core competencies to support operational response and recovery functions;
- b) identifying how staff undertaking the roles can be incorporated into operational plans;
- c) ensuring staff are available to undertake the requisite level of training and exercises and are released to undertake response roles during emergencies.

**Status:** Ongoing - Directors of HR Group are in the process of commissioning a review of the borough arrangements for maximising their staffing pool and securing the acceptable level of resilience within response arrangements. Linked to Rec 7, guidance will be developed and published for London Local Authority Directors of Human Resources on effective resourcing of



emergency planning/resilience arrangements and the means of ensuring compliance with the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

It must also be noted that local assessment of the effectiveness of arrangements will be supported by the roll-out of Resilience Standards for London.

### Assurance

**Rec 23.** As part of the Assurance Framework, boroughs need to ensure that they have clear community engagement and liaison plans in place and that they understand the impact of incidents on their communities.

**Status:** Ongoing – This is linked to Rec 9. The community resilience standard within the new Resilience Standards for London will allow boroughs to assess the effectiveness of their engagement at the local and micro-levels. Initial results are likely to be available by the end of 2019. This recommendation will be further supported by the work of the regional Community Resilience Steering Group with advice, support and guidance likely to be shared throughout this year.

**Rec 24.** ‘Minimum Standards for London’ should be re-branded ‘Resilience Standards for London’ and to more accurately reflect service requirements, consideration should be given to aligning the assurance process to:

- a) Immediate Response Capabilities (covering both local and LLAG operations);
- b) Contingency Planning to develop capabilities to deal with acute shocks;
- c) Business Continuity Planning and Corporate Assurance;
- d) Longer Term Resilience Strategies to provide resilience for chronic stresses.

**Status:** Complete – the launch of new Resilience Standards for London is scheduled for 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019.

**Rec 25.** All local assurance results should continue to be consolidated for the Local Authorities Panel to offer an annual assessment of collective capacity and capability across London and include the way urgent concerns can be escalated to chief executives.

**Status:** Complete – An annual report is programmed into the business planning for LAP Meetings.

**Rec 26.** Greater detail should be added to assurance criteria pertaining to immediate response capabilities, including clearly defined measurable criteria such as; baseline numbers of trained staff, defined response times and length of operation to be sustained, to establish the level of capacity and capability to be maintained by local authorities to address local incidents.

**Status:** Complete – incorporated into 2018 interim assurance approach and also included in the full set of Resilience Standards for London.

## **6. Conclusion**

Of the 26 recommendations included in this status report, 16 are now considered complete. The remaining 10 recommendations remain visible in the LAP Business Plan with LAP receiving regular progress reports through a robust programme management approach. With effective use of the Central Resilience Fund to add impetus where necessary, combined with the further development of sub-regional collaboration supported by Programme Boards for each area, it is anticipated that we will see significant progress made in delivering the remaining recommendations.

With the roll-out of the new Resilience Standards for London, based on a sector led improvement philosophy, it is expected that Leaders and Chief Executives will be well placed to maintain oversight of local arrangements including their organisations capacity and capability to comply with the duties detailed in the Civil Contingencies Act.



# A Civil Resilience Handbook for Councillors in London Local Authorities



# Contents

Introduction.....3

Overview of local authority responsibilities for civil resilience.....4

**PART 1**

Civil resilience guidance for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members.....6

**PART 2**

Civil resilience guidance for Ward councillors.....21

Further reading.....31

**Addendum**

Guidance for officers on supporting councillors to fulfil their civil resilience roles.....32



## INTRODUCTION

London local authorities have a central role to play in responding to major emergencies and other significant crises in the capital. When such events happen, people expect councils to respond swiftly and effectively alongside other organisations, whilst continuing to deliver essential ‘business-as-usual’ services.

After an emergency response has been dealt with and the blue light services have withdrawn, the role of local authorities often becomes even more prominent as they assume leadership responsibility for recovery. As well as being important to those affected by an emergency, recovery can be a long, complex and highly-sensitive process. When done well however, it can also be a process that provides opportunities to improve local places and strengthen communities. On that basis, it is essential that councils are able to provide the resources necessary to lead effective recovery operations.

In order to be successful in response and recovery, local authorities must prepare, and have a duty to do so under the Civil Contingencies Act. Although the process of ensuring necessary preparedness involves many strands, at its heart rests a requirement for people to understand their roles and have the experience, skills and support necessary to exercise them well. In relation to this requirement, whilst all operational responsibilities associated with civil resilience will be assigned to officers, councillors in London local authorities have a key political role to play in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from major emergencies and other significant crises. Their contribution in this regard must not overlap with, but should be complementary to, the operational role of their officer colleagues.

The important part that councillors have to play in civil resilience is reflected in the Resilience Standards for London (RSLs)<sup>1</sup>. The Standards set an expectation for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members, as well as Ward councillors to have clearly defined roles and responsibilities in relation to civil resilience. They also state that support arrangements should be put in place to enable councillors to fulfil their defined roles effectively.

This Handbook has been prepared to assist London local authorities in meeting the requirements set by the RSLs. It provides councillors with a range of information associated with their roles in relation to civil resilience, including:

- i. An overview of local authority responsibilities under the Civil Contingencies Act;
- ii. Practical guidance on the role of Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members (collectively referred to as ‘Leading Members’)
- iii. Practical guidance on the role of Ward Councillors; and
- iv. An Addendum containing guidance for officers on supporting councillors to fulfil their agreed roles in civil resilience.

Although the breadth of the guidance accounts for the roles of councillors in relation to major emergencies and other significant crises, the principles on which it is based are intended to be

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of drafting this version of the Handbook, the Resilience Standards for London were in their final stages of development. It is anticipated that the substantive Standards will be published in mid-2019.

applicable to all emergencies and organisational crises – regardless of their size and/or complexity.

In combination with an ongoing training and development programme, the guidance contained in this Handbook will help ensure that all councillors in London understand their roles in civil resilience and have the skills and support necessary to fulfil them effectively.

## **OVERVIEW OF LOCAL AUTHORITY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CIVIL RESILIENCE**

Alongside all principal councils in the UK, London local authorities are classified as Category 1 Responders under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (CCA). As such, and in common with other Category 1 Responder organisations such as the emergency services and NHS, they have a range of statutory duties:

- To assess the risk of emergencies happening
- To put plans in place to deal with emergencies
- To establish business continuity plans, i.e. plans for ensuring that essential services can continue to be delivered during an emergency
- To make information available to the public about emergencies that may occur; to warn the public when an emergency is likely to occur; and to provide information and advice in the event of an emergency
- To share information and cooperate with other local responders in the interests of effective coordination and efficiency
- To provide business continuity advice to private and voluntary sector organisations in their area (a responsibility for local authorities only).

The CCA defines an “emergency” as follows:

- a. An event or situation which threatens serious damage to human welfare in the UK;
- b. An event or situation which threatens serious damage to the UK environment; or
- c. War, or terrorism, which threatens serious damage to the security of the UK.

Category 1 Responders must perform the above duties under the Act where the scale and/or nature of an “emergency”:

- Is likely to seriously obstruct their ability to perform functions for which they are responsible; and
- Makes it necessary or desirable for them to respond; and doing so requires [significant] changes to the deployment of their resources or the need to secure additional resources.

Local Category 1 Responders work to a generic national framework for managing emergency response and recovery. The framework provides local flexibility for responders to make their own decisions about what emergency planning arrangements are appropriate to deliver their duties under the CCA, based on local circumstances, priorities and risks.

Category 1 Responders are, however, required to work together as members of Local Resilience Forums (LRFs). LRFs operate across areas having coterminous boundaries with police

forces. They have a key statutory role in facilitating regional, strategic-level multi-agency cooperation in the process of establishing effective resilience. In London, the London Resilience Forum - which operates across, both, the Metropolitan and City of London Police areas - is supported by 33 Borough Resilience Forums (BRFs), i.e. one for each local authority area. BRFs are also statutory bodies, and are responsible for the development and delivery of local, Borough-level resilience arrangements.

# PART ONE

## Civil resilience guidance for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet Members

<b>1. Purpose and application of guidance for Leading Members</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Summary of Leading Members' role in civil resilience</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. The role of Leading Members in ensuring preparedness</b>	
3.1. Personal Preparedness	8
3.2. Political leadership within the council	8
3.3. Political leadership beyond the council	10
<b>4. The role of Leading Members in the response phase</b>	
4.1. Political leadership within the council	12
4.2. Political leadership beyond the council	14
<b>5. The role of Leading Members in the recovery phase</b>	
5.1. Political leadership within the council	16
5.2. Political leadership beyond the council	17
<b>Appendix 1A – Aide Memoire for Leading Members during an emergency response</b>	<b>19</b>



## **1. PURPOSE AND APPLICATION OF GUIDANCE FOR LEADING MEMBERS**

The purpose of this guidance is to provide Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors of London local authorities and other Cabinet members **(collectively referred to as 'Leading Members')** with practical guidance on how to discharge the agreed role they have in civil resilience.

The guidance covers all key areas of activity in which Leading Members may be involved when preparing for, responding to and recovering from emergencies. In practice, the division of associated responsibilities will vary from one local authority to another, depending upon different decisions being taken locally regarding Cabinet member portfolio responsibilities. The nature and scale of particular emergencies may also affect the distribution of political leadership responsibility across Cabinet members during response and recovery. That being the case, political administrations should decide how to distribute the various activities to Leading Members on a 'by-default' basis – accepting that associated responsibilities may need to be adjusted during response and recovery.

The guidance is intended to be augmented by a training and development programme, to ensure that all Leading Members fully understand their role and are able to develop the skills and experience necessary to exercise it effectively.

## **2. SUMMARY OF LEADING MEMBERS' ROLE IN CIVIL RESILIENCE**

Whilst all operational responsibilities associated with civil resilience will be assigned to officers, Leading Members in London local authorities have a key political leadership role to play in preparing for, responding to and recovering from major emergencies. They also have an equally important role in confirming that appropriate business continuity plans are in place. Their contribution in this regard should complement, and be complemented by, the operational role of officers, as well as important political activities being undertaken by back-bench Ward councillors and other political stakeholders beyond the council.

Leading Members must make policy and funding decisions to ensure that their council is prepared to deal effectively with emergencies and other crises that will impact on communities and/or the council's ability to provide essential services. They must also put in place mechanisms for securing assurance that associated arrangements are robust.

When a council responds to a major emergency, Leading Members have a central part to play in providing visible civic leadership and reassurance to local people, as well as supporting and enabling council officers who are involved in the response effort. They will also lead on arrangements for engaging with political stakeholders outside the Cabinet – both within and beyond the council.

During recovery, Leading Members should maintain a visible civic leadership presence. They may also need to lobby for necessary financial assistance in support of the recovery operation and should closely monitor progress on its delivery. Finally, Leading Members should

champion the process of making certain that available lessons are learnt, addressed and shared with others.

### **3. THE ROLE OF LEADING MEMBERS IN ENSURING PREPAREDNESS**

#### **3.1 Personal Preparedness**

Experience clearly shows that there is a direct relationship between levels of preparedness and the effectiveness of a local authority's response to, and recovery from, an emergency. Whilst there are many strands associated with achieving necessary preparedness, at its heart rests a requirement for officers and councillors to fully understand their respective roles and have the experience, skills and support necessary to exercise them well. Where this is not the case, it is highly-likely that councils will be found wanting at a time when their help is most needed by the communities they serve.

On the above basis, the importance of all councillors investing time and effort in ensuring that they are personally prepared to contribute constructively in the event of a major emergency or other significant crisis occurring cannot be overstated.

In this regard, all Leading Members should set an example for others to follow by:

- i. **Having a thorough knowledge of the guidance contained in this document on how to exercise their role in practice**
- ii. **Ensuring that they keep headline guidance on actions to be taken during an emergency response readily available (see Aide Memoire at Appendix 1A)**
- iii. **Having a thorough knowledge of the guidance contained in this document for local Ward councillors.** This will to assist them in understanding how their political leadership role will complement the political roles of their colleagues, and also because they, themselves, are Ward councillors.
- iv. **Being familiar with the council's key emergency and business continuity plans**
- v. **Attending training courses to ensure that they understand their role and how to exercise it in practice**
- vi. **Taking part in exercises so that they are able to perform their role in a simulated environment, alongside officer and councillor colleagues, as well as representatives from other agencies.**

#### **3.2 Political leadership within the council**

Leading Members have a central role to play in ensuring preparedness by providing necessary political leadership within their local authorities.

As the most senior politicians in their councils, Leaders and Directly-elected Mayors must work closely with Chief Executives, as the most senior officers, to ensure a clear understanding of their respective roles and how they will complement one another - whilst it is important for clear lines of demarcation to exist between the political role of the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor and the operational role of the Chief Executive in all aspects of civil resilience, the

interface between the two needs to be well understood if the benefits of aligning political and managerial leadership are to be realised.

From a governance perspective, working with their officer colleagues where necessary, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members should:

- i. **Assign lead portfolio responsibility for civil resilience to a single Cabinet member.** Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors may decide to retain this lead role themselves or assign it to another Cabinet member. Either option is perfectly acceptable. The important point is that there is clarity over who will hold lead political responsibility for civil resilience preparedness.
- ii. **Ensure that lead managerial responsibility for civil resilience is assigned to a single senior officer through the authority's scheme of delegation.** As with political leadership, it is important that lead professional responsibility rests with a single, designated individual.
- iii. **Ensure that a policy framework setting out details of the council's emergency planning and resilience responsibilities, and arrangements for discharging them, is produced and published.** Putting such a framework in place not only provides a focus for preparedness-related activity within the local authority, it also demonstrates a commitment to civil resilience, as well as transparency to external stakeholders in terms of what they can expect from the council.
- iv. **Ensure that necessary financial provision is made within the council's budget to deliver against the policy framework.**
- v. **Ensure that arrangements are in place to enable urgent decisions to be taken quickly during the response phase.** When responding to emergencies, operational decisions need to be taken quickly by officers. At times, the decisions in question will commit a level of resource that would require Cabinet-level approval under normal circumstances. However, formal processes that are used by officers to secure decisions from Cabinet members during 'business-as-usual' periods are not conducive to the fast-moving decision-making environment in which officers will be operating during emergency response. That being the case, arrangements must be put in place to delegate authority to officers for specified urgent decisions during an emergency response that would normally be reserved for Cabinet.
- vi. **Ensure that mechanisms are in place for securing assurance that the council is prepared to deal with major emergencies and has appropriate business continuity plans in place.** There are various routes by which this assurance can be secured. Internally, periodic reports could be provided to Cabinet on the authority's state of preparedness, based upon a self-assessment against the Resilience Standards for London, which have been developed as part of a pan-London assurance framework. Scrutiny committees also have an important internal assurance role to play, and the political leadership may wish to actively encourage scrutiny committee Chairs to consider including aspects of preparedness in their work programmes. External mechanisms for providing assurance can also be considered. For example, Peer Review

is a useful tool and the Resilience Standards for London provide a benchmark against which teams of independent experts can judge levels of preparedness.

Beyond putting the governance arrangements above in place, **Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors should consider producing a joint ‘statement of commitment’ with other political group leaders, to champion the role and involvement of their respective group members in achieving necessary preparedness.** Along with the heads of other political groups, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors have an important role in setting clear expectations that members of their respective groups will play a full and active part in preparing for emergencies. Whilst these expectations can be set within individual groups, a joint statement demonstrates cross-party commitment to the principle that councillors of all political persuasions should work together on ensuring necessary preparedness.

The Cabinet member who is assigned lead portfolio responsibility for civil resilience preparedness should also:

- i. **Build a strong professional relationship with the officer having lead managerial responsibility for civil resilience**
- ii. **Engage with officer colleagues to understand the main risks to local communities and businesses – both existing risks and those being identified through horizon-scanning**
- iii. **Secure assurance that there are robust plans in place for internal and external communication during response and recovery**
- iv. **Enable Ward councillors to contribute to, and influence, mechanisms for securing assurance regarding emergency preparedness and business continuity**
- v. **Confirm that business continuity advice is publicly available to local businesses, and that associated good practice is actively promoted**
- vi. **Confirm that information is publicly available to raise awareness in communities and businesses about the risks they face, and the roles of different agencies in managing the risks in question**
- vii. **Support Ward councillors in their local leadership role for building community resilience.**

### 3.3 Political Leadership beyond the council

In addition to the political leadership responsibilities that Leading Members have within their own local authorities for preparedness, they also have an essential role in the wider environment. By exerting effective external leadership influence, Leading Members can create the conditions for productive operational collaboration with partner organisations to achieve vital collective resilience. Such external political leadership also has potential to foster the development of constructive relationships with politicians beyond their council. Investing in such relationships around the theme of civil resilience as a strand of preparedness can deliver

significant downstream benefits where joined-up political leadership and/or engagement becomes necessary during an emergency response and recovery effort.

In terms of specific external leadership actions associated with preparedness, Leading Members should:

- i. **As members of the London Councils Leaders' Committee, and in accordance with the *Assurance Framework for London Local Government*, secure assurance that local authorities in London have the collective capability and capacity to deal with emergencies and other crises that require a pan-London response.** The resources required to respond effectively to a major incident are highly-likely to exceed those available to any single local authority in London. On that basis, all Leaders and Directly-elected Mayors have committed to the principle of building the collective resilience necessary to ensure effective responses to, and recovery from, all reasonably foreseeable incidents in London. An Assurance Framework has been developed in support of this commitment. The Framework should be used by Leaders and Directly-elected Mayors to arrive at informed judgements about the extent to which the collective resilience of London local authorities is fit-for-purpose.
- ii. **Consider exchanging contact details with other Leaders and Directly-elected Mayors, so that necessary high-level political discussions can take place in the event of a major emergency or other significant crisis.**
- iii. **Consider exchanging contact details with local MPs and discussing their role during the response to a major incident affecting their constituents.** Whilst MPs have no official role associated with the Civil Contingencies Act during an emergency response, they will inevitably seek to be involved in some capacity where the emergency directly affects their constituents. That being the case, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors should initiate a dialogue with MPs in their local authority area. In doing so, it is suggested that they should acknowledge that MPs have a legitimate stake in any major emergency response and recovery effort. They should also discuss arrangements for enabling MPs to exercise their representative role constructively, and without in any way compromising the operational response.
- iv. **Give consideration to the role that the Mayor of London will wish to play during major incidents.**

#### **4. THE ROLE OF LEADING MEMBERS IN THE RESPONSE PHASE**

When an emergency occurs, the leadership of senior politicians is brought into sharp focus. Communities will look to Leading Members from local authorities to provide visible civic leadership and reassurance. Councillors and council officers within their own authorities will

also expect them to lead the political response, providing whatever support is necessary and enabling officers to focus on their role in leading the operational response.

#### 4.1 Political Leadership within the council

In terms of their internal political leadership role, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors should open a dialogue with the Chief Executive (or duty 'Gold' on-call senior officer) as soon as they become aware of a major incident, to receive an initial briefing and agree any urgent steps that need to be taken in the early stages of the council's response. Whilst the Chief Executive and their officer colleagues must be allowed to manage all aspects of the operational response, alignment of their operational role with any political leadership activity is very important. In order to facilitate this, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and Chief Executives must keep communications channels open so that they are operating from an up-to-date, common understanding of the situation at all times.

The nature, scale and complexity of emergencies can differ significantly. As a result, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors will need to decide which members of their Cabinet will lead on different aspects of the political response. In this regard, and in consultation with the Chief Executive, they will need to consider:

- i. **Whether another member of the Cabinet should be the 'public face' of the council in its civic leadership role.** By default, this will be the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor, but the nature and scale of the incident may lead to another Cabinet member with appropriate portfolio responsibility being selected for this role. It is also possible that the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor may be unavailable to take on the role initially, if, for example, they are out of the country.
- ii. **Which member of the Cabinet will lead on 'business as usual' during the response phase.** Again, depending upon the nature and scale of the incident, the response phase may continue for some time, and generate the need for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors to focus exclusively on their associated civic leadership role. Where this is the case, it may be appropriate to allocate responsibility for political leadership of the local authority's routine business to another Cabinet member.
- iii. **Which member of the Cabinet will lead on providing political support to initial work associated with the recovery phase.** Although the response to major incidents is led by the emergency services, local authorities will almost always assume lead responsibility for the recovery operation. As a result, good practice will see local authority officers commencing work on recovery whilst the operational response is ongoing for the following reasons:
  - The response phase – even for major emergencies – can be relatively short in duration. Where this is the case, local authorities will be assigned responsibility for leading a potentially-significant recovery operation at short notice and need to be ready to do so.

- Recovery operations can be complex, protracted and resource intensive. They are also likely to attract a high-level of scrutiny. As a result, the sooner resources are assigned to developing a recovery strategy and associated action plans, the better. As with the response phase, all operational aspects of recovery will be led by officers. Nevertheless, strong and effective political leadership is necessary to support and complement the efforts of officers in delivering an effective recovery operation. Such political leadership needs to be in place from the point at which work on recovery commences, and it is important, therefore, for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors to assign this role to a member of their Cabinet as soon as is reasonably practicable.
- iv. **Which member of the Cabinet will be assigned lead responsibility for Ward councillor engagement.** Both in their capacity as community leaders and community representatives, Ward councillors have a potentially significant role to play during an emergency response. As the 'local face of the council' they can be a great asset, providing reassurance to local people and businesses on behalf of the council, and also acting as a conduit through which regular and reliable two-way information can flow. Whilst some aspects of the Ward councillor's role will be helpful in supporting the operational response effort, others may best be exercised through politician-to-politician interaction. That being the case, it can be helpful for the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor to appoint, and communicate details of, a Cabinet member who will be the conduit through which member-level interests associated with the response phase will be addressed by the administration.

With the above decisions having been taken, Leading Members should:

- i. **Confirm that arrangements have been put in place for briefing them and Ward councillors during the response phase.** The importance of providing all councillors with regular, appropriate and reliable communications – to avoid them feeling as though they are operating in an information vacuum – cannot be overstated. This is undoubtedly a challenge during the early stages of response when reliable information regarding operations 'on-the-ground' may be very limited. It can also be difficult when the nature of an incident means that associated details are sensitive for security reasons, for example. Even under these circumstances, however, generic messages of reassurance or confirmation that 'there is no more news at this stage' can reduce the risk of councillors feeling isolated from the council, at a time when their desire for news of what is going on will be significant.
- ii. **Confirm that business continuity plans are being deployed to enable ongoing delivery of essential services**
- iii. **Provide support and encouragement to council staff and others involved in the response effort.** During an emergency response, council officers and councillors are likely to be working extremely hard, for long hours, under potentially very difficult and, at times, harrowing circumstances. As a result, it is important for Leading Members, with necessary support from the communications team, to send out regular messages of thanks to their colleagues. They should also make time to 'walk the floor' and meet

- those involved in the response effort face-to-face, by visiting teams within the council and those running rest centres and sites offering temporary accommodation etc.
- iv. **Ensure they are briefed on activities associated with the deployment of 'spontaneous volunteers'.** When a major emergency occurs, it is likely that news and social media coverage will result in people travelling to the area in order to assist. Whilst such spontaneous volunteers can be a valuable asset, it is important that their involvement is managed to avoid it negatively impacting on the response effort. Failing to do so can also cause frustration amongst the volunteers, leading to reputational damage to local authorities and other responding agencies.
  - v. **Maintain a record of significant actions and events for use in subsequent debriefs, scrutiny activity and official enquires, etc.** Although everyone's efforts during the response phase should focus exclusively on minimising the impact of the emergency on those affected, after the transition into recovery has taken place, attention will begin to turn to examining the effectiveness of the emergency response. This is a crucial stage in the cycle of integrated emergency management. It provides an opportunity to identify examples of what went well - which can be celebrated and shared with others as good practice. It also enables areas where the response could have been better to be highlighted, addressed and disseminated as part of the 'lessons learned' process. Post-incident analysis can take many forms, including operational debriefs, formal reviews by local authority scrutiny committees, coroner's inquests, independent external reviews and Public Inquiries. It is almost certain that Leading Members will be asked to contribute details of their involvement in the response to one or more of these post-incident reviews. Consequently, and on the basis that they may be asked to provide an account many months, or even years, after the incident, it is highly-advisable for Leading Members to maintain a written record of significant actions and events in which they were involved, or witnessed, during the response phase.

#### 4.2 Political Leadership beyond the council

As far as external leadership focus of Leading Members is concerned during the response phase, consideration will need to be given to the following:

- i. **Working with the council's communications team to act as the 'public face of the council' in interactions with the media and local communities affected by the incident.** A key strand in the civic leadership role of local authorities during emergencies involves the intelligent and sensitive use of communications. In this regard, a communications strategy should be in place that exploits the benefits of using different communication channels to reach as diverse a range of audiences as possible. As well as focusing on the channels that will be used, the strategy should also recognise that different 'messengers' should be employed, depending on the nature of the messages being conveyed and the audiences for whom they are intended. Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors have a key role to play in this regard, in their capacity as the most senior elected representative in the local authority. They should be



positioned as the 'public face of the council' and, in this role, communicate regular, appropriate and reliable information on behalf of the local authority via the variety of communication channels available.

- ii. **Represent the council during visits by VIPs and ensure that such visits are sensitive to the 'mood' and needs of the community.** During the response to a major incident in London, it is highly-likely that VIPs, such as Government ministers, will want to personally visit the scene of operations to meet those affected by, and dealing with, the emergency. The fact that many such VIPs are based in London also means that these visits can take place at very short notice. Whilst the intent behind VIP visits is positive and understandable, it is essential that they do not interfere with the operational response being dealt with by officers. The timing and nature of the visits should also be sensitive to the 'mood' and needs of the communities affected. Leading Members have a key role in both respects. As those who will represent their council during such visits, they should liaise with their Chief Executives regarding any operational implications. They should also attempt to influence the detail of the visits, based upon intelligence they are able to gather about the 'mood' on the ground, through, for example, discussions with local Ward councillors.
- iii. **Consider initiating dialogue with Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors of other councils impacted by, or responding to, the incident.**
- iv. **Consider initiating dialogue with MPs whose constituencies are being impacted by the incident.** Where an MP's constituents are affected by a major emergency, they are almost certain to want to be seen to be getting directly involved in some capacity. It might be advisable for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors to take the initiative and make contact to discuss how the MPs would like to contribute. In doing so, Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors may wish to remind them that they should not attempt to involve themselves directly in the operational aspects of the emergency response.
- v. **Consider liaising with the Mayor for London's office where appropriate.** In the event of a major emergency occurring in London, the Mayor will have an important civil leadership role for the whole city, alongside Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors as civic leaders of local places.
- vi. **If necessary, lead on making representations to the Government for financial assistance.** Although local authorities hold contingency reserves that can be used to meet immediate additional costs associated with responding to major incidents, it is conceivable that the scale of an emergency will exceed this financial provision. Where such a scenario does emerge, Leading Members will need to make the case to Government for emergency financial assistance to be provided.

## 5. THE ROLE OF LEADING MEMBERS IN THE RECOVERY PHASE

Throughout the process of recovery following a major emergency, the leadership provided by senior politicians will remain firmly in the spotlight. This is particularly so for those in local government, as their councils will almost always assume lead responsibility for the recovery phase – which is frequently a resource-intensive, complex and sensitive process that can continue for many years.

As with the response phase, operational aspects of recovery will be led by officers, however Leading Members have an essential role to play in providing civic leadership and political

oversight. Doing so will demonstrate to communities a commitment by senior political leaders to work with them on taking opportunities, as well as addressing challenges, associated with recovering from a major emergency. It will also ensure that the recovery process is well-planned, appropriately resourced and delivered in line with agreed timescales.

### 5.1 Political Leadership within the council

Due to the scale, complexity and resourcing requirements of recovery from a major emergency, Leading Members must ensure that effective arrangements associated with governance and political oversight are in place. In this regard, they should:

- i. **Alongside senior officers, agree internal governance and delivery arrangements that will be put in place during recovery.** Because of associated resourcing challenges, it is likely that governance and delivery arrangements will need to be temporarily reconfigured during a major recovery operation. Such temporary arrangements will assist in ensuring that 'business-as-usual' activities can continue in parallel with the recovery programme.
- ii. **Secure assurance that a recovery strategy has been developed and is supported by a comprehensive, balanced, timebound and affordable recovery action plan.** Operational delivery of the recovery phase will be overseen by a multi-agency Recovery Coordinating Group (RCG). RCGs bring together representatives from a range of organisations and are chaired by a senior officer – almost always a local authority Chief Executive or Director, to reflect the lead responsibility of local government in the recovery phase. The primary role of RCGs is to develop, and oversee delivery of, a Recovery Strategy. Whilst RCG activity is officer led, it is important for Leading Members to be assured that the Recovery Strategy is fit-for-purpose, as well as being delivered in accordance with agreed timescales.

Beyond addressing the above internal leadership issues associated with governance and political oversight, Leading Members should:

- i. **Work with the communications team to ensure frequent internal communications to keep all staff and councillors updated, and to provide them with key messages to be conveyed on behalf of the council.** Regular communication to officers and councillors will be essential throughout the recovery process. As well as such communication keeping colleagues well-informed, it will provide an opportunity for Leading Members to thank them for their continuing efforts, and demonstrate an ongoing personal commitment to the recovery operation. Leading Members can also use internal communication to provide key messages to be conveyed on behalf of the council to external audiences – particularly via Ward councillors operating in their community leadership role as the 'local face of the council'.
- ii. **Confirm that local voluntary sector organisations and the community are fully involved in the recovery process, and that their comments are appropriately acknowledged/taken into consideration.**
- iii. **Confirm that the community, businesses, councillors and council staff are being kept informed of plans and progress.**
- iv. **Play a prominent and proactive role in the process of ensuring that all available lessons are captured, shared with others and acted upon.** All major emergencies and

other crises provide opportunities for learning. In order to ensure that all available lessons – both positive and negative – are captured, shared with others and acted upon, it is essential for an open, honest and proactive leadership tone to be set. Leading Members are encouraged to demonstrate a personal commitment to learning all available lessons and actively engaging in associated internal and external post-incident review mechanisms.

## 5.2 Political Leadership beyond the council

Leading Members will need to maintain a visible civic leadership role throughout the recovery period. Although media focus and broader public interest tends to fall away soon after the response phase is completed, for communities and businesses directly affected the process of returning to normal – sometimes a very different ‘normal’ - is at least as important as the emergency response had been. When done well, recovery will strengthen the bond of trust between councils and the communities they serve by restoring and improving local places. However, if insufficient attention is paid to leading an effective recovery operation, trust will be lost, and local authorities may face increasing external scrutiny and criticism.

In addition to their ongoing civic leadership role in recovery, Leading Members will also need to exert influence at a political level to secure alignment of political effort, as well as additional financial resources necessary to fund delivery of the Recovery Strategy.

On the above basis, Leading Members should:

- i. **Maintain a visible civic leadership role.** This should involve them undertaking periodic visits to people and businesses in the affected area, as well as attending public meetings etc.
- ii. **Ensure that communities are engaged in the process of developing and delivering recovery plans.** It is essential for those in affected communities to directly influence details of the recovery operation. They must feel that recovery is being done *with* them and not *to* them. Leading Members are advised to publicly commit to this principle and then ensure that it is being reflected in the way the recovery operation proceeds, alongside local Ward councillors.
- iii. **Ensure that regular progress updates are communicated to communities and other stakeholders.** Once recovery plans have been developed and published, it is important for communities and other stakeholders to receive regular updates on progress against them. The link between making commitments, and then being seen to keep them, is fundamental to the process of building and maintaining trust. Again, Leading Members should publicly commit to this principle and then ensure it is adhered to throughout the recovery operation.
- iv. **Establish protocols for involvement of, and liaison with, other political stakeholders.** Beyond the central role that Ward councillors will have during the recovery phase, other political stakeholders, such as the Mayor for London, MPs and Government ministers are likely to maintain an interest. Leading Members should keep communication channels with these stakeholders open, in order to understand their wishes, manage expectations and, where possible, align political activity behind delivering the Recovery Strategy as effectively as possible.
- v. **Make the case for financial assistance to support the recovery process.** By default, local authorities are expected to make arrangements to bear the costs of recovery in all

but the most exceptional circumstances. Central Government is clear that it is up to councils to assess their own risks and put in place the right mix of insurance and contingency reserves to meet the cost of dealing with them. However, in the event of an exceptional emergency, Government departments will consider providing financial support for some aspects of the recovery effort. In order to access funding under these circumstances, a case will need to be made and Leading Members have a role to play in this regard, with necessary support from officer colleagues.

- vi. **Offer support to the process of managing 'disaster funds' set up to collect and distribute charitable donations, as necessary.** It is very common for disaster appeals to be set up in the aftermath of major emergencies. The process of doing so can generate significant levels of charitable giving in a very short space of time. Whilst this is clearly very positive in terms of providing, often much-needed, financial assistance to those impacted by the emergency, it is essential that such funds are appropriately administered. Such administration should properly balance the need for funds to be released to those who need them in a timely fashion, with the requirement to avoid charitable donations being passed on to those for whom they were not intended – particularly if fraud is involved. Where it is decided that local authority support and a degree of democratic oversight would be helpful in the governance of disaster appeal funds, Leading Members may have a role to play as, for example, trustees.
- vii. **Attend memorial or remembrance services, as appropriate.** In the aftermath of major emergencies that result in a loss of life, it is very likely that the loved-ones of those who have perished, and members of local communities, will want to come together for services of remembrance in order to pay their respects. It will be important for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors to make themselves available to attend such events on behalf of the council. However, in doing so, they will want to be sensitive to the wishes of those organising the memorial and remembrance services who may or may not wish to have civic dignitaries in attendance.

### AIDE MEMOIRE FOR LEADING MEMBERS DURING RESPONSE

During the emergency response phase, Leading Members should:

- Contact the Chief Executive (or duty 'Gold' on-call senior officer) to receive an initial briefing and agree any urgent steps to be taken.
- Decide which member of the Cabinet will be the 'public face' of the council in support of its civic leadership role (by default, this would be the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor).
- Work with council's communications team to act as the 'public face of the council' in interactions with the media and local communities affected by the incident.
- Decide which member of the Cabinet will lead on 'business-as-usual'.
- Decide which member of the Cabinet will lead on providing political support to initial recovery work.
- Decide which member of the Cabinet will lead on Ward councillor engagement.
- In conjunction with the Chief Executive, senior communications officer and Cabinet member responsible for Ward councillor engagement, put in place arrangements for briefing Leading Members and Ward councillors during the response phase.
- Provide support and encouragement to council staff and others involved in the response effort.
- Maintain a record of significant actions and events for use in subsequent debriefs, scrutiny activity and official enquiries etc.
- If necessary, lead on making representations to the Government for financial assistance.
- Represent the council during visits by VIPs and ensure that such visits are sensitive to the 'mood' and needs of the community.
- Consider initiating dialogue with Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors of other councils impacted by, or responding to, the incident.
- Consider initiating dialogue with MPs whose constituencies are being impacted by the incident.
- Consider initiating dialogue with the Mayor for London – particularly where a pan-London response has been mobilised.

# PART TWO

## Civil resilience guidance for Ward Councillors

<b>1. Purpose of Ward councillor guidance.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>2. Summary of Ward councillor's role in civil resilience.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3. Ward councillor's role in ensuring preparedness</b>	
3.1. Personal preparedness.....	21
3.2. As a community representative.....	22
3.2. As a community leader.....	23
<b>4. Ward councillor's role in the response phase</b>	
4.1. As a community representative.....	24
4.2. As a community leader.....	25
<b>5. Ward councillor's role in the recovery phase</b>	
5.1. As a community representative.....	27
5.2. As a community leader.....	27
<b>Appendix 1B – Aide Memoire for the Ward councillor's role in response.....</b>	<b>29</b>

## 1. PURPOSE OF WARD COUNCILLOR GUIDANCE

The purpose of this document is to provide Ward councillors in London local authorities with practical guidance on how to discharge the agreed role they have in civil resilience, i.e. their role in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from major emergencies and other significant crises.

The guidance is intended to be augmented by a training and development programme, to ensure that Ward councillors fully understand their role, and are able develop the skills and experience necessary to exercise it effectively.

## 2. SUMMARY OF WARD COUNCILLOR'S ROLE IN CIVIL RESILIENCE

Whilst all operational responsibilities associated with civil resilience will be assigned to officers, Ward councillors in London local authorities have a key political role to play which complements other important activities being undertaken by the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor, other Cabinet members and officers.

The overall role of ward councillors in this regard can be considered as having two dimensions:

- i. A **community representative** dimension – the role of Ward councillors in ensuring that the interests of their constituents are properly represented in the way the council conducts its business; and
- ii. A **community leadership** dimension – the role of Ward councillors in working closely with those in the communities they represent, to become the 'trusted face of the council' and lead the process of building community resilience.

## 3. WARD COUNCILLOR'S ROLE IN ENSURING PREPAREDNESS

### 3.1 Personal Preparedness

Experience clearly shows that there is a direct relationship between levels of preparedness and the effectiveness of a local authority's response to, and recovery from, an emergency. Whilst there are many strands associated with achieving necessary preparedness, at its heart rests a requirement for officers and councillors to fully understand their respective roles and have the experience, skills and support necessary to exercise them well. Where this is not the case, it is highly-likely that councils will be found wanting at a time when their help is most needed by the communities they serve.

On the above basis, the importance of all councillors investing time and effort in ensuring that they are personally prepared to contribute constructively in the event of a major emergency or other significant crisis occurring cannot be overstated.

In this regard, all Ward councillors should:

- i. **Have a thorough knowledge of the guidance contained in this document on how to exercise their role in practice**
- ii. **Ensure that they keep key guidance on actions to be taken during an emergency response readily available (see Aide Memoire at Appendix 1B)**
- iii. **Be familiar with the guidance in this document for Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and Cabinet members, to assist them in understanding how their political role as Ward councillors might complement the roles undertaken by members of the political executive**
- iv. **Be familiar with the council's key emergency and business continuity plans**
- v. **Attend training courses to ensure they understand their role; and exercises so that they are able to perform it in a simulated environment.**

### 3.2. As a community representative

As community representatives, all Ward councillors have an important part to play in ensuring that local authorities are well prepared to manage emergencies that may impact upon their constituents. Where Ward councillors are also members of formal scrutiny committees with a remit covering civil resilience, their role in this regard broadens to encompass risks to which constituents anywhere in the borough are exposed.

In order to discharge this aspect of their role effectively, Ward councillors should:

- i. **Support the development of policy that meets the needs of communities they represent.** This involves councillors engaging with local communities to build a detailed picture of community risk by, for example, understanding and mapping vulnerabilities. This local intelligence can then be combined with risk analysis work being undertaken centrally by emergency planning professionals to build a really rich community risk profile, which can then inform subsequent civil resilience policy decisions and associated planning activity. In order to exert influence in this way, Ward councillors will need to engage with members of the emergency planning teams in their local authorities, as well as the Cabinet member with portfolio responsibility for civil resilience preparedness.
- ii. **Secure assurance that plans to manage major emergencies and other significant crises that could impact upon the communities they represent are comprehensive, robust and subject to testing and periodic review.** This aspect of a Ward councillor's role can be achieved by requesting and reviewing information available via the local authority's website, intranet and emergency planning team. Alternatively, it might involve them engaging in formal scrutiny of a local authority's preparedness, as a scrutiny committee member. In this regard, Scrutiny committee members should periodically examine the performance that their authority is achieving against the Resilience Standards for London. The Local Government Association has also prepared a set of questions that local Ward councillors and scrutiny committee members may



wish to ask, when seeking assurance in connection with emergency preparedness (see Appendix 3 of [A councillor's guide to civil emergencies](#)).

### 3.3. As a community leader

As community leaders, Ward councillors have an excellent opportunity to reinforce their position as the 'trusted face of the council' by working with residents and business owners to ensure they are well prepared for emergencies – with a particular focus on collaboratively building community resilience. The value of councillors 'banking' trust in this way when preparing for emergencies will really come to the fore in the event of a major incident occurring. In these circumstances, a trusted Ward councillor becomes huge community leadership asset – both to those impacted by the emergency and to the council they represent.

In order to collaboratively build community resilience in their role as leaders of local places, Ward councillors should:

- i. Share information with local residents and businesses about the risks in their area.**  
Ward councillors can assist in this regard by sharing with their constituents, details of risk profiling work that has been undertaken by emergency planning officers within their own local authorities, as well as by the multi-agency Borough Resilience Forum.
- ii. Actively engage in the process of understanding and mapping risk in the community and pass on associated details to council officers.** Beyond sharing details of risk-profiling work being undertaken centrally, Ward councillors are uniquely placed to gather and map further, detailed risk information by engaging with residents, community groups, voluntary sector organisations and businesses. By gathering such information and passing it on to officer colleagues, Ward councillors will help to build a really rich picture of community risk that can be used to inform subsequent emergency response and recovery planning activity.
- iii. Explain the civil resilience role of the council and its partner agencies and, in doing so, manage expectations and promote self-resilience within the community.**  
Having worked with their constituents and officers to build a detailed picture of risk in the area, Ward councillors should share details of the role that the council and its partner agencies have in managing it. In this regard, they should work alongside council officer colleagues and local representatives of the partner agencies in question to share and explain emergency plans. This will help local people to understand details of the response to emergencies that will be provided. It will also help to set reasonable expectations and, in doing so, create an opportunity for Ward councillors to introduce and promote the concept of building community resilience, i.e. what local communities can do themselves to supplement the response to, and recovery from, emergencies provided by statutory agencies.
- iv. Use local knowledge to identify and engage individuals and groups who can play a role in preparedness, response and/or recovery and, where appropriate, provide associated details to council officers.** Ward councillors can use their local knowledge

and connections to identify community 'assets' of the sort that are central to the process of building community resilience. By identifying and engaging with individuals, social networks and community groups that could play a role in preparedness, response and/or recovery, Ward councillors can act as convenors in unlocking and combining local resources to help manage risk. As with community risk information, councillors should share details of these community 'assets' with officer colleagues.

- v. **Promote, encourage and play an active part in the preparation of community plans.** Having worked alongside their constituents with the support of officers to assess risk in the area and identify local assets with the potential to help manage it, community resilience activity then needs to focus on preparing community plans. Local Ward councillors should seek support from officer colleagues in the development of these plans. HM Government has also published a range of practical guidance on [preparing for emergencies](#) that will be helpful to councillors and the community groups with which they are working.

#### 4. WARD COUNCILLOR'S ROLE IN THE RESPONSE PHASE

The role of Ward councillors is critical when an area is significantly impacted by an emergency. If they have invested necessary time and effort in working with local communities to ensure preparedness, Ward councillors will be seen as the trusted face of the council. In this capacity, they will be able to legitimately and effectively represent their constituents throughout the response phase. They will also be well placed to provide community leadership on behalf of the council and, in doing so, ensure that those they represent receive the information, reassurance and empathy they will expect from the council, whilst officers focus on the operational aspects of the response effort.

##### 4.1. As a community representative

As representatives of communities during the response phase, Ward councillors should:

- i. **Be present locally to identify the needs of individuals and the wider community and feed them in to the appropriate response organisation via council officers.** The most important role for local councillors in the event of an emergency is to be out-and-about in their communities. By directly engaging with constituents in this way, not only will they demonstrate a physical council presence, they will also be able to identify the needs of individuals, families and businesses, as well as maintaining a direct sense of the 'mood' in the community. Details of this intelligence can then be fed-in to appropriate response organisations via council officers.
- ii. **Confirm the reliability of information before passing it on.** During an emergency response, Ward councillors are likely to receive a huge amount of information from various sources, including social media. In order to add value and avoid the risk of

becoming seen as a source of unreliable information, Ward councillors must attempt to verify the authenticity of material communicated to them before passing it on.

**iii. Avoid attempting to get involved in the operational response to an emergency.**

Ward councillors must keep in mind that, as with the delivery of services during business-as-usual, the elected member role is not to be involved in operational activities. This principle is more important than ever when an emergency is being dealt with, as those with operational command responsibility must have had the professional training and development required to ensure necessary operational competence. Furthermore, operational activities can be hazardous. As a result, the geographical area within which an emergency response is taking place will often be cordoned-off by emergency services personnel. This is for good reason, as those entering will need to have received appropriate training in safe systems of work and will also, frequently, need to be wearing appropriate personal protective equipment. Councillors should not, therefore, attempt to cross access-controlled cordons.

**iv. Avoid attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of the emergency response.**

Although Ward councillors have a clear, important and entirely legitimate role in reviewing and scrutinising the council's corporate response after an incident, they should resist any temptation to make judgements in this regard during the response phase itself. In particular, actions that may be perceived as seeking political advantage should be avoided.

- v. Maintain a record of significant experiences and actions for use in subsequent debriefs, scrutiny activity and official inquiries etc.** After an emergency, attention will turn to examining the effectiveness of the response. This is important as it provides an opportunity to identify examples of what went well, as well as examining aspects of the emergency response that could have been better. Post-incident analysis can take many forms, including operational debriefs, formal reviews by scrutiny committees, Coroner's Inquests, independent external reviews and Public Inquiries. It is likely that Ward councillors will be asked to contribute details of their involvement in the response to one or more of these post-incident reviews. Consequently, and on the basis that they may be asked to provide an account some time after the incident, it is advisable for councillors to maintain a written record of significant actions and events in which they are involved, or witness, during the response phase.

#### **4.2. As a community leader**

In their role as community leaders during the response phase, Ward councillors should:

- i. Be a visible, trusted and reassuring presence in the community.** Again, the most important role for local councillors during an emergency response is to be out-and-about in their communities. As trusted community leaders representing the council, they can provide personal support and reassurance to residents, and calm emerging tensions at a time when emotions are likely to be running high. It is important that officers are aware of a councillor's involvement when they are providing such support

so that they can receive necessary briefings and other relevant information. On that basis, councillors should contact their council's on-scene Local Authority Liaison Officer (LALO) to advise them of the nature of community support they intend to provide.

- ii. Communicate key messages and reliable information to the public and media on behalf of the council.** As trusted community leaders, Ward councillors will, by default, be seen as a source of important information. This makes them a potentially valuable asset to local communities, the media, and to the council as a conduit through which key messages and other information can be passed. The importance of ensuring that any information communicated by Ward councillors is accurate and reliable cannot be overemphasised. Communicating inaccurate or unreliable information – particularly where it builds expectations that are subsequently not met – is a recipe for rapidly losing the trust of those receiving the information and causing damage to personal and corporate reputations. It is also likely to cause unnecessary anxiety and unrest, which can negatively impact on the response effort. Unfortunately, reliable information about what is happening on-the-ground – particularly in the fast-moving early stages of an emergency response – can be in short supply. It can also be difficult to provide such information when the nature of an incident means that associated details are sensitive for security reasons, for example. Even under these circumstances, however, communicating generic messages of reassurance or confirmation that 'there is no more news at this stage' can enable Ward councillors to say something helpful, at a time when they may be under significant pressure to explain what's going on.
- iii. Signpost members of the public and businesses towards the right agency to get the support they need.** Unlike many of their constituents, Ward councillors will understand how the public sector 'system' operates, and also have direct access to advice in this regard from officer colleagues. That being the case, they are well placed to signpost members of the public and businesses towards organisations that are able to provide necessary support and assistance.
- iv. Provide support and encouragement to council staff and others involved in the response effort.** When out in their communities during the response phase, Ward councillors will have the opportunity to thank and encourage council staff and others involved in the front-line response effort. The positive effect of providing people who are likely to be working under very difficult circumstances with a 'pat on the back' should not be underestimated and will send a clear message that the council is grateful for what they are doing.

## **5. WARD COUNCILLOR'S ROLE IN THE RECOVERY PHASE**

Whilst, mirroring the response phase, operational aspects of recovery will be dealt with by officers, as community representatives and leaders of local places, Ward councillors for affected communities have an important political role to play in supporting the recovery operation.

Recovery is often a complex and resource-intensive process, which can continue for many years. In fact, for some emergencies, there is a need to be cautious with the use of the word ‘recovery’, as some people will never fully recover from the physical or emotional trauma of having been impacted by a terrorist attack or other, similarly-catastrophic event. However, it should also be recognised that, when done well, recovery can realise opportunities to improve local places – both in terms of infrastructure, and by building better networked, stronger and more resilient communities.

#### 5.1 As a community representative

In their role as community representatives during recovery, Ward councillors should:

- i. **Listen to, and advocate on behalf of, the community to ensure that their needs and aspirations inform and influence details of the recovery process.** Whilst it is important for a strategic view to be taken when embarking on programme of recovery following a major emergency, it is equally important that the needs and aspirations of those who live and work in the affected communities are taken into account. In this respect, Ward councillors need to ensure that the interests and views of their constituents are well represented and influence high-level decisions associated with the recovery process.
- ii. **Help assess the extent to which business-as-usual frontline services are continuing to be delivered in parallel with the recovery operation.** Due to the significant resourcing demands of major recovery operations – often over long periods of time – they generate a risk to the delivery of business-as-usual frontline services in councils. Whilst business continuity plans should be deployed to manage such risks, Ward councillors can help monitor the service delivery experience of their constituents, to help confirm that the plans in question are effective.
- iii. **Be proactive in the process of ensuring that all available lessons are compiled, shared with others and acted upon.** All major emergencies and other crises provide opportunities for learning. In order to help ensure that all available lessons – both positive and negative – are captured, shared with others and acted upon, Ward councillors should be proactive in providing details of their experience of having been involved in the response phase. They may also have a formal role in this regard, if they are members of scrutiny committees with a remit covering civil resilience.

#### 5.2. As a community leader

In their role as community leaders during the recovery phase, Ward councillors should:

- i. **Continue to be a visible, trusted and reassuring presence in the community.** Throughout the recovery process, Ward councillors should position themselves as trusted and caring representatives of their local authority, providing personal support and reassurance to their constituents.

- ii. **Communicate key messages and information to the public and media on behalf of the council.** During the extended period over which recovery operations take place, it is important for local people to receive regular updates on progress, so they feel that they are being kept in-the-loop. Ward councillors can be a conduit through which such information can flow and can also communicate key messages to the media.
- iii. **Use local knowledge to provide information on local resources, skills and other assets to the council and relevant recovery groups, including local community groups.** If community response plans have been developed as part of preparedness activity, details of some local community groups with a role to play in recovery will already be known. However, in the aftermath of emergencies, it is very common for other individuals and groups to put themselves forward to assist. Ward councillors are well placed to use their local knowledge and contacts to identify such volunteers and, having done so, pass on their details to relevant statutory agencies or existing community groups.
- iv. **Participating in community self-help groups that may be set up to support those affected in the community.** Ward councillors should encourage, and make themselves available to participate in, self-help groups that may organically emerge in the aftermath of a major emergency.
- v. **Provide support and encouragement to council staff and others involved in the ongoing recovery effort.** Council officers and their colleagues from partner agencies may need to 'go the extra mile' for some time during a recovery operation. Personal words of support and encouragement from councillors will be at least as important during this period – long after the emergency services and media have left – as they were during the response phase.
- vi. **Attending memorial or remembrance services, as appropriate.** In the aftermath of major emergencies that result in a loss of life, it is very likely that the loved-ones of those who have perished, and members of local communities, will want to come together for services of remembrance, in order to pay their respects. It will be important for Ward councillors to make themselves available to attend such events on behalf of the council and as a member of the community themselves.

### AIDE MEMOIRE FOR WARD COUNCILLORS DURING RESPONSE

During the emergency response phase, Ward councillors should:

#### As community leaders

- Be a visible, trusted and reassuring presence in the community
- Advise the Local Authority Liaison Officer (LALO) when providing direct support to communities, so that officers are aware of your involvement and can arrange necessary briefings etc
- Communicate key messages and reliable information to the public and media on behalf of the council.
- Signpost members of the public and businesses towards the right agency to get the support they need.
- Provide support and encouragement to council staff and others involved in the response effort.

#### As community representatives

- Be present locally to identify the needs of individuals and the wider community and feed them in to the appropriate response organisation via council officers
- Confirm the reliability of information before passing it on.
- Avoid attempting to get involved in the operational response to the emergency and do not cross access-controlled cordons
- Avoid attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of the emergency response.
- Maintain a record of significant experiences and actions for use in subsequent debriefs, scrutiny activity and official inquiries etc.

## FURTHER READING

4. [A councillor's guide to civil resilience](#) – **Local Government Association**. This is a generic guide for councillors in all roles, which also signposts readers to useful reference documents in Appendix 4.
5. [Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: A good practice guide for Chief Executives](#) – **Solace and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government**. A guide that sets out the types of issues local authorities should consider in order to be fully prepared to respond to a civil emergency. Whilst primarily written for Chief Executives, the guide is also considered to be a useful resource for councillors.
6. [The life cycle of an emergency: learning from recent experience](#) – **Solace and Local Government Association**. Detailed case studies of the Manchester Arena bomb attack and a wide area flooding event in Suffolk – examined during the different stages of the integrated emergency management cycle, i.e. preparedness, response and recovery
7. **Resilience Standards for London**.



# Addendum

## Guidance for officers on supporting councillors to fulfil their civil resilience roles

<b>1. Purpose of officer guidance.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>2. Introduction.....</b>	<b>32</b>
3. Structure and application of the guidance	
3.1. Structure.....	32
3.2. Application.....	33
<b>4. Part A – Supporting Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet members</b>	
4.1. Officer support in ensuring necessary preparedness.....	33
4.2. Officer support in the response phase.....	34
4.3. Officer support in the recovery phase.....	34
<b>5. Part B – Supporting Ward councillors</b>	
5.1. Officer support in ensuring necessary preparedness.....	36
5.2. Officer support in the response phase.....	37
5.3. Officer support in the recovery phase.....	37
<b>6. Further reading.....</b>	<b>38</b>

## 1. PURPOSE OF OFFICER GUIDANCE

The purpose of this document is to provide generic guidance to London local authority officers on supporting councillors to fulfil their agreed roles in civil resilience effectively.

The guidance has been intentionally written in high-level, generic terms to allow necessary flexibility in its practical application, so that particular circumstances within individual local authorities can be taken into consideration. In tailoring the guidance to local circumstances, it is important for officers to keep the overall objective in mind on which the guidance is focused, i.e. ensuring that all councillors in London local authorities have the support they need to exercise their roles effectively in preparing for, responding to and recovering major emergencies and other significant crises.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

Whilst all operational responsibilities associated with civil resilience will be assigned to officers, councillors in London local authorities have a key political role to play in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from major emergencies, as well as confirming that appropriate business continuity arrangements are in place. Their contribution in this regard must not overlap with, but should be complementary to, the operational role of their officer colleagues.

The important role that councillors have in civil resilience is reflected in the Resilience Standards for London. The Standards set a clear expectation that political leaders and Ward councillors will have clearly defined roles and responsibilities in relation to civil resilience. They also state that support arrangements should be put in place to enable councillors to fulfil their defined roles effectively.

Councillors' ability to follow the guidance will be substantially dependent on necessary support arrangements being put in place by officers. Hence, this guidance has been introduced to assist officers in the process of making certain that their councillor colleagues are getting the information, training and development they require to understand, and acquire the skills necessary for, their roles in civil resilience. It also focuses on the day-to-day support that councillors will need from officers when actually undertaking their roles in preparedness, response and recovery.

## 3. STRUCTURE AND APPLICATION OF GUIDANCE

### 3.1. Structure

The guidance contained in this document is divided into two main parts - Part A is focused on the provision of support to Leaders/Directly-elected Mayors and other Cabinet Members **(collectively referred to as 'Leading Members')**, with Part B addressing the support

requirements of local Ward councillors. Both Parts are subdivided into sections dealing with preparedness, response and recovery.

Within Parts A and B, the document is structured to mirror that of guidance prepared for Leading Members and Ward councillors on their respective roles in civil resilience. The rationale for taking this approach is to clearly align guidance for councillors on exercising their roles, with guidance for officers on supporting and enabling them to do so.

### **3.2. Application**

In applying the guidance, Chief Executives should assign lead responsibility for its implementation to a designated member of their senior leadership team. Doing so will demonstrate a clear corporate commitment to ensuring that councillors get the support they need in their roles associated with civil resilience.

The guidance itself has been written in high-level, generic terms to allow necessary flexibility in its application across the 33 London local authorities. Rather than being prescriptive, it is intended to signpost officers to key issues that need to be addressed, in order that councillors are enabled to fulfil their roles effectively. The detailed solutions arrived at through this process need to fit with organisational context, whilst, at the same time, supporting councillors to operate in accordance with agreed good practice for elected members in London local authorities. With that in mind, the starting point for applying this guidance should involve officers reviewing the guidance that has been prepared for councillors.

## **4. PART A – SUPPORTING LEADING MEMBERS**

The guidance contained this section of the document should be applied such that Leading Members are able to follow the good practice set out in the Part 1 of this Handbook.

### **4.1. Officer support in ensuring necessary preparedness**

#### **Supporting Personal Preparedness of Leading Members**

In order to support Leading Members to be personally prepared to fulfil their agreed roles during the response to, and recovery from, major emergencies, officers should:

- i. Make guidance associated with the role of councillors in civil resilience readily available to elected members
- ii. Make copies of the local authority's key emergency and business continuity plans readily available to elected members
- iii. Make initial and refresher training courses available, to assist Leading Members to understand their respective roles, and how to exercise them in practice
- iv. Run exercises that enable Leading Members to perform their respective roles in a simulated environment.

#### **Supporting the political leadership role of Leading Members within the council**

In order to support Leading Members to exercise their internal and external political leadership roles in connection with preparedness effectively, officers should:

- i. Assign lead managerial responsibility for civil resilience to a single senior officer
- ii. Put in place arrangements to ensure that Leading Members will be able to contact the Chief Executive/Gold on-call senior officer immediately, in the event of an emergency
- iii. Work with councillor colleagues to put arrangements in place to enable urgent decisions to be taken during an emergency response
- iv. Put in place arrangements for reporting on the performance of the local authority in relation to preparedness – with a particular focus on performance against the Resilience Standards for London.
- v. Support the Leader to engage effectively as a member of the London Leaders' Committee, on issues associated with the individual and collective resilience of London local authorities
- vi. Where requested, support Leaders to put arrangements in place associated with the political role of MPs during response and recovery operations
- vii. Where requested, support Leaders to consider issues associated with the Mayor of London's role during response and recovery operations.

#### **4.2. Officer support in the response phase**

In order to support Leading Members to exercise their internal and external political leadership roles effectively during the response to a major emergency, officers should:

- i. Ensure that effective and resilient arrangements are put in place for regularly briefing Leading Members throughout the response phase
- ii. Ensure that effective and resilient arrangements are put in place to support the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor in their civic leadership role as the 'public face of the council'
- iii. Ensure that effective and resilient arrangements are in place to enable the two-way flow of information between the Cabinet member with lead responsibility for Ward councillor engagement and Ward councillors themselves
- iv. Support Leading Members in expressing their gratitude to council staff involved in the response operation
- v. Support Leading Members to represent the council during visits by VIPs
- vi. Where necessary, provide support to Leading Members in making representations to the Government for financial assistance
- vii. Assign responsibility for initial work associated with recovery to a designated lead officer, who will engage with the Cabinet member appointed by the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor to provide necessary political support.

#### **4.3. Officer support in the recovery phase**

In order to support Leading Members to exercise their internal and external political leadership roles effectively during the recovery from a major emergency, officers should:

- i. Ensure that effective and resilient arrangements remain in place to support the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor in their ongoing civic leadership role as the 'public face of the council'
- ii. Put in place arrangements for reporting progress to Leading Members on the development and delivery of a Recovery Strategy
- iii. Support Leading Members to ensure that regular progress updates are communicated to communities and other stakeholders
- iv. Support Leading Members to ensure that frequent messages on progress are conveyed to staff and councillors
- v. Support Leading Members in communicating key messages to staff and councillors that they should convey on behalf of the council
- vi. Support the Leader/Directly-elected Mayor in establishing protocols for any involvement of external political stakeholders in the recovery operation
- vii. Support Leading Members in making the case for financial assistance to support the recovery operation
- viii. Provide necessary support to the process of establishing and managing any 'disaster funds' set up to collect and distribute charitable donations
- ix. Support Leading Members in attending memorial or remembrance services
- x. Support Leading Members to engage in post-incident reviews, scrutiny, inquests and Public Inquiries

## **5. PART B – SUPPORTING WARD COUNCILLORS**

The guidance contained in this section of the document should be applied such that Ward councillors are able to follow the good practice set out in Part 2 of this Handbook:

### **5.1. Officer support in ensuring necessary preparedness**

#### Supporting Personal Preparedness of Ward councillors

In order to support Ward councillors to be personally prepared to fulfil their agreed roles during the response to, and recovery from, major emergencies, officers should:

- i. Make guidance associated with the role of councillors in civil resilience readily available to elected members
- ii. Make copies of the local authority's key emergency and business continuity plans readily available to elected members
- iii. Make initial and refresher training courses available, to assist Ward councillors to understand their role, and how to exercise it in practice
- iv. Run exercises that enable Ward councillors to perform their role in a simulated environment.

#### Supporting Ward councillors as community representatives

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community representatives in connection with preparedness effectively, officers should:

- i. Provide routes by which Ward councillors can feed-in local intelligence on community risk, to inform civil resilience policy decisions and associated planning activity
- ii. Make plans available to Ward councillors associated with managing risks that may impact upon the communities that they represent

#### Supporting Ward councillors as community leaders

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community leaders in connection with preparedness, officers should:

- i. Develop and communicate details of arrangements that are available to support Ward councillors in developing community resilience
- ii. Provide routes by which Ward councillors can feed-in local knowledge on individuals and groups who could play a part in preparedness, response and/or recovery, to inform central planning activity
- iii. Establish and disseminate details of reliable, resilient and secure communication routes through which information can be passed to-and-from Ward councillors during an emergency response
- iv. Put arrangements in place to ensure that the safety of councillors will be protected when they are providing direct support to communities during an emergency response and through the recovery phase

- v. Put arrangement in place to ensure the personal welfare of councillors when they are providing direct support to communities during an emergency response and through the recovery phase.

## **5.2. Officer support in the response phase**

### Supporting Ward Councillors as community representatives

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community representatives during an emergency response, officers should:

- i. Provide resilient and reliable routes by which Ward councillors can identify the needs of individuals and the wider community and feed them in to the appropriate response organisation/s via council officers

### Supporting Ward Councillors as community leaders

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community leaders during an emergency response, officers should:

- i. Provide details to Ward councillors of locations/facilities, such as rest centres, where they will be able to present as a visible, trusted and reassuring presence for their constituents
- ii. Provide briefings and regular updates on the response operation to Ward councillors, so that they are able to communicate key messages and reliable information to the public and media on behalf of the council
- iii. Ensure that details of welfare support arrangements for councillors are communicated

## **5.3. Officer support in the recovery phase**

### Supporting Ward Councillors as community representatives

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community representatives during the recovery phase, officers should:

- i. Provide routes by which Ward councillors can articulate the needs and aspirations of the communities they represent in ways that are able to inform and influence the recovery process
- ii. Make details of the recovery strategy readily available to Ward councillors, and provide them with regular updates on progress in delivering it
- iii. Provide routes by which Ward councillors can feed-in details of any local impact that is being experienced by their constituents on the delivery of front-line services during the recovery phase
- iv. Support Ward councillors to engage in post-incident reviews, scrutiny, inquests and Public Inquiries, as appropriate

### Supporting Ward Councillors as community leaders

In order to support Ward councillors to exercise their role as community leaders during the recovery phase, officers should:

- i. Provide regular updates to Ward councillors, so that they are able to communicate key message and information to the public and media on behalf of the council
- ii. Provide routes by which Ward councillors can feed-in emerging local knowledge about individuals and groups who may be able to assist with the recovery operation
- iii. Support Ward councillors to participate in the proper administration of funds from any disaster appeals, as necessary
- iv. Support the attendance of Ward councillors at memorial and remembrance services, as necessary.

## 6. FURTHER READING

1. **Resilience Standards for London.**
2. [A councillor's guide to civil resilience](#) – **Local Government Association.** This is a generic guide for councillors in all roles, which also signposts readers to useful reference documents in Appendix 4.
3. [Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: A good practice guide for Chief Executives](#) – **Solace and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.** A guide that sets out the types of issues local authorities should consider in order to be fully prepared to respond to a civil emergency. Whilst primarily written for Chief Executives, the guide is also considered to be a useful resource for councillors.
4. [The life cycle of an emergency: learning from recent experience](#) – **Solace and Local Government Association.** Detailed case studies of the Manchester Arena bomb attack and a wide area flooding event in Suffolk – examined during the different stages of the integrated emergency management cycle, i.e. preparedness, response and recovery



London Councils  
59½ Southwark Street  
London SE1 0AL  
[www.londoncouncils.gov.uk](http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk)

Publication date: Updated May 2019  
Cover image: Photofusion

# Resilience Standards for London Local Government



# Overview

## **Resilience Standards for London**

In January 2018, a review was commissioned by the City of London Corporation on behalf of the Local Authorities' Panel. The objective of the review was to recommend the means by which London local government, comprising the thirty-two boroughs and the City of London Corporation, can individually and collectively assure their organisation's preparedness, particularly their capacity and capability, through a credible, transparent, efficient and cost-effective approach. The review set out a broad framework that supports a blended approach to assurance and contained fifteen recommendations including the development of new resilience standards for London local government. On 18<sup>th</sup> April 2018, the Local Authorities' Panel endorsed the review report and the recommended assurance framework.

The previous standards used were the Minimum Standards for London (MSL), which were introduced in 2007. The MSL comprised sixteen standards designed to ensure that all local authorities had the appropriate procedures and policies in place to support the London Local Authority Gold (LLAG) arrangements.

The following draft Resilience Standards for London are significantly different to the Minimum Standards for London and provide a very different approach to assurance. The standards are designed to lead to good outcomes and leading practice whilst supporting compliance with the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 establishes a clear set of roles and responsibilities for local responders; gives greater structure and consistency to local civil protection activity and establishes a sound basis for performance management at a local level. Local authorities are designated as Category 1 responders and are at the core of emergency response and recovery arrangements. Category 1 responders are subject to the full set of civil protection duties.

The content within each standard has been drawn from national government guidance and legislation, LGA guidance, London specific guidance and other publications and reports; examples include relevant British Standards and the Kerslake report.

## Using the standards

The standards should be seen as part of a broader assurance framework for a council, with the aim of continually improving performance across its emergency planning and resilience activities. The standards have been designed, with a council focus, to lead to good outcomes and possible leading practice, if they are embedded and used across an organisation; they are not a guarantee of assurance.

In designing the standards, it has been assumed the Corporate Leadership Team, or equivalent, will be the accountable body and that Services and departments will be responsible for the resilience arrangements in their respective areas. Emergency planning teams will continue to provide expertise, advice and guidance.

Assessing your organisation against the standards should not be seen as a bolt-on activity conducted once a year by the emergency planning team. It is intended for the appropriate Service, department or team to take ownership of the standard most relevant to them. You should be able to assess or measure progress against any standard (or part of it) at any time of the year as part of your business as usual arrangements.

The standards have been developed to support continuous improvement and assurance within a council. They should not lead to a duplication of work or activity within a council. There should be no need to create additional policies, procedures, processes or documents where these already exist. For example, it is not necessary to create an additional risk register when one is already in place.

The standards are designed to be progressive; continually improving performance by 'raising the bar' through review and evaluation of the standards. In time, leading practice could become good practice and new, more challenging leading practices introduced. It is not expected that every council will identify leading practice, however, where it is identified it is assumed the practice will be shared with other councils.

Each standard contains a 'Descriptor' (developing, established and advanced). The descriptor provides a framework for the council to reach a view on its current level of performance, based on the evidence. These are intended as food for thought and to promote honest consideration of how developed a council's approach is.

**It is not intended that the descriptor is used as a judgement.**

There is some duplication within the standards and this is intentional, particularly where it is important to emphasise a specific activity such as 'training'. As previously stated, the standards have been designed to be distributed across the council and each standard can be used as a stand-alone document and built into a Directorate or team's work programme.

## Item 5 - Appendix C

The standards do not replicate or replace existing legislation, guidance or other standards. They do, however, complement the National Resilience Standards produced for use by Local Resilience Forums, by the Cabinet Office.

Each standard contains links to further information and guidance which is seen as the most relevant information available. There may be other reference material an organisation would like to refer to.

In completing a self-assessment using the standards, councils should consider the impact of their activities in terms of performance, benefits to the community and outcomes for the organisation. The self-assessment should be conducted in a spirit of genuine challenge and awareness.

The process is not intended to be burdensome and should make use of evidence readily available, whether that is evidence of strategy, performance data or case study type examples of interesting or leading practice.

Undertaking a self-assessment against the complete set of standards is recommended at least every three years and is a prerequisite for authorities wishing to undertake a peer challenge.

The sub-regional groups should continue, to provide an annual challenge session, assess progress and to share experience and leading practice,

# Key assessment areas

## RISK ASSESSMENT

### Resilience Standard for London #1

Desired Outcome
The council has a robust and collectively understood assessment of the most significant risks to the local area, based on how likely they are to happen and what their impacts might be. This information is used to inform a range of risk management decisions, including the development of proportionate emergency plans and preparations.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<p>The Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) and accompanying regulations place a statutory obligation on all Category 1 responders to “from time to time assess the risk of an emergency occurring”. <a href="#">CCA 2004 Part 1, Section 2 (1)(a) duty</a>. See also <a href="#">CCA 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 3</a>.</p> <p>In addition, under the CCA 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 3, Section 18, a Category 1 responder must consider whether it is appropriate to share risk assessment information with another Category 1 responder in order to support and inform their risk management decisions.</p>
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Undertake a local risk assessment, with reference to the National Risk Assessment, at least as regularly as new national assessments (every two years) or when associated guidance is issued.</li> <li>b. There is an up to date risk register that fully reflects the council’s foreseeable risks. It is sufficiently detailed and comprehensive, written in plain English and understandable to the general public. It is readily available to the public.</li> <li>c. The risk register contains specific local risks that may only require a response from the council or partners within the borough. It is not just a copy of the London risk register but should have regard to it.</li> <li>d. Consider the common consequences of identified risks (for example mass casualties, people requiring evacuation or shelter, loss of an essential service, environment and the economy) to inform generic and flexible emergency plans.</li> <li>e. The council is conducting active horizon scanning for new risks and is regularly updating its risk register accordingly.</li> <li>f. The diverse nature of the community is understood, the council consults and engages with the community as part of its approach to community risk.</li> <li>g. Processes are in place to update risk assessments following any major event or exercise to consider lessons learned about the impacts of that event.</li> <li>h. The risk assessment considers the impact on local people, visitors and businesses.</li> <li>i. The council, with partners on the Borough Resilience Forum, are working together to deliver against the National Resilience Standards produced by the Cabinet Office for Local Resilience Forums.</li> </ul>

How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>i. Takes account of “out of area” hazards including across council and regional boundaries, which could affect the organisation and its locality.</p> <p>j. Risk assessment information is shared with neighbouring authorities with similar risk profiles in order to collectively improve understanding of risk impacts.</p> <p>k. Captures information about the impact of simultaneous events and the effect on the local area.</p> <p>l. A risk assessment for major incidents considers the impact on mental health to adults, children and young people, families and council responders.</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Risk Assessment (most recent edition at time of consultation is the 2016 NRA) available on <a href="#">Resilience Direct</a>.</li> <li><a href="#">London Risk Register 2019</a></li> <li>Local Risk Management Guidance (available on <a href="#">Resilience Direct</a>)</li> <li><a href="#">Emergency preparedness</a>: Chapter 4 – local responder risk assessment (2012)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British, European and International Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">BS ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management - Guidelines</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Other recommended points of reference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Business Resilience Planning Assumptions</a> (a publicly available example of how common consequence information is collated and conveyed)</li> </ul>		
Descriptor		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>The council is developing risk analysis processes to become more effective.</p> <p>The council is building up knowledge and understanding of its community and priorities.</p>	<p>A risk analysis process is in place and the council is well aware of the different risk groups representing the diversity within the local area.</p> <p>The council has regard to statutory responsibilities and national guidance but does not extend its process to reflect local circumstances. Leaders understand the nature of community risk.</p>	<p>A well informed and developed risk analysis process exists and the council is very aware of the diversity in the local area and takes active steps to inform itself about the distinctive needs and opportunities. It engages in discussion with the local community about community risk. Statutory guidance is fully implemented and is extended in a coherent way to reflect local circumstances.</p>

## GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS – POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

### Resilience Standard for London #2

Desired Outcome
A council that operates with effective political governance which enables the organisation to meet their duties under the Civil Contingencies Act, and to achieve local resilience objectives.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
The Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) establishes the legislative framework for Category 1 responders, which includes London Borough Councils and the City of London. Further detail is set out in: <a href="#">Contingency Planning, Duty to Assess, Plan and Advise</a> (Section 2); Advice and Assistance to the Public (Section 4); and General Measures (Section 5). <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> provides guidance on part 1 of the CCA and its associated regulations and non-statutory arrangements. <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> sets out guiding principles for emergency response and recovery (Section 2.2) and defines roles and responsibilities (Section 5.2).
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Define roles and responsibilities for political leaders and ward councillors, which is supported through induction, training and development and exercises.</li> <li>b. Make key policy decisions and consider recommendations from senior officers prior to, during or following a civil emergency.</li> <li>c. Discuss with the Chief Executive and senior officers the main risks to communities so key actions can be promoted and supported, which will increase resilience.</li> <li>d. The council has appropriate arrangements in place to enable political scrutiny of emergency planning and resilience arrangements.</li> <li>e. Elected Members assure themselves that the council has the staff resources, to not only support the response and recovery, but also maintain the delivery of front line services.</li> <li>f. Arrangements are in place for scaling up staff resources including mutual aid arrangements.</li> <li>g. Support the work of the Borough Resilience Forum (BRF) in planning for emergencies and helping them to be aware of the particular needs of discrete groups and issues within communities.</li> <li>h. Seek assurance that the council not only has developed sufficient plans in conjunction with partners on the BRF, but also tests those plans and trains personnel by participating in regular exercises.</li> <li>i. Elected Members are assured that lessons from incidents and exercises are identified, addressed and shared with appropriate partners and the community.</li> <li>j. Councillors, including ward councillors, are encouraged to participate in training and exercises so they are prepared to respond to an emergency and get involved in the recovery from it.</li> <li>k. Explore with the Chief Executive and senior officers whether contracts with suppliers include clear provisions requiring comprehensive plans for continuing service provision in the event of a civil emergency and for assisting with the response to and recovery from an emergency as appropriate.</li> </ul>



l. Elected Members identify and feedback problems and vulnerabilities in their community that may require priority attention to the relevant service or group, e.g. Recovery Coordinating Group.		
How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>m. A policy framework has been developed and published, signed off by the Leader or directly elected Mayor, Portfolio Holder and Chief Executive setting out the council's statutory duties, responsibilities and expectations for the public in the event of a civil emergency.</p> <p>n. Engage with Government departments, agencies and other authorities to shape national policy development and other initiatives that build more resilient communities.</p> <p>o. The council is conducting active horizon scanning for new risks and working with the BRF to regularly update the risk register.</p> <p>p. Arrangements have been made to enable close working with other local authorities in the event of an emergency (e.g. information sharing, shared communications plan, joint spokespeople, pooling resources, etc).</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emergency Preparedness (2011-12)</li> <li>Emergency Response and Recovery (2013)</li> <li>Central Government's Concept of Operations (2013)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British, European and International Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BSI 13500: 2014 Code of practice for delivering effective governance of organisations, British Standards Institution</li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting guidance and statements of good practice from professional authorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Councillor's Guide to Civil Emergencies (Local Government Association, 2018)</li> <li>Delivering Good Governance in Local Government, CIPFA (SOLACE) (2016)</li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>The council is developing Governance processes to become more effective.</p> <p>The council is planning to or beginning to implement scrutiny and oversight arrangements. Members have limited input into preparedness and recovery arrangements including exercises.</p> <p>There is limited or no engagement with the Borough Resilience Forum.</p>	<p>Governance processes are in place and the council is well aware of its statutory responsibilities and associated national guidance.</p> <p>The council engages with the BRF and its partners, identifies community priorities and feeds this back into the BRF and the organisation. The council shares lessons learned from incidents and exercises with its partners.</p> <p>Elected Members, including Ward councillors are involved in training and exercises.</p>	<p>Governance processes are well developed and emergency planning and resilience is frequently discussed at the appropriate committees. Discussions are conducted in public and include preparedness, response and recovery arrangements for a civil emergency.</p> <p>The council engages and collaborates with its community, with government departments and across borough borders. Challenging the status quo and horizon scanning is the norm.</p>

## GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS – MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP

### Resilience Standard for London #3

Desired Outcome
A council that operates with managerial leadership that drives the emergency planning and resilience agenda across the organisation. The organisation meets their duties under the Civil Contingencies Act and achieves local resilience objectives.
Summary of duties (mandatory requirements)
The Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) establishes the legislative framework for Category 1 responders, which includes London Borough Councils and the City of London. Further detail is set out in: <a href="#">Contingency Planning, Duty to Assess, Plan and Advise (Section 2)</a> ; Advice and Assistance to the Public (Section 4); and General Measures (Section 5). <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> provides guidance on part 1 of the CCA and its associated regulations and non-statutory arrangements. <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> sets out guiding principles for emergency response and recovery (Section 2.2) and defines roles and responsibilities (Section 5.2).
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chief Executives and senior managers support Members in their emergency planning and resilience role and through all phases of a civil emergency. This support includes the ability to communicate with the public and media.</li> <li>b. Organisational resilience and emergency planning are driven from the corporate team, owned across the organisation and fully embedded in service areas.</li> <li>c. An emergency planning and resilience function that is appropriately funded through an agreed staffing model, which enables it to support the strategy, work programme and wider organisation.</li> <li>d. An agreed and resourced training programme for the managerial leadership across the organisation to support emergency planning and resilience objectives.</li> <li>e. Inclusive, flexible and effective engagement at appropriate levels with Category 1 responder organisations, the business and voluntary sectors, neighbouring authorities and other stakeholders whose support and participation is necessary to achieve the organisation's objectives.</li> <li>f. The ability to authorise, activate and verify the support available through the London Local Authority Gold arrangements and mutual aid protocol.</li> <li>g. A clearly defined process to determine the required levels of security clearance to enable information sharing in preparedness, response and recovery.</li> <li>h. Arrangements for sharing and reviewing the activities which may be recognised as good or leading practice.</li> <li>i. Arrangements to proactively, and in a timely manner, identify, implement and share lessons following major incidents and exercises with the wider resilience community.</li> </ul>

How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>j. Proactive engagement across council, regional and national boundaries as appropriate, to plan jointly for emergencies, share relevant information, train and exercise, hold joint development workshops and develop mutual aid arrangements.</p> <p>k. Continuously improve, through commissioning peer reviews or other means of independent validation of capabilities and emergency readiness.</p> <p>l. Extend the leadership focus and influence beyond the usual partnership boundaries to engage with related agendas, which may include security, safety, sustainability, social cohesion, and engagement within wider national and international resilience initiatives.</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness (2011-12)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery (2013)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Central Government's Concept of Operations (2013)</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Thematic multi-agency guidance from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The role of Local Resilience Forums: A reference document (2013)</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British, European and International Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">BSI 13500: 2014 Code of practice for delivering effective governance of organisations</a>, British Standards Institution</li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting guidance and statements of good practice from professional authorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Delivering Good Governance in Local Government, CIPFA (SOLACE) (2016)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: a good practice guide for Chief Executives Solace and MHCLG (2018)</a></li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>The Corporate Leadership team are interested and engaged with the emergency planning agenda. The engagement across other management levels is sporadic with an ongoing reliance on a limited number of key people.</p> <p>Limited involvement in exercises and training across the organisation. Emergency planning and resilience is seen as a responsibility that rests with the Emergency planning team.</p>	<p>The Corporate Leadership team promotes a culture of 'emergency planning and resilience' is everyone's business. This philosophy is embedded across the organisation; managers at all levels encourage this within their teams.</p> <p>Managers across the organisation are involved in training and exercises and ensure lessons identified, through exercises and incidents, are implemented and shared with partners.</p>	<p>Emergency planning and resilience is embedded across the organisation and managers at all levels are proactive in seeking further and continuous improvement.</p> <p>The organisation engages and collaborates with its community, partners, with government departments and across borough borders. Challenging the status quo and horizon scanning is the norm.</p>

## CULTURE – ORGANISATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

### Resilience Standard for London #4

Desired Outcome
The council has a positive culture towards Emergency Planning and resilience which is embedded and seen as ‘everyone’s business’. Capacity and resilience are developed across the organisation ensuring the responsibility of plans and decision making is at the appropriate level, building experience and knowledge across the organisation.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<a href="#">The Public Sector Equality Duty: Equality Act 2010</a> places a duty on public bodies and others carrying out public functions. It ensures that public bodies consider the needs of all individuals in shaping policy, in delivering services, and in relation to their own employees. It encourages public bodies to understand how different people will be affected by their activities so that policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs.
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Strategic and operational responsibilities support the council to become more resilient.</li> <li>b. The organisational culture is sufficiently open and transparent to allow critical risks that are recognised at low level to be escalated appropriately and that senior leaders and managers pass relevant information down to the appropriate level in a timely manner.</li> <li>c. Emergency Planning and Resilience is promoted across the organisation and is seen as everyone’s business.</li> <li>d. Those who are responsible for delivering greater organisational resilience are empowered to work across organisational boundaries and are able to speak to top management easily.</li> <li>e. Directors and Heads of Service take ownership of their own business continuity plans and understand their role in preparing for, responding to and recovering from a civil emergency. This approach complements and supports the core role of the emergency planning team.</li> <li>f. Staff are involved in emergency response roles from across the organisation and there is regular and effective internal staff communications.</li> <li>g. There is active engagement in local, sub-regional and regional Emergency Planning activities (e.g. Borough Resilience Forum, Sub-Regional Group and LAP, CELC and Leader’s Committee)</li> <li>h. The same priority is given to ‘recovery’ as the ‘preparedness’ and ‘response’ phases of an emergency.</li> <li>i. Commissioning of public services include a requirement that organisations tendering for contracts meet the council’s resilience requirements and that providers share information and data on the impact of disruptions such as severe weather or industrial action.</li> <li>j. Projects, contracts, initiatives and other organisational changes and developments always account for resilience to ensure that these enhance and do not weaken capability.</li> <li>k. Communications teams should have a role at the heart of emergency planning and resilience.</li> <li>l. Teams actively build strong networks across their own organisation, with other authorities’ teams and with outside organisations such as other Category 1 responders as well as community groups.</li> </ul>

- m. Core teams, including the Communications team are involved in training and exercising, particularly where elected Members are involved.
- n. Continuously improve through sub-regional challenge sessions, commissioning peer reviews or other means of independent validation of capabilities and emergency readiness.

#### How to achieve leading practice in this area

- o. There is a positive HR culture for resilience, including consideration for succession planning.
- p. Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Planning requirements, which are proportionate and role-appropriate, are contained within job descriptions, individual appraisals. Job descriptions include the expectations that, where available, staff will support the council and their community during times of emergency outside normal working hours.
- q. Communications teams, as well as those engaged in mutual aid arrangements, support each other during a multi-borough event through pooling or sharing resources.
- r. Focus and influence beyond its usual partnership boundaries to engage with related agendas, which may include security, safety, sustainability, social cohesion, and engagement within wider national and international resilience initiatives.
- s. Engage the community through public discussions at council committees on the council's capabilities and performance. Publish peer review reports and action plans to support continuous improvement.

#### Guidance and supporting documentation

##### **Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government**

- [The Public Sector Equality Duty: Equality Act 2010](#)

##### **Recommended points of reference**

- [Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: a good practice guide for Chief Executives Solace and MHCLG \(2018\)](#)
- An assurance framework for London Local Government: providing individual and collective assurance (Sean Ruth 2018)

#### Descriptors

Developing	Established	Advanced
Engagement across the organisation is limited or developing, with an ongoing reliance on a limited number of key people.	There is a culture of 'emergency planning and resilience' is everyone's business. This philosophy is embedded across the organisation.	There is a culture of 'emergency planning and resilience' is everyone's business. This philosophy is embedded across the organisation and extends beyond to partners and the community, the business and voluntary sector.
Limited involvement in exercises and training across the organisation. Emergency planning and resilience is seen as a responsibility that rests with the Emergency planning team.	Individuals and teams take ownership within their own areas of responsibility and are involved in emergency response where their service is impacted. Corporate services, such as Communications, are fully engaged in emergency planning work.	Public discussions are encouraged and take place to promote wider inclusion and continuous improvement. Collaboration with other authorities and partners is the norm.

## CAPABILITIES, PLANS AND PROCEDURES

### Resilience Standard for London #5

Desired Outcome
The council has risk-based emergency plans which are easy to use, underpin an agreed, clearly understood, and exercised set of arrangements to reduce, control or mitigate the effect of emergencies in both the response and recovery phases.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
The <a href="#">Civil Contingencies Act (CCA)</a> requires Category 1 responders to maintain effective plans for the delivery of their functions to prevent emergencies. They are also required to publish all, or parts, of their emergency plans where that can assist local communities. The CCA requires an inclusive approach to contingency planning, including Category 2 responders and voluntary organisations, and the recommendation to have regard to local communities. A related duty is the requirement to maintain arrangements to advise, warn and inform the public about emergencies.
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Plans for risk-based, and supporting capabilities reflect the identified risks as prioritised within the local community risk register and the London risk register as appropriate.</li> <li>b. The council's emergency plan is approved at an executive level and integrated across the wider organisational structure.</li> <li>c. The council has documented the capabilities set out on <a href="#">Resilience Direct</a> in a plan/procedure and staff trained to deliver the capability. The plan/capability has been validated in an exercise in the last 3 years.</li> <li>d. Plans deal with the consequences of a civil emergency, the capability to respond to unseen events and the ability to adapt when the established plan does not fit what is being experienced.</li> <li>e. Plans clearly identify, or direct to procedures to identify, vulnerable individuals, groups or businesses that may be at particular risk.</li> <li>f. Plans are developed in collaboration with key stakeholders, using expertise from across the council and other partners as required.</li> <li>g. The council provides sufficient resources to support the response to, and recovery from, emergencies across the range of relevant planning assumptions.</li> <li>h. Plans enable the council to anticipate rising tide emergencies and take preventative or pre-emptive actions as required.</li> <li>i. Plans include, or can be linked to, an escalation process for engaging wider involvement, including mutual aid, national capabilities, the voluntary sector, and spontaneous volunteers (council staff).</li> <li>j. Plans which have a clear activation and notification process and include an agreed process for de-activation and closedown of response and recovery activity.</li> <li>k. Plans have clear and agreed arrangements for communication with all stakeholders and the public across the full range of media.</li> </ul>

<p>l. Protocols for the establishment, at an early stage in the emergency response, of key work stream and recovery coordinating groups, with guidance for leaders and practitioners on managing the transition through response to recovery.</p> <p>m. Plans define post-event procedures, include a formal debrief process, the identification of lessons and use Local Authorities Learning and Implementation Protocol to record and share both lessons identified and leading practice.</p>		
How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>n. Share plans and procedures and consult with neighbouring local authorities, in order to share good practice, enhance cross-border awareness and interoperability of response and recovery arrangements.</p> <p>o. Procedures are in place for the coordination and support of spontaneous volunteers (citizens).</p> <p>p. Plans consider the needs of the community in extended periods of response and recovery, with a clear understanding of how those needs might evolve and will continue to be met.</p> <p>q. Plans that follow a common template. They show good use of action cards, diagrammatic instructions, detachable annexes and directories. They “sign-post” the responder, rather than serving as an all-inclusive or stand-alone resource, and connect to a wider set of complementary resources.</p> <p>r. Emergency plans for major incidents should incorporate comprehensive contingencies for the provision of mental health support to adults, children and young people, families and responders.</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> (Cabinet Office, 2011-12) – chapters 5,6 and 7</li> <li>• <a href="#">National Recovery Guidance</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013)</li> <li>• <a href="#">LESPL Major Incident Procedure Manual V9.4 2015</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">HSE A guide to the Radiation</a> (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001</li> <li>• <a href="#">HSE A guide to the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">HSE The Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 2015</a></li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>Arrangements for preparedness are being implemented based on the community risk profile.</p> <p>Engagement of partners, staff and public is being developed and implemented.</p>	<p>Arrangements for preparedness are established and implemented based on the community risk profile. Clear responsibility to maintain and improve these arrangements is assigned.</p> <p>There is evidence of staff and stakeholder consultation and involvement in maintaining and improving incident planning arrangements.</p>	<p>Preparedness is based on multi-agency collaboration and cooperation which demonstrates safe and effective arrangements.</p> <p>These arrangements ensure that operational procedures are comprehensively underpinned by risk assessment. All partners, staff and public are engaged effectively in maintaining and improving incident planning arrangements.</p>



## RESOURCES, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### Resilience Standard for London #6

Desired Outcome
The council has sufficient resources in place to support emergency planning and organisational resilience arrangements and has the ability to scale up staff resources, not only to support the response and recovery, but also to maintain the delivery of business critical services.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
The Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) establishes the legislative framework for Category 1 responders, which includes London Borough Councils and the City of London. Further detail is set out in: <a href="#">Contingency Planning, Duty to Assess, Plan and Advise (Section 2)</a> ; Advice and Assistance to the Public (Section 4); and General Measures (Section 5). <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> provides guidance on part 1 of the CCA and its associated regulations and non-statutory arrangements. <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> sets out guiding principles for emergency response and recovery (Section 2.2), defines roles and responsibilities (Section 5.2).
How to achieve good practice in this area
<p>a. Gold and silver levels are able to set, monitor and amend a working strategy (Gold) and tactical plan (Silver) for the emergency response.</p> <p>b. Gold and Silver levels can make and record decisions in a consistent manner within a defined and documented decision making process, such as the JESIP joint decision making model.</p> <p>c. Decisions, which are reasoned, lawful and justifiable, are recorded in writing and are clear, intelligible and accurate.</p> <p>d. Directors and Heads of Service understand their role in preparing for, responding to and recovering from a civil emergency and take ownership of their own business continuity plans including their review and validation.</p> <p>e. A nominated Director is a member of the local authority sub-regional group to achieve greater accountability across local authorities and support improved engagement from fellow senior managers in their own council.</p> <p>f. The role of the sub- regional group includes coordinating multi-borough exercises, scrutiny and challenge of self-assessments and peer reports, providing assurance of performance within the sub-region, identifying and sharing lessons learned and discharging improvement plans.</p> <p>g. The appropriate resources, including staff, have been targeted and distributed across the organisation to meet identified priorities and reduce risks.</p> <p>h. Resources, including staff with the appropriate skills and competency, are sustainable through the emergency response and recovery phases to ensure risk can continue to be targeted.</p> <p>i. The council is able to maintain a sufficient number of staff for core emergency response roles to respond for 48 hours (as set out in Resilience Standard for London 6a). These staff are suitably trained, equipped and empowered to fulfil their respective role.</p> <p>j. Arrangements to provide appropriate resources, including adequate equipment and personal protective equipment (PPE), to meet predictable levels of operational activity; the means to supplement those resources in the event of extraordinary need, such a major incident, are in place.</p>



- k. A control centre can be established and maintained for the duration of an incident including the maintenance of an incident (BECC) log, detailing key events and actions during an incident.
- l. The council is able to open and operate a Humanitarian Assistance Centre within the agreed timescale of 72 hours.
- m. Be able to communicate with councillors, staff and members of the public via the most appropriate medium, which includes social media, council website, news media and face-to-face.
- n. A communication response and monitoring capability is available within 1 hour and can be maintained 24/7.

#### How to achieve leading practice in this area

- o. Spontaneous volunteer council staff can be contacted, coordinated and re-tasked to support emergency response and recovery activities.
- p. The council is able to deploy core departmental services in response to an emergency for at least the first 48 hours of an incident while maintaining the provision of core services to residents outside the emergency response.
- q. Suitable emergency centre locations have been identified and arrangements are in place to use these locations. There is sufficient capacity to support (simultaneously within 3 hours) and operate (for 48 hours) a rest centre, family and friend's reception centre and a survivor reception centre.
- r. The council has a communications strategy to enable the scaling up and sustainability (for a protracted incident) of communications arrangements for the purpose of warning and informing members of the public about the risks of the emergency and the available (council) support services using a range of media.

#### Guidance and supporting documentation

##### **Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government**

- [Emergency Response and Recovery, Chapter 4 \(Cabinet Office 2013\)](#)
- [Emergency Preparedness \(Cabinet Office 2013\)](#)
- Concept of Operations for Emergency Response & Recovery, London Local Authorities 2018.

##### **Thematic multi-agency guidance from Government**

- [JESIP Joint Decision Making Model](#)

Descriptor		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>The council is developing its staff resource pool to ensure it has the capacity, with the appropriate knowledge, skills and experience.</p> <p>The ability to scale up resources whilst managing business as usual is untested and there may be some reliance on mutual aid or partner arrangements.</p>	<p>The staff resources are in place across the organisation with the ability to scale up during an emergency. The skills, knowledge and experience are in place and has been tested through an exercise or incident. Local facilities, such as a BECC, as well as sub-regional structures are established and delivering good outcomes.</p>	<p>The council has an enhanced staffing model based upon the model set out in the attached sub-set which is supplemented by a coordinated cadre of volunteers.</p> <p>Core services, including communications, can deploy for a protracted period whilst managing business as usual.</p>

## RESOURCES, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### RSL 6a -Quantitative data, a sub-set to Resilience Standard for London #6

Desired Outcome		
The council has access to sufficient resources with the appropriate experience, skills and knowledge to support emergency planning and organisational resilience arrangements and has the ability to scale up staff resources to support the response and recovery.		
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)		
There are no mandatory requirements to support this sub-set.		
Local authorities may wish to consider the following requirements in order to satisfy themselves they can maintain the required support to their communities in the event of a protracted civil emergency.		
The council is able to deploy core departmental services in response to an emergency for at least the first 48 hours of an incident. These services may include, Communication, Highways, Building Control, Environmental Health, Social Care.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<p>The council is able to maintain a sufficient number of staff* for core emergency response roles to respond for 48 hours. These staff are suitably trained, equipped and empowered to fulfil their respective role.</p> <p>1 Council Gold 1 Council Silver 2 Loggist (one for Council Gold, another for Council Silver) 1 LALO 1 BECC Manager 4 BECC staff (1 per role: BECC Message Handler; BECC Loggist; BECC Info Officer; BECC Officer) 1 Communications Link Officer Service Link Officer (4 trained in each department) Resilience Advisor</p> <p>* Staff numbers are based on an 8-hour shift.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
The borough has identified suitable emergency centre locations across its area and has in place arrangements to use these locations	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<p>The council is able to open and operate a Rest Centre for 200 people (open within 3 hours) for 48 hours. Also, support the Police in their operation of a Survivor Reception Centre and Family and Friends Reception Centre.</p> <p>Minimum number of trained staff* for the combined requirements of SRC, RC and FFRC:</p> <p>3 Emergency Centre Managers An appropriate number of Emergency Centre Officers dependent upon the circumstances.</p> <p>* Staff numbers are based on an 8-hour shift.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no

## Item 5 - Appendix C

<p>The council is able to open and operate a Humanitarian Assistance Centre within the agreed timescale of 72 hours.</p> <p>Minimum number of trained staff for the HAC:  1 Senior HA Officer  1 Emergency Centre Manager  An appropriate number of staff dependent upon the circumstances.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council is able to establish and maintain a control centre for the duration of an incident.</p> <p>Minimum staffing: BECC Manager and BECC Officer.  Full staffing: BECC Message Handler; BECC Loggist; BECC Info Officer; BECC Officer; Communications Link Officer; Service Link Officer.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council is able to make an appropriately authorised bilateral or multilateral mutual aid request within 2 hours of identifying the need for support.</p> <p>Multilateral mutual aid is disseminated across London by the LLACC. The LLACC collates responses, which are passed back to the requesting borough.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council is able to activate the following roles, for the duration of the on-call period, in the times specified:</p> <p>Local Authority Liaison Officer to forward command point (60 minutes)  Local Authority Gold to SCG (2 hours)  Deputy Local Authority Gold to SCG (2 hours)  Executive Officer/Loggist (2 hours)</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council has the capability to mobilise transport and staff to move up to 200 people within 3 hours of identification of need.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council has considered appropriate local venues available to shelter up to 5000 people.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p>The council can provide evidence of those people who have been appropriately trained.</p> <p>The council can provide evidence of the frequency of exercises and the people who have taken part.</p>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no </div>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Guidance and supporting documentation</b></p>	
<p><b><i>Overarching guidance and reference material</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of Operations for Emergency Response &amp; Recovery, London Local Authorities 2018</li> <li>• <a href="#">London Resilience Forum website - Planning for Emergencies</a></li> </ul>	

## PARTNERSHIPS

### Resilience Standard for London #7

Desired Outcome
The council demonstrates a high level of partnership working and interoperability between itself and all emergency responder and supporting organisations, as a means to ensure an inclusive, collaborative approach to Integrated Emergency Management.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<p>The statutory guidance <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> sets out the duties on Category 1 and 2 responders to cooperate (Chapter 2) and to share information (Chapter 3), and further civil protection duties which fall on Category 1 responders, including risk assessment, (Chapter 4) emergency planning (Chapter 5) and communicating with the public (Chapter 7).</p> <p>The non-statutory guidance <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a>, which complements Emergency Preparedness, describes the multi-agency framework for responding to and recovering from emergencies. The Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP), <a href="#">Joint Doctrine: Interoperability Framework 2016</a> publication is a non-statutory complement to the guidance identified above.</p>
How to achieve good practice in this area
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council is represented on the Borough Resilience Forum (BRF) at the appropriate level and positively engages with its partners.</li> <li>Decisions, actions and key messages, from the BRF, are cascaded and embedded into the organisation.</li> <li>Understand the critical interdependencies, both internal and external, and actively consider these when making decisions.</li> <li>Senior Managers regularly engage in strategic discussions, with senior managers and Chief Officers from partner organisations, on emergency response and resilience activities.</li> <li>Consider the future planning and resilience of partner agencies (e.g. in terms of planning, transport and regeneration) that potentially change community risk.</li> <li>Embed the principles of joint working in all multi-agency arrangements, with the objective of normalising interoperability across the activities of Integrated Emergency Management.</li> <li>A common understanding of local risks, partner agencies' capabilities, limitations, priorities and working practices, in order to facilitate an efficient, effective and coordinated joint response to incidents of varying levels of severity and scale.</li> <li>A common understanding of the JESIP Joint Decision Model to support joint decision making in multi-agency groups.</li> <li>Contribute to a multi-agency training and joint exercising programme to embed and then validate interoperability principles and practices across responders and responder agencies, at strategic, tactical and operational levels. Training is conducted by suitably qualified and experienced people.</li> <li>A clearly defined and commonly understood plan that enables the council, with partners, to communicate to the public with a common message during an incident.</li> </ol>

k. Clearly defined arrangements for debriefing in a partnership environment e.g. Strategic Coordinating Group, following incidents and exercises to enable learning and continuous improvement.

l. A clear understanding of other organisations' roles including the role of the Government Liaison Officer (GLO) and wider Government Liaison Team (GLT) and the interface with Central Government.

### How to achieve leading practice in this area

m. Arrangements to proactively, and in a timely manner, identify and share lessons and leading practice following major incidents and exercises with the wider resilience community using the Local Authorities Learning and Implementation Protocol.

n. An auditable database of multi-agency training and exercising which records when responders receive training, take part in exercises and when they are due refresher training.

o. Developing strong relationships with the business and voluntary sector organisations, which includes understand their capabilities, sharing risk assessments, establishing arrangements for joint training, exercising and sharing lessons learned.

### Guidance and supporting documentation

#### **Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government**

- [Emergency Preparedness \(Cabinet Office, 2011-12\)](#)
- [Emergency Response and Recovery \(Cabinet Office, 2013\)](#)
- [Central Government's Concept of Operations CONOPs \(Cabinet Office, 2013\)](#)

#### **Thematic multi-agency guidance from Government**

- [Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework Edition 2 2016](#)

Descriptor		
Developing	Established	Advanced
Engagement with partners is limited to those within the organisation who sit on the Borough Resilience Forum.	The council is very engaged with key partners and particularly those who sit on the Borough Resilience Forum. This engagement extends across the strategic, tactical and operational areas of responsibility.	Engagement with partners extends beyond those on the Borough Resilience Forum. These may include Category 2 responders and the business and voluntary sector.
Partnership working in emergency planning across the organisation, particularly at strategic level, is being developed.	There is a common understanding of risks facing partners as well as each other's roles, responsibilities and capabilities.	Lessons identified through incidents and exercises are identified and shared with this broader range of partners.
There is limited understanding of partners capabilities, or the interdependencies between organisations, and these are not considered during planning or when making operational decisions.	Training, exercising and evaluation occurs across a range of partners.	A multi-agency database exists to record and verify training and competency.

## TRAINING, EXERCISING AND EVALUATION

### Resilience Standard for London #8

Desired Outcome
Members and officers across the organisation are competent to fulfil their roles in emergency preparedness, response and recovery. The council develops and assures their resilience capabilities and arrangements through an exercise programme that is risk-based. Lessons learned from previous exercises and incidents have been identified and plans modified accordingly.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<a href="#">The Civil Contingencies Act (2004)</a> Regulations require Category 1 responders to include provision for the training and exercising of staff or other persons in emergency plans, business continuity plans and arrangements to warn, inform and advise the public. 'Other persons' could include contractors with a role in the plans. All those within an organisation who may be involved in planning for, responding to and recovering from an emergency should be appropriately prepared. This requires a clear understanding of plans, their roles and responsibilities and how they fit into the wider picture.
How to achieve good practice in this area
<p>a. A training and development programme is in place to build the organisation's capability for resilience by developing appropriate competencies among key employees, services and councillors against a range of operational and strategic scenarios. This includes induction programmes with relevant emergency planning and resilience content for Members and staff.</p> <p>b. Training addresses all roles within the plans including senior leaders (e.g. Directors, elected members and the Mayor).</p> <p>c. A comprehensive joint exercise programme exists to enable key services to maintain competency for dealing with cross-borough incidents or major incidents which require a multi-agency response.</p> <p>d. Exercises test the organisation's plans and procedures which considers local, regional and national risks.</p> <p>e. Exercising tests a council's capacity (e.g. staffing levels and the impact of holiday periods) and capability (e.g. evacuation and shelter, warning and informing, coordinating the voluntary sector and spontaneous volunteers).</p> <p>f. The council learns by identifying the lessons of events and acting on them in order to change structure, activities and behaviours. Lessons learned from previous emergencies across the country, and where appropriate from overseas, have been identified.</p> <p>g. A comprehensive debrief and review process is in place for operational incidents, with multi agency involvement if appropriate; this is used effectively to inform policies and practices across the organisation and allow any necessary change to be embedded.</p> <p>h. Arrangements exist to evaluate the training and development of personnel to ensure that it is effective and skills are maintained, people are developed and remain competent within their role.</p> <p>i. Competence can be quickly verified when sharing staff with other authorities.</p>

How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>j. The council creates a safe learning environment that will enable confident, no-fault learning across the range of its training, exercising and development activities.</p> <p>k. Build resilience by training staff volunteers that may be called upon to support primary personnel in the event of concurrent or long-running events, or as part of organisations' business continuity planning.</p> <p>l. Specific exercising of recovery arrangements, including play by senior managers, to rehearse and validate their roles, including the interplay with national recovery management structures.</p> <p>m. Establish clear criteria to assess the impact of training and development for both individuals and organisations and share the results of any evaluation with relevant stakeholders.</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> (Cabinet Office, 2011-12) especially chapters five, six and seven</li> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013)</li> <li>• <a href="#">JESIP Joint Doctrine: the interoperability framework</a> (Edition 2, 2016)</li> <li>• <a href="#">National Recovery Guidance</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013)</li> </ul> <p><b>Single-agency guidance from Government and professional authorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: a good practice guide for Chief Executives Solace and MHCLG</a> (2018)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British (BSI), European (CEN) and International (ISO) Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">PD 25666:2010 Business continuity management – Guidance on exercising and testing for continuity and contingency programmes</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">BS11200 : 2014 Crisis Management: guidance and good practice</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">BS ISO 22398:2013 Societal security – Guidelines for exercises</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting guidance and statements of good practice from professional authorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Planning College (2016). Developing and Delivering Exercises</a></li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>Training and exercise programmes are being developed to provide realistic training scenarios for staff and Members across the council.</p> <p>Lessons are being identified but not necessarily actioned throughout the organisation. Debrief and evaluation processes are being enhanced or introduced with the aim of changing policy, procedures, working arrangements and behaviours.</p>	<p>An induction, training and exercise programme is in place for key employees, services and elected Members across the council.</p> <p>There is a comprehensive exercise programme, that tests capacity and capability, with in-built debrief and evaluation processes. Incidents are evaluated to identify and learn lessons and actions are implemented.</p> <p>The council looks beyond its boundary to identify learning.</p>	<p>The council has extended its training and exercise programme to support the development of volunteers to improve capacity and organisational resilience.</p> <p>The 'recovery' phase of a civil emergency is tested through exercising and includes external partners, other authorities and government departments.</p> <p>Lessons learned are shared with external stakeholders where appropriate.</p>

## BUSINESS CONTINUITY

### Resilience Standard for London #9

Desired Outcome
The council is able to demonstrate a high level of resilience in their priority functions and emergency response and recovery capabilities.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<a href="#">The Civil Contingencies Act (2004)</a> requires the council to maintain plans to ensure that they can continue to deliver their functions in the event of an emergency as far as is reasonably practicable, and this duty relates to all priority functions, not just their emergency response functions. There must be arrangements for reviewing and exercising to ensure the business continuity plans are current and effective with arrangements for the provision of training to those involved in implementing the plan. They are also required to publish aspects of their business continuity plans making this information available for the purposes of dealing with emergencies. Local authorities are required to provide advice and assistance to businesses and voluntary organisations about business continuity management.
How to achieve good practice in this area
<p>a. Business continuity plans and arrangements are in place that are current and aligned to the ISO 22301 standard.</p> <p>b. Business continuity is appropriately embedded within the organisation in order that critical functions, emergency response and recovery capabilities are highly resilient. Account is taken of links and interdependencies between Services across the organisation.</p> <p>c. Key business continuity management personnel are competent and experienced and the council invests in their training and continuous professional development.</p> <p>d. Information is shared with other responder organisations where appropriate, in order to understand their respective business continuity plans and arrangements, and also vulnerabilities and dependencies that may become relevant in the event of disruption.</p> <p>e. Robust arrangements are in place for the review and validation of business continuity plans and contingency arrangements including emergency response and recovery capabilities.</p> <p>f. Contractors and providers, including their supply chains, understand the civil resilience risks for the council's area and have robust business continuity arrangements, especially for services for which the council has a statutory duty.</p> <p>g. Provider's emergency plans and procedures, including business continuity arrangements for specific services are fit for purpose and up to date. They consider specific risks and scenarios, for example, disruption due to severe weather or industrial action.</p> <p>h. The provider has the capacity and adequate resourcing to put plans in place particularly to cover short or no notice incidents, with recovery timescales that are acceptable to both the provider and commissioner.</p> <p>i. Service users know how they can contact the provider or the council in an emergency, both during a normal working day and out of hours.</p>



j. Providers understand any responsibilities that may be imposed on them during an emergency as set out in local emergency plans.

k. Where Providers deliver contracts to multiple authorities, the council is aware of the implications during prolonged or widespread emergencies (because of increased demand for services or resources) and have contingency arrangements in place.

#### How to achieve leading practice in this area

n. Facilitate independent assurance, and where appropriate certification, of their business continuity plans and arrangements against ISO22301.

o. Incorporate business continuity elements and considerations into exercises in order to robustly test vulnerabilities and validate the resilience of local capabilities. Testing or exercising of business continuity arrangements of contractors is in place.

p. Enable other authorities to have access to assets and resources in the event of disruption such as loss of premises.

#### Guidance and supporting knowledge

##### **Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government**

- [Emergency Preparedness](#) (Cabinet Office, 2011-12) (especially Chapter 6)
- [Emergency Response and Recovery](#) (Cabinet Office, 2013)

##### **Relevant British (BSI), European (CEN) and International (ISO) Standards**

- [ISO 22301 Business Continuity Management](#)

##### **Supporting guidance and statements of good practice from professional authorities**

- [Business Continuity Institute Good Practice Guidelines \(2018\)](#)
- [London Resilience – Preparing your Business \(2018\)](#)
- [Local authorities' preparedness for civil emergencies: a good practice guide for Chief Executives Solace and MHCLG \(2018\)](#)

#### Descriptors

Developing	Established	Advanced
Business continuity plans are in place in some parts of the organisation but not routinely tested. Contingency arrangements are not clearly understood.	Business continuity plans are in place across the organisation and are tested to support resilience and contingency arrangements.	Business continuity plans and contingency arrangements for the organisation, contractors and providers are tested.
Providers and contractors are not aware of their responsibilities or have not implemented contingency arrangements that support the council.	Contractors and providers have business continuity arrangements and they are aware of their role within an emergency.	Key business continuity people have appropriate qualifications and professional development.
	Information is provided to service users during an emergency. Advice is provided to businesses and the voluntary sector on Business Continuity Management.	There is independent validation or certification through ISO 22301 in place.

## COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

### Resilience Standard for London #10

Desired Outcome
The council has a strategic and coordinated approach to activity that enables individuals, businesses, community networks and voluntary organisations to behave in a resilient way and act to support other members of the public. Community resilience considerations and the voluntary capabilities of all these partners are integrated into existing emergency management plans.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
<p>Duties set out in the <a href="#">Civil Contingencies Act (2004)</a> which pertain to community resilience include the publication of risk and emergency management information and warning and informing the public about emergencies. The Act also sets out a duty for Local Authorities to provide business continuity advice for private and voluntary organisations in Contingency Planning, Advice and Assistance to the Public (section 4).</p> <p><a href="#">The Public Sector Equality Duty: Equality Act 2010</a> requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. This includes specific duties for engagement by public authorities.</p>
How to achieve good practice in this area
<p>a. A strategic approach to ensure coordination of community led social action and partnering with voluntary capabilities.</p> <p>b. Easily accessible and regularly updated information about statutory responder and BRF community resilience services, resources, governance and points of contact.</p> <p>c. Identify and engage with community and voluntary networks which might offer support to their communities and to responders before, during or after an emergency.</p> <p>d. A process for providing advice and support to community groups that want to have a role in emergency management.</p> <p>e. A communications and engagement plan to promote resilient behaviours and encourage community groups and networks to promote resilience and take a role in emergency management.</p> <p>f. Clearly defined roles for community and voluntary partners for preparing, responding and recovering from emergencies, which are agreed and communicated prior to an incident. This may range from informal expectations for neighbours to support one another to formal partnership arrangements utilising memorandums of understanding and codes of conduct.</p> <p>g. A regularly updated database of local and national voluntary capabilities available to support emergency response and recovery, with clear agreed activation processes.</p> <p>h. Locally agreed arrangements to manage spontaneous offers of support to affected people and to emergency responders in emergencies, including financial and physical donations, unaffiliated 'spontaneous' volunteers, resource and expertise.</p>

How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>i. A process for on-going consultation and collaboration with community networks in relation to risk assessments and emergency plans, including understanding and mapping the risks that are of primary concern and motivation to communities.</p> <p>j. Regular outreach sessions, workshops and conferences for individuals, businesses and community networks to share leading practice, provide training, build relationships and enable networking.</p> <p>k. Provision of physical resources, assets and training for community networks and volunteers.</p> <p>l. Community resilience approaches, programmes and lessons are proactively shared with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>m. A process for identifying, mapping and regularly assessing the resilience of communities at highest risk to inform priorities for targeted communications and interventions.</p>		
Guidance and supporting knowledge		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Preparedness</a> (Cabinet Office, 2011-12)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013)</li> </ul> <p><b>Thematic multi-agency guidance from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Preparing for emergencies</a> (Cabinet Office 2018)</li> <li>• Community Resilience: Resources and Tools</li> <li>• <a href="#">Community resilience framework for practitioners</a> (Cabinet Office, 2016)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Enabling social action</a> (Cabinet Office 2017)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British (BSI), European (CEN) and International (ISO) Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ISO 22319:2017 Security and resilience — Community resilience — Guidelines for planning the involvement of spontaneous volunteers</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting guidance and statements of good practice from professional authorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Community engagement hub 'how to' guides for emergency managers from the Defra Flood Resilience Community Pathfinder Scheme (2016)</a></li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>Community resilience activities are in the early stages of development. The council is in the process of understanding the role of volunteers from the community, business and voluntary sector.</p> <p>Discussions with community groups are at an exploratory stage or activities are being developed and piloted.</p>	<p>Community led social action is coordinated where the community, business and voluntary sector, who want a role in emergency management, are identified and engaged. Roles are clearly identified and there is a database of voluntary capabilities.</p> <p>There are arrangements to manage spontaneous offers of support and to give advice and information to citizens.</p>	<p>The council has enhanced its community engagement and resilience work by arranging an ongoing process for consultation and collaboration. There are regular engagement sessions for a wide range of community groups including businesses.</p> <p>Community groups are provided with access to assets, equipment and where appropriate training, to support their role.</p>

## RECOVERY MANAGEMENT

### Resilience Standard for London #11

Desired Outcome
The council has robust, embedded and flexible recovery management arrangements in place to support the rebuilding, restoring and rehabilitation of the community following an emergency. Arrangements clearly link and complement emergency response arrangements, enable the smooth transition from response to recovery and support collective decision making to initiate, inform, resource, monitor and ultimately closedown the recovery phase of emergencies.
Summary of legal duties (mandatory requirements)
The organisational requirement to maintain plans for recovery is set out in the <a href="#">Civil Contingencies Act</a> (CCA), specifically as part of the requirement to reduce, control or mitigate the effects of an emergency and 'to take other action in connection with it'. Detailed advice on recovery planning can be found in the Cabinet Office core guidance <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> and the <a href="#">National Recovery Guidance</a> .
How to achieve good practice in this area
<p>a. The recovery process should be considered from the moment the emergency begins and is coordinated by the council in liaison with the Strategic Coordinating Group. If resources allow, the Recovery Co-ordinating Group is set up on the first day of the emergency.</p> <p>b. The management of recovery is approached from a community development perspective with the active participation of the affected community and a strong reliance on local capacities and expertise. The private sector and the wider community play a crucial role.</p> <p>c. An impact assessment (covering impacts on residents, businesses, infrastructure, environment) is carried out as soon as possible and is regularly updated. Resulting actions are accurately captured and progress monitored.</p> <p>d. A concise recovery action plan with clear targets and milestones is developed that can be quickly implemented, involves all agencies and fits the needs of the emergency.</p> <p>e. The community is fully involved in the recovery process, including the business sector, voluntary sector, faith groups, community groups and tourist organisations.</p> <p>f. A pro-active and integrated framework of support to businesses is established.</p> <p>g. The council works closely with other agencies, the community and those directly affected, including on monitoring and protection of public health and the reinstatement of utilities and transport networks.</p> <p>h. Information and media management of the recovery process is co-ordinated through the Recovery Coordinating Group led by the council.</p> <p>i. Effective protocols for political involvement and liaison (local, regional and national) are established.</p> <p>j. An early assessment should be made of the responding organisations' capacity and resources, and mutual aid agreements activated as required.</p> <p>k. Accurate record keeping is established. There are clear audit trails with comprehensive records of timings, notifications, decisions, actions and expenditure.</p>

<p>l. An agreed and rehearsed framework for setting objectives, milestones and closedown criteria as part of a recovery strategy which enables recovery progress to be evaluated and supports the eventual transition of the recovery programme into 'business as usual'.</p> <p>m. Appropriate psychological and social care and support is provided for all those who have been affected by an emergency. This may include survivors of an incident, the family and friends of survivors and the deceased, those responding to the emergency, and the community living and working in the area affected.</p>		
How to achieve leading practice in this area		
<p>n. Opportunity for longer term regeneration and economic development is considered at the earliest stages of the recovery process.</p> <p>o. Developing strong relationships with charitable and private sector organisations offering financial or other support to community development and other recovery initiatives e.g., the management of donations following an emergency.</p> <p>p. Developing a generic framework, agreed with the lead local council's Responsible Financial Officer (Section 151), for rapid distribution of emergency payments to affected people and organisations, including identifying payment channels, reporting and monitoring mechanisms and a communications strategy.</p>		
Guidance and supporting documentation		
<p><b>Statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference from Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Emergency Response and Recovery</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013)</li> <li>• <a href="#">National Recovery Guidance</a> (Cabinet Office, 2013), including Common issues, Economic issues, Humanitarian issues and Infrastructure issues</li> <li>• <a href="#">Human Aspects of Emergency Management</a> (Cabinet Office, 2016)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant British (BSI), European (CEN) and International (ISO) Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">BS 12999:2015 Damage Management</a>. Code of practice for the organization and management of the stabilization, mitigation and restoration of properties, contents, facilities and assets following damage.</li> </ul>		
Descriptors		
Developing	Established	Advanced
<p>The council has a generic plan in place to manage recovery but this has not been tested. There are arrangements to manage business as usual and possibly small scale incidents.</p> <p>The community perspective has been considered and information is provided to them but they do not actively participate in recovery work.</p>	<p>Recovery starts at the earliest possible stage and is approached from a community perspective with their active involvement. An impact assessment is in place and regularly updated. An action plan is in place with targets and milestones and there are arrangements to advise and support local businesses. Accurate record keeping is established which is auditable.</p>	<p>The council is looking at opportunities for long term regeneration and economic development.</p> <p>There are strong relationships with the community, business and the voluntary sector and their expertise is being utilised.</p> <p>Robust financial arrangements are in place to manage support to citizens and donations.</p>

# Leaders' Committee

## Pledges to Londoners - Update on Progress in Supporting Business and Inclusive Growth

Item no: 6

**Report by:** Dianna Neal      **Job title:** Strategic Lead: Enterprise, Economy and Skills

**Date:** 9 July 2019

**Contact Officer:** Dianna Neal,

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9819      **Email:** [Dianna.Neal@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Dianna.Neal@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** This paper provides an update on the supporting business and inclusive growth pledges agreed by Leaders' Committee as part of its wider Pledges to Londoners.

**Recommendations:** Leaders' Committee is asked to note and comment on this report.



# Pledges to Londoners – Update on supporting business and inclusive growth

## Introduction

1. Pledges to Londoners states that London is the business capital of Europe and the most outward looking global city on the planet. All London boroughs are committed to nurturing that success and ensuring that all Londoners can share in it. Boroughs aspire to be the first choice of every London business when it wants a conversation with London government.
2. While London continues to see strong employment and economic growth, the benefits of this growth are not spread equally. Some Londoners, such as disabled people and some BAME groups, are more likely to be unemployed and in-work poverty is high, with 58 per cent of Londoners in poverty living in a working household. This is a 50 per cent increase over the last decade<sup>1</sup>.
3. The following Pledges were adopted by Leaders in the supporting business and inclusive growth policy areas:
  - Co-designing a Charter for Business with London businesses, improving London as a place to do business, promoting inclusive growth and positive dialogue.
  - Lobbying to ensure that post-Brexit development funding provides at least as much support to London as the current EU ESIF programme.
  - Working alongside the Mayor to transform adult skills training through the devolved powers starting in 2019; supporting in work progression and ensuring that we meet the job aspirations of learners and the skills needs of business in each part of London.
  - Working towards a better start for young people through improved careers advice, work experience for every young Londoner and building the case to extend skills devolution to include 14-19 provision.
  - Working in partnership with London businesses to help government reform the apprenticeship levy; including using London levy underspends to support training within London.
  - Creating a comprehensive local welfare support offer for those transferring to Universal Credit or at risk of homelessness, supported by work with government to develop more effective funding models based on invest to save principles.
  - Supporting 55,000 disadvantaged Londoners towards a job through the devolved employment programme agreed with the DWP.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.trustforlondon.org.uk/publications/londons-poverty-profile-2017/>



- Lobbying government for co-location and joint working of council and Jobcentre Plus services.
4. The delivery of these pledges is being overseen by the Executive member for Business, Europe and Good Growth, the Executive member for Skills and Employment and the Executive member for Welfare, Empowerment and Inclusion. They reflect shared pan-London priorities for Leaders over the next three years but the list does not reflect the entirety of London Councils work around the economy, skills, employment and welfare for this period.

## **Progress Update**

### Supporting business

- i. Co-designing a Charter for Business with London businesses, improving London as a place to do business, promoting inclusive growth and positive dialogue.
  - ii. Lobbying to ensure that post-Brexit development funding provides at least as much support to London as the current EU ESIF programme.
5. London Councils has reviewed the current approach of London boroughs to business engagement, publishing a report and hosting a series of best practice seminars to inform the development of the Charter for Business. We are actively consulting boroughs and business groups on the Charter. The draft Charter will be presented to the Executive and Leaders' Committee in the autumn and we aim to launch it before the end of 2019.
  6. London Councils and the Mayor have agreed a set of principles and objectives we want to see from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), which will replace the current European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) programme. We currently await a consultation from central government on proposals for the new fund and how it will operate.

### Skills and employment

- i. Working alongside the Mayor to transform adult skills training through the devolved powers starting in 2019; supporting in work progression and ensuring that we meet the job aspirations of learners and the skills needs of business in each part of London.
- ii. Working towards a better start for young people through improved careers advice, work experience for every young Londoner and building the case to extend skills devolution to include 14-19 provision.

- iii. Working in partnership with London businesses to help government reform the apprenticeship levy; including using London levy underspends to support training within London.
  - iv. Supporting 55,000 disadvantaged Londoners towards a job through the devolved employment programme agreed with the DWP.
  - v. Lobbying government for co-location and joint working of council and Jobcentre Plus services.
7. London Councils nominates five Leaders<sup>2</sup> to sit on the Skills for Londoners Board, which advises the Mayor on the devolved Adult Education Budget (AEB) and skills more widely. London Councils has worked with the Sub-Regional Partnerships (SRPs) to develop a set of skills pilot projects that aim to demonstrate and test out changes that we want to see in the skills system. The pilots cover a range of issues - creating clear progression routes in key sector, testing out employer-led provision, bringing together skills and employment provision; improving provision for learners with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), dealing with fast changes in skills requirements using technology, testing out how to scale up successful pilots and adding to the evidence base around in-work progression. The GLA will publicly support the pilots and we are working with them to identify funding and other support to implement them.
8. London Councils is working with SRPs and boroughs to develop a Skills and Employment Vision for London with the GLA. The vision will inform parts of London's Local Industrial Strategy, which will set out policies and priorities to increase productivity and inclusive growth. The Skills and Employment Vision will be published separately to the LIS in September 2019. The vision will set out a strong pitch for future UK Shared Prosperity Fund and other funding and argue for more fundamental reforms to London's skills and employment system, including for young people, and for powers to London government to achieve the vision. London Councils has developed proposals for a clear borough role in delivering the vision and the LIS.
9. London Councils hosted a conference on STEM skills, with a range of major employers such as Google. We have engaged extensively with professional organisations, charities and others looking to engage with London's school age pupils. We will be conducting a survey of boroughs' work in this area, as well as supporting boroughs involvement in the annual Skills London careers event in October 2019. London Councils has worked with the GLA to commission research to explore progression opportunities for young people with SEND, and the education and employment trajectories of young people in London

---

<sup>2</sup> These are: London Councils' Executive member for employment and skills, plus the Leaders who chair four sub-regional skills and employment boards.

following their GCSEs. The final report will be published in September 2019. London Councils will also be working with Impetus PEF to analyse data sets on young people not engaged in education, employment or training in London at a granular level. This research should help build an evidence base to extend skills devolution.

10. We continue to lobby for greater freedoms and for London to retain more of its apprenticeship levy. London Councils led the development of joint submission to government with a range of business groups, the GLA and the SRP, which was submitted to the Chancellor and Minister for Apprenticeships and Skills. We also used the proposals to input into the government's review of the apprenticeship levy. A meeting was subsequently held with the Minister for Apprenticeship and Skills to discuss the proposals.
11. The four devolved Work and Health Programmes (WHPs) in London have been running for just over a year. After a slow start, where referrals and starts were well below profile, SRPs (who manage the programmes) have worked closely with DWP and Jobcentre Plus to improve these figures and get referral and start levels back to profile. London Councils has also worked with the SRPs to commission a pan-London evaluation of the WHPs in London. This evaluation is underway and will add value to the national one, delivered by DWP.
12. London Councils has also published its 'Better Ways to Work' report, setting out recommendations for further reform to employment services in London, to reflect the changing job market. One of these recommendations was around co-location and joint working of council and Jobcentre Plus services. We have received a positive response from Jobcentre Plus to this. Following a site visit to Croydon Jobcentre, where councils and JCP services are co-located, London Councils is planning an event in the autumn for borough and JCP officers to explore how this model could be extended across London.

### Welfare

- i. Creating a comprehensive local welfare support offer for those transferring to Universal Credit or at risk of homelessness, supported by work with government to develop more effective funding models based on invest to save principles.
13. London Councils has begun work to develop a new local welfare support offer by mapping existing local welfare provision in London. A survey was issued to London Councils' members to establish what local welfare services are currently being provided by London local authorities. The findings of this survey are being used to produce a report showcasing innovative approaches to local welfare in London, to be published in the Autumn. London Councils has also held a workshop to seek local authority officers' views

on the shortcomings of the government's existing model of local welfare and explore how a new local welfare support offer could work. The findings from this workshop will be used to draw up a proposal for a new comprehensive local welfare support offer. London Councils is also working with the Local Government Association to co-design financial support pathfinders with local councils. The pathfinders aim to deliver a more integrated offer of advice and support, discretionary payments by building on existing service delivery and partnerships with the voluntary sector. It is expected the evaluation and learning from the London pathfinders will be used to inform the design of the new support offer.

### **Next Steps**

14. London Councils officers and Executive members will continue to work on supporting the implementation of the pledges as outlined in this report and will keep Leaders updated on a regular basis.

**Recommendations:** Leaders' Committee is asked to note and comment on this report

### **Financial implications for London Councils**

None

### **Legal implications for London Councils**

None

### **Equalities implications for London Councils**

None

# Leaders' Committee

## London Councils' Capital Ambition      Item no: 8 Board Urgency Report

**Report by:** Lisa Dominic    **Job title:** Governance Support Officer  
**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019  
**Contact Officer:** Christiane Jenkins  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9540    **Email:** [Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

<b>Summary</b>	London Councils' urgency procedure was used to approve a London Ventures commercial deal with Blue Prism
<b>Recommendations</b>	Leaders are asked to note the decision taken under the urgency procedure.

---



# London Councils' Urgency Report

## **1.0 Introduction**

In January 2019, London Ventures conducted commercial deal negotiations with new and existing venture partners in anticipation of these commencing from 1st April 2019. London Ventures reported the outcomes of the negotiations to the Capital Ambition Board (CAB) in February 2019, requesting approval for 6 new commercial agreements. These were agreed by the Board and commenced on the 1st April 2019 other than the agreement with Blue Prism, following Blue Prism's desire to include additional terms within the deal necessitating a longer negotiation process.

## **1.1 Details**

Blue Prism Ltd. required a legal contract between London Councils and Blue Prism Ltd. This is unprecedented, as all London Ventures partnerships operate on a standardised commercial agreement and not a legal contract. In consultation with respective legal advisors, both parties agreed suitable terms. An addition entitled "Special Terms" was included to the commercial agreement (this is available on request). It was also agreed that Blue Prism Ltd. would not be subject to the standard quarterly minimum working capital and revenue share payments, but rather an annual fixed fee, invoiced quarterly covering the agreement period. This addition sits outside the standardised commercial agreement and does not affect commercial agreements with any other venture partner.

## **2.0 Summary**

### **Reason for Urgency**

The current commercial agreement 2018/19 with Blue Prism Ltd. expired on 31 March 2019. The new commercial agreement 2019/20 and was not submitted to the February 2019 CAB prior to commencement date on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019, as negotiations were still underway.

Further delay to approval of the new commercial agreement would have resulted in reduced income into the sustainability fund, due to pro-rated fees to the end of the commercial agreement period in August 2020.

## **2.1 Recommendation**

The Director of Local Government Performance and Finance recommended that the Commercial Agreement with Blue Prism and London Ventures was agreed

Elected Officers of Capital Ambition Board were asked to agree the London Councils submission by midday on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2019. The Urgency was approved.

---

### **Financial Implications for London Councils**

Over the course of the agreement period from August 2019 to August 2020, this commercial agreement will generate an income of approximately £25k per annum into the sustainability fund.

Additional income is pro-rated to account for the months prior to August 2019. This income is valued at approximately £4.2k from 1st June to 31st July 2019.

Deferring the review and approval of the commercial agreement with Blue Prism Ltd. to the July 2019 CAB, would have resulted in approximately £2k to £4.2k loss of income to the programme.

### **Legal Implications for London Councils**

London Councils' officers sought legal advice and took this into account in finalising the proposed agreement.

### **Equalities Implications for London Councils**

None



# Leaders' Committee

## Minutes and Summaries

Item no: 9

**Report by:** Lisa Dominic    **Job title:** Senior Governance Support Officer  
**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019  
**Contact Officer:** Christiane Jenkins  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9540    **Email:** [Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary**                      Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

**Recommendations**    Leader's Committee is recommended to note the attached minutes:

- GLPC Minutes – 21<sup>st</sup> March 2019
- Capital Ambition Board – 15<sup>th</sup> May 2019
- Executive – 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019
- Executive – 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019

# Leaders' Committee

## Report from the Greater London Provincial Council – 21 March 2019

Item no:

**Report by:** Steve Davies      **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers'  
**Date:** 9 July 2019  
**Contact Officer:** Steve Davies  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9963      **Email:** [steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** Summary of the minutes of the Greater London Provincial Council held on 21 March 2019

**Recommendations:** For information.

**1. Attendance: Employers' Side:** Cllr Cameron Geddes (Sub) (Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Alison Kelly (Sub) (Camden), Cllr Simon Hall (Croydon), Cllr David Gardner (Greenwich), Cllr Carole Williams (Hackney), Cllr Philip Corthorne (Hillingdon), Cllr Malcolm Self (Kingston), Cllr Amanda De Ryk (Lewisham), Mayor John Biggs (Chair) (Tower Hamlets), Cllr Guy Senior (Wandsworth), Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) **Unions:** Helen Reynolds (UNISON), April Ashley (UNISON), Kim Silver (UNISON), Maggie Griffin (UNISON), Sean Fox (UNISON), Mary Lancaster (UNISON), Clara Mason (UNISON), Vaughan West (GMB), Jonathon Coles (GMB), Wendy Whittington (GMB), Gary Cummins (Unite) and Danny Hoggan (Unite).

**2. Apologies for Absence:** Cllr Sade Bright (Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Richard Olszewski (Camden), Cllr Christine Grice (Greenwich), Cllr Robert Benham (Havering), Cllr Katherine Dunne (Hounslow), Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest), Gloria Hanson (UNISON), Simon Steptoe (UNISON), Donna Spicer (GMB), Peter Murphy (GMB), Kath Smith (Unite) and Susan Matthews (Unite).

**3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 October 2018:** The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2018 were agreed.

**4. Matters Arising:** There were no matters arising from the minutes of the 18 October 2018.

**5. Capital Letters – Eloise Shepherd:** Eloise Shepherd, Head of Housing and Planning Policy, London Councils informed colleagues that Capital Letters is a collaborative housing project for the joint procurement for London boroughs to access an improved supply of good quality accommodation to prevent and relieve homelessness and where necessary for use as temporary accommodation.

Thirteen boroughs have formally signed up are Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Waltham Forest, Brent, Ealing, Bexley, Lewisham, Croydon, Redbridge, Southwark, Barking & Dagenham, Westminster and Hammersmith & Fulham.

At present we think twenty staff will be TUPE'd, but we will know more after a Board meeting on 23 April.

Capital Letters is being set up as a new Company Limited by Guarantee, owned by London boroughs, with the support of funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Capital

Letters will employ staff in their own right as well as seconded staff from boroughs. Homelessness advice is an area where there is a huge gap in skills, so the package of employment will have to be attractive.

Sean Fox (UNISON) raised concern that by setting up a company by guarantee. In terms of the employment relationships how long is the company set up for? How long are people seconded for? This needs to be stated in contracts of employment. Will the company recognise trade unions, local authority terms and conditions and the local government pension scheme (LGPS)? Will they be on the Modification Order?

Eloise responded that the length of secondment to the company is backed up by the central government grant for three years so at present there is an end date for that.

In terms of terms and conditions etc these are known in boroughs so should be fine. There are discussions around the LGPS about are they financially able to do this. We need to come up with a definitive answer at the Board meeting on 23 April 2019.

Sean Fox (UNISON) requested that a discussion take place at the next meeting of Joint Secretaries as these are issues the unions are concerned about. In year two more boroughs may or may not join.

Eloise informed the meeting that there are arrangements to how boroughs will pay. The actual project plan was to have eight boroughs in year one, so we have more than expected. Anticipate 19 boroughs in year two.

The central government grant over the three years is £37.8 million.

April Ashley (UNISON) asked when will negotiations start with individual boroughs about secondments?

Eloise responded that this is currently happening in some boroughs and in others will happen soon.

Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) enquired whether the government grant will be renewed when it runs out?

Eloise responded that yes, we will look to continue to the work.

Colleagues in attendance agreed that an update be given at the GLPC AGM on 24 October 2019.

**6. GLPC London Pay Implementation 2019 – Update:** Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary informed colleagues that the report is self-explanatory in terms of what boroughs are proposing to do with implementing the new 2019 pay spine arrangements. Three boroughs are doing something a little bit more involved.

Sean Fox (UNISON) stated that he is pleased to see that 31 boroughs had responded to the survey and assumed that although Barnet are not on the list that they will be implementing.

Steve Davies Employers' Side Joint Secretary responded that yes, Barnet will be implementing and are currently bringing their HR service back in-house from CAPITA so have not had the time to respond.

Sean Fox (UNISON) requested that where boroughs are proposing to change grade boundaries that the Employers' Side share information with the unions as this will be a new collective agreement, so we will need to consult and allow time to consult on final proposals.

Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary responded that intel from the Heads of HR is that all are implementing from 1 April 2019 and where changes need to be made this will be discussed with the unions to agree before 1 April 2020.

Gary Cummins (Unite) highlighted that the report does not say how many councils signed off and got agreement with the unions.

Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary responded that he is not aware any boroughs had signed off at this moment in time. Boroughs responses to a survey in February 2019 fed in to the report tabled today.

April Ashley (UNISON) informed colleagues that Southwark should be signing off at Cabinet shortly.

Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary stated that it was key that any consultation did not affect the implementation of staff getting the 2% from 1 April 2019.

Mary Lancaster (UNISON) raised concern about community schools who are using internal payroll services. We do not know how the implementation will go for academies and MATs. The Union Side ask the Employers' Side who sit on school governing bodies to make sure this goes through smoothly.

Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) asked if the unions had any good practice they could share which could then be shared with schools.

Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) enquired when negotiations will start for the pay agreement for 2020-2021.

Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary responded that the GLPC take the lead from the National Joint Council following the Unions' pay claim.

Sean Fox (UNISON) informed colleagues that the Unions' pay claim should be happening in June 2019.

**7. Regional Adoption Services – Update:** Maggie McGrath, Programme Lead for London Adopt summarised the following key points:

- Since Maggie last attended GLPC on 18 October 2018, membership and timescales have changed. There are now 23 London boroughs. The four host Regional Adoption Agencies (RAAs) remain: Ealing, Havering, Southwark and Islington.
- The models and business cases have now been signed off by the RAA's.
- The four RAAs are at slightly different phases. Cabinet approval has happened in Southwark.
- Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea formally withdrew in February 2019.
- Looking to go-live in June/July 2019.
- Agreed at an Executive meeting two days ago that we will have a formal London-wide go-live at the end of September/October 2019. We do not want to rush the process.
- Three of the four Lead RAAs Heads of Service have been appointed but they will not be formalised until Cabinet approval. These are all existing London borough employees. East RAA is still to appoint.
- There is a HR Lead Working Group discussing policies and processes which is supported by the four RAAs.
- A lot of pan-London work happening recruiting Adopters and getting them to work pan-London.

Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) enquired why TUPE in place of secondments?

Maggie McGrath responded that some staff are going through reviews and consultations with their teams. Some staff saying that they want to remain employed in their borough. Each of the structures has a different process and they are seeking their own legal advice.

Danny Hoggan (Unite) asked what would the issue be if they do not join the consortium? People moving from Lewisham to Southwark would move to Southwark's terms and conditions. We are worried whether councils will turn around and fight against issues around geography – it seems a madcap idea. The South West is one area where it crosses all boroughs and we struggle to recruit.

Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) stated that he is not sure it will work this way. Some staff will stay within the same location they currently work. This is government policy just like with the homelessness issue we heard earlier.

April Ashley (UNISON) echoed Danny's comments, there are lots of staff unhappy with what is going on. In Lewisham an alternative proposal has been put forward. Have councils looked at different proposals and how the practices will change e.g. TUPE, terms and conditions, location – travel is a major issue.

We have been told in Southwark that if staff did not want to move across then they could find new jobs within the council.

Consultations and negotiations have not started in all boroughs yet.

Cllr David Gardner (Greenwich) informed colleagues that Greenwich are holding fire, not joined formally and are exploring locally other options but may have to join because of the DfE's hard deadline. Local authorities are under pressure.

Gary Cummins (Unite) informed colleague that he had received a consultation document yesterday and is surprised to hear that Heads of Services roles have been recruited to. The unions were not consulted about this and we are concerned we are not trusted.

The unions are also concerned that staff will become deskilled. Not sure the new proposal in Lewisham has reached officers and unions for discussion. We are willing in the South to sign people over to new terms and conditions which the unions do not agree with and we have just been talking about all London employees receiving the new pay scales.

Maggie McGrath gave the following responses to observations/comments:

- The presentation today was just to give an overview of what has been happening.
- If you do not join, the government are saying that they have the power to direct. So far have not seen any evidence this has happened.
- Each of the business cases are not in formal consultation yet. This will happen after Cabinet approval.
- Each model is different due to the number of boroughs in each of the four RAAs.
- Expectation is that staff will not be travelling across London.
- London's performance in adoption recruitment is lower than in the whole country. The premise is working collaboratively across London to support and recruit adopters.
- Recruitment – long standing workforce with very few vacancies. Staff are saying that they want to retain their specialisms – fostering and adoption.
- Clarity – would be helpful to know what clarity colleagues are asking for. Happy to coordinate questions and go back to the Strategic Directors and get answers.
- There are practice working groups. Small working groups of 3-4 staff so practice should not be different.
- Heads of Service JD's – not intentional to disrespect people. Advised colleagues in October that these posts will be advertised. These need to be approved by Cabinet.

Helen Reynolds, Joint Side Secretary stated that it is helpful to have an overview, but we are being told different things on the ground. Staff are being told different things by their managers, but this is probably about things not being agreed.

Maggie McGrath responded that the business case should be shared regularly with the unions.

Helen Reynolds, Joint Side Secretary we are not being given this and concerned the consultations have not started but will start on 1 June. In our mind to harmonise terms and conditions is not legal, so we will be getting advice.

Maggie McGrath responded that one of the challenges is communications in 23 boroughs. Some things are getting lost in translation.

Helen Reynolds, Joint Side Secretary requested that a meeting of the unions and HR RAA leads be organised.

Sean Fox (UNISON) raised concern about the timelines for staff who need to decide whether to stay or go.

Mary Lancaster (UNISON) stated that there is very little local consultation and knowledge. This is big frustration as we raised the issue two years ago of involving the unions at the early stages as we could see the things we are discussing today unfolding.

Maggie McGrath informed colleagues that the models had been shared with the West several times. There is a meeting scheduled for 4 April where I will raise issues highlighted today and agree to pick up issues off-line with colleagues.

**8. London Living Wage – Summary of the Position in London:** It was noted that Redbridge and Haringey should now have an \* against their name which acknowledged they are now Living Wage boroughs. The report was noted.

**9. Workplace Support for Parents with Premature or Sick Babies – Update:** Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets) highlighted the list provided by the Employers and stated that we should get just on with it and do this, it is a win, win.

**10. Schedule of Outstanding Differences:** It was noted that there were no outstanding appeals and differences.

**11. Any Other Business:** There was no further business.

**12. Date of next meeting:** The next meeting would be held on **Thursday 24 October 2019**  
*Group meetings will take place at 10am and the main meeting at 11.30am (or on the rising of the sides).*

**The meeting was concluded at 12.32pm**

# Leaders' Committee

## Report from the Capital Ambition Board Item no: – 15 May 2019

**Report by:** Ana Gradiska      **Job title:** Principal Governance and Projects Officer  
**Date:** 9 July 2019  
**Contact Officer:** Ana Gradiska  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9781      **Email:** Ana.gradiska@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

**Summary:** Summary of the minutes of the Capital Ambition Board held on 15 May 2019.

**Recommendations:** For information.

*Members* Cllr Steve Curran (Chair - LB Hounslow), Cllr Stephen Alambritis (LB Merton), Cllr David Simmonds OBE (LB Hillingdon), Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Dep - LB Ealing) *Advisors* Paul Najsarek (Chief Executive, LB Ealing), EY Victoria Evans (Senior Manager, Local Public Services), Amy Luca (Senior Consultant, Local Public Services). *Also attending:* Melissa Caslake, Bi-Borough Executive Director of Children's Services.

London Councils officers were in attendance.

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

1.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. Apologies for absence**

2.1. Apologies were received from Cllr Kevin Davis (RB Kingston Upon Thames), Cllr Victoria Mills (LB Southwark – Cllr Yvonne Johnsons was deputising), Andrew Blake-Herbert (Chief Executive, LB Havering), John Hooton (Chief Executive, LB Barnet) and Sarah Ireland (Director, Corporate and Commercial, RB Kingston upon Thames).

### **3. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2019**

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **4. Capital Ambition – Director's Report and London Ventures Progress Report**

4.1 Guy Ware, Director of Local Government Performance and Finance, introduced the report, which set out the current financial position of the programme. He said that at April 202119 there would be an unallocated balance of £150,711. However, it is likely that these funds would potentially be spent on the forthcoming new one year London Ventures contract to August 2020.

- 4.2 Members were informed that the following new organisations have been accepted into the general ventures offering of products and services:
- Autome, which helps Local Authorities measure the progress of people with Learning Disabilities to improve decision making and deliver better outcomes through the use of apps to support their independence;
  - EveryLIFE, which provided Local Authorities with access to real time information and intelligence about the delivery of social care to enable councils to commission more effectively and improve outcomes for its service users; and
  - Pythagoras, which supported Local Authorities to transform their digital transformation strategies through the Microsoft platform.
- Guy Ware said that these new partners would be invited to give presentations at future Capital Ambition Board meetings.
- 4.3 The following partners have committed to continuing their longstanding relationship with the London Ventures will be continuing its relationship with long standing partnerships with Xantura, Oxygen Finance, FISCAL Technologies and Cornerstone.
- 4.4 An update on the first cycle of targeted ventures on homelessness, temporary accommodation and housing that were being delivered by the boroughs included:
- PLACE - the contract for the design and manufacture of the modular housing units units was awarded to Extraspace. Additional London boroughs (Tower Hamlets, Lambeth, Ealing and Redbridge) have now joined the company.
  - Capital Letters - the contract for the property listing platform that London Ventures provided the specification for was awarded to Panlogic.
  - Transition Insurance – LB Southwark has been successful in their application to the PRS Access fund on behalf of a number of councils across the country.
  - Predictive analytics was on hold at LB Southwark.
- 4.5 EY said that they were currently finalising commercial deals with two potential venture partners: Blue Prism and Canopy which are discussed in more depth in a later paper.
- 4.6 Members raised the applicability of the Xantura offer to domains other than childrens' services and EY, as well as London Councils officers, raised the fact that the predictive analytics capability was being tested across a number of service areas. Furthermore EY leads alluded to the point that the London Ventures model was generating a high level of interest from members of the County Councils Network, which also provided an expanded opportunity to promote the products and services offered through the programme to a wider audience.

## **5. Any other business**

- 5.1 There was no other business.

**Members resolved to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the exempt part of the meeting.**

The meeting finished at 10:55



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive  
Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019 9:30 am**

**Cllr Peter John OBE was in the chair**

**Present**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>
Cllr Peter John OBE	Chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Vice chair
Cllr Nickie Aiken	
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Darren Rodwell	
Cllr Muhammed Butt	
Cllr Jas Athwal	
Cllr Clyde Loakes	Substitute
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Liz Green	Substitute
Mayor John Biggs	Substitute

Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE and London Councils officers were in attendance.

**1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Georgia Gould for whom Mayor John Biggs was substituting, Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE for whom Cllr Liz Green was substituting, Cllr Clare Coghill for whom Cllr Clyde Loakes was substituting, and Catherine McGuinness.

**2. Declaration of interest**

Cllr Teresa O'Neill declared an interest as a board member for Homes for England.

**3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting

**4. Secure Children's Homes**

It was reported that item 4 on the Agenda, "Secure Children's Homes' had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**5. Exiting the EU – Update on Local Engagement**

The Chief Executive introduced the report. There were two primary streams of work in which London local government was engaged – the pan London resilience and contingency arrangements reporting through the Local Authority Panel in to the London Resilience Panel, as well as the regional information hub with MHCLG being delivered through London Councils. Members were informed that since 11<sup>th</sup> April the daily and weekly reporting schedules had been suspended following the extension of Article 50; weekly teleconferences involving the nine Regional Hub Chief Executives and officials from Government had continued. The Ministerial EU Exit Local Government Delivery Board, with London Councils representation, also continued to meet.

In response to a question from the Chair about position of settled status cases, the Chief Executive confirmed that he had asked the Home Office for a breakdown of cases by borough to match against borough expectations.

Cllr Govindia asked about available information on whether people were opting to apply for dual nationality as opposed to settled status. The Chief Executive agreed to investigate the likely availability of such data.

Members noted the report.

## **6. Nominations to Outside Bodies**

The Chief Executive informed members that the report was made annually to members on the breakdown of nominations to outside bodies and the principles underpinning this.

In response to a question from Cllr Bell, it was confirmed that most nominations were elected members but, on occasion, non-elected people were nominated where, it was felt, this could benefit London local government.

Members noted the report.

The meeting ended at 09:55 am.

---

<b>Action points</b>			
	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Exiting the EU – Update on Local Engagement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chief Executive to check the availability of dual nationality applications against settled status applications.</li> </ul>	<b>Chief Executive</b>	Ongoing

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive**  
**Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019 9:30 am**

**Cllr Peter John OBE was in the chair**

**Present**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>
Cllr Peter John OBE	Chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Vice Chair
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Muhammed Butt	
Cllr Jas Athwal	
Cllr Georgia Gould	Deputy Chair
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Ruth Dombey	Vice Chair
Catherine McGuinness	Vice Chair

Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE, London Councils officers and Chris Munday, ALDCS/LB Barnet were in attendance.

**1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Nickie Aiken, Cllr Darren Rodwell and Cllr Clare Coghill.

**2. Declaration of interest**

Cllr Teresa O'Neill declared an interest as a board member of Homes for England.

**3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

**4. Secure Children's Homes**

The Chief Executive introduced Chris Munday, the Director of Children's Services - London Borough of Barnet and the resources and sustainability lead for the Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS), who talked about the work produced by the ALDCS steering group, carried out in partnership with the NHS.

Mr Munday introduced the paper, commenting that:

- the report, which was initiated and funded by the NHS, with input from the GLA and Department for Education (DfE), arose out of a requirement for London Directors to consider the issue of placement of children in secure accommodation, which, although rarely done because of the seriousness of the decisions, was nevertheless challenging because of the lack of suitable accommodation nationally, exacerbated by the closure of children's homes
- as there were no secure children's homes in the capital, children had to be placed nationally, on average 190 miles from London
- the report recommended the development of two units in London to give increased capacity, although accepting that some placements would still need to be made outside of London
- it was important that any arrangement shared risks across the capital rather than the authorities in which future accommodation would be located
- the recommendation was dependent on capital and revenue investment from the DfE

In response to questions from the Chair, Mr. Munday confirmed that the precise locations of the homes would be dependent on the level of capital investment offered and the ability to comply with the regulatory requirements, although the sites were most likely to be in outer London (LB Barking and Dagenham had already made the offer of a site); the average cost of placements depended on the needs of the children, but averaged between £500 – 900 a week; it was envisaged that the commissioner would be a wholly owned entity, the details of which would be addressed at the business case stage of the proposal. Mr. Munday also hoped that the resources could eventually be extended beyond the present proposal to look at other areas which had low incidence but high costs.

Members made the following points:

- There was concern that more demand might be created by the establishment of additional homes
- The impact on police resources should be considered
- 'wraparound' support may be more effective than secure provision
- Step-down provision needed to be in place

Mr Munday responded to these points: incidents of secure home placements among young children were rare, but it was important to provide adequately sized regulated accommodation; in terms of police resources, he felt that it would be useful for the police

to do more preventative work to obviate the need for securing children; that 'wraparound' support was effective with some children but not others in terms of desired outcomes; and that the creation of packages of support were often short term in nature. In addition, Mr. Munday reported that step down provision would be built into the proposals, as well as appropriate and secure arrangements for risk sharing between boroughs.

Members noted the work of the Steering Group and thanked Mr. Munday for attending the meeting.

## **5. MHCLG Consultation: Future Funding and Delivery of Accommodation-based Domestic Abuse Services**

Cllr Athwal introduced the report, informing Members that:

- The consultation put forward the possibility of a pan London agreement for a facility to sit alongside existing borough provision, and to take a strategic approach to dealing with the anomalies in that provision
- The paper set out the way forward from 2020 and highlighted the statutory duties of the Tier 1 authorities and the Tier 2 authorities' requirement to co-operate with the GLA at Tier 1
- There were still issues to be resolved to ensure that boroughs both played a central role and coordinated their work, in that the client group were often not housed in the borough in which they lived

In response to a question from the Chair regarding existing funding of domestic abuse services, Cllr Athwal confirmed that while some of these services were currently grant funded, the funding sources were wide and the arrangements often complex; the proposal would move towards a clearer cross borough strategic approach to commissioning.

Members made the following points:

- The proposal concentrated on moving the affected women, rather than the perpetrators
- Funding decisions made at a central level could impact on services at a borough level
- The role of the GLA was highlighted in relation to discussions about pan London governance
- There was a need for a solid governance model and cross borough commissioning, which were important because of the different positions of boroughs in terms of funding their domestic abuse services

Members were informed that as the paper was a consultation document from MHCLG, Executive were entitled to challenge the proposed Tier 1 and 2 governance arrangements. In suggesting alternatives regard needed to be given to statutory responsibilities; also, it was agreed that in terms of boroughs' collective capacity any new governance arrangements needed to be assessed, and that the Grants Committee should be involved. It was also confirmed that a new funding stream would be made available for the service, rather than from existing resources.

The Chair noted the steer proposed by Members, particularly in relation to Tier 2 governance.

## **6. Next steps for Housing cross sector working**

In the absence of Cllr Rodwell, Dick Sorabji, London Councils Corporate Director of Policy & Public Affairs, introduced the paper, informing Members that the paper proposed the establishment of a Task and Finish Group, involving sector experts.. The intention was to confirm a fixed agenda by the early autumn.

The Chair noted that, of the list of potential issues contained in Section 5 of the paper, in that many of the others were being managed via other Committees and groups, the one most obviously suitable was "Identifying issues in the development of new homes in suburban London and seeking ways to collaborate to address these issues."

Members also commented that:

- The role of Homes for Londoners should be considered in relation to the work of the proposed Group
- the proposed new Group was to be a Task and Finish Group rather than a Board
- the Group needed a clear remit to ensure that it added value
- The Group presented the opportunity for boroughs to work collectively rather than individually and to present findings to Boards such as Homes for Londoners
- Resident representation was important in the Group, and had been valued at the recent conference
- Any sign up to resulting proposals would be at boroughs' discretion
- The development of a set of pan London benchmarks regarding developer consultation with communities would be of value
- There was a continued issue about the need to obtain accurate figures regarding the number of new homes to be built by boroughs

The Chair confirmed that the difference between the proposed Group and the Homes for Londoners Board was that the former would concentrate on delivery rather than strategy,

and that it was important that the challenges considered by the Group needed to be correctly focused.

The Corporate Director of Policy and Public Affairs responded to members' points by confirming that:

- The concept of 'pan London' was not restricted to the GLA
- The elements of the Group's work that would add value had yet to be fully informed by evidence, but would concentrate on areas of value to boroughs, which the GLA would not statutorily be able to address
- The aim of the group was not to seek commitments from boroughs but to provide useful tools for adoption by them
- In the policy issues contained in item 5 of the report, no green belt land would be included within development proposals

Members noted the report and provided the required steer for further changes. It was agreed that a further report on the proposals be brought back to a future meeting of the Executive.

## **7. Borough role in the London Local Industrial Strategy and Skills Employment Vision**

Cllr Georgia Gould introduced the report, commenting that:

- Although the first draft of the London Industrial Strategy had not made specific mention of London boroughs it was informed by borough priorities; the issues of subsidiarity had not been resolved within the strategy, however
- This paper set out a high-level vision of boroughs' roles in the areas of employment and skills both individually and sub regionally
- There was still a need to make the vision more granular so that there was an understanding of each borough's employment and skills arrangements, the commitments to be made from bodies involved in those arrangements and the role of the GLA
- A meeting was to be held with London boroughs following this Executive meeting to further these discussions, as there needed to be better consistency and 'join up' among boroughs in terms of engagement with businesses.

In response to a question from Cllr O'Neill regarding the feasibility of signing off the work with the Mayor by summer 2019, Cllr Gould commented that this element related to the skills and employment vision only, and that that the timetable for the Industrial Strategy was a national one, linked to a seven year package of post EU funding, on which a lot of consultation work had already been done with boroughs.



Cllr Gould also mentioned that the GLA had commissioned some work looking at opportunities for devolution to London in areas like the Apprenticeship Levy and funding for 16-18 year-olds.

In terms of the overall strategy, it was recognised that while there were some themes common to all boroughs, each London local authority would have its own specific issues, and indeed its own approach to the development of its industrial and economic strategies (including sub regional relationships), and that 'ownership' of these issues was important in the strategy's development.

Members discussed whether it might be possible to append some borough strategies to the overall Industrial Strategy document, although accepting that arrangements would vary between boroughs, and that an understanding of those differing arrangements would be important.

The Chair thanked members for their steer on this work and confirmed the intention that the issue was to be discussed by Congress at their July meeting.

## **8. Consolidated Pre-Audited outturn 2018/19**

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Services, informed members that the provisional figures showed a surplus of just over £3.1m, against the previously reported figure of £2.6m.

There was nothing new to report in terms of variances contained in the body of the report. With regard to reserves, the commitments of just over £10m were slightly higher than previously reported, because of changes agreed at TEC in relation to the 2020 Freedom Pass reissue process which would achieve savings.

Cllr Puddifoot noted the underspend in many areas and the reasonable level of reserves, and commended London Councils staff for their work in this area.

The meeting ended at 10:50 am.

---

**Action points**

<b>Item No</b>		<b>Action by</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A further report on the next steps for Housing cross sector working be brought back to a future meeting of the Executive</li></ul>	<b>Corporate Director of Policy &amp; Public Affairs</b>	In progress
<b>7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>London Local Industrial Strategy and Skills employment Vision to be discussed at next meeting of Congress</li></ul>	<b>Strategic Lead: Enterprise, Economy and Skills</b>	On agenda for Congress July 2019