

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE

Meeting of the CIVIL
CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE to be
held in Authority Rooms, Fire and
Rescue Service Headquarters, Nissan
Way, Barmston Mere, Washington on
MONDAY 31 JANUARY 2011 at
10.30 a.m.

AGENDA

PART I

ITEM	PAGE
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Minutes	1
Minutes of the last meeting of the Civil Contingencies Committee held on 25 October 2010, Part I (copy herewith) for confirmation.	
4. Community Risk Register	9
Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer (copy herewith).	
5. Flood Plan Update	13
Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer (copy herewith).	
6. Great North Run 2010	17
Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer (copy herewith).	

7. **Dame Hines Pandemic Influenza Review – Recommendations** 25
Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer (copy herewith).
8. **Performance Against Targets - Quarter 3 2010/11** 35
Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer (copy herewith).

Note:

Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation Order) 2006

The reports contained in Part II of the Agenda are not for publication as the Authority is considered likely to exclude the public during their consideration of the reports as they contain exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) or information relating to consultations/negotiations in connection with any labour matter arising between the Authority and employees of the Authority (Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, Part I, Paragraphs 3 and 4).

PART II

9. **Minutes** 49
Minutes of the last meeting of the Civil Contingencies Committee held on 25 October 2010, Part II (copy herewith).
10. **Review of Emergency Planning and Resilience Arrangements in Tyne and Wear** 51
Report of the Chief Executive, Sunderland City Council (copy herewith).

Dave Smith,
Clerk to the Authority.

Civic Centre,
SUNDERLAND.

21 January 2011

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE held in the Authority Rooms, Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters, Nissan Way, Barmston Mere, Washington on MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2010 at 10.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Bell in the Chair

Councillors Charlton, Clark, Mole, Renton, Trueman and Wright.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jordan, Val Bowman and Tom Capeling.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Minutes

15. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 5 July 2010 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Emergency Planning Society Conference 2010

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer (CEPO) submitted a report (copy circulated) on the Emergency Planning Society Conference 2010.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

The conference focused on the key challenges in the field of Emergency Planning and Business Continuity and consisted of a series of presentations and workshops.

The delegates heard from a wide range of speakers including the opening address by Kenny MacAskill MSP, Cabinet Secretary for Justice and a snapshot on the Future of UK Resilience by Christina Scott, Director of the Civil Contingencies Secretariat, Cabinet Office.

The conference covered the following themes:

- Keynote Address ‘Are We Ready for the Next Disaster’;
- Session One – ‘The Ghost of Futures Past’;
- Session Two – ‘Herding Cats? Cooperation and Coordination in Present Day Emergencies’;
- Session Three – ‘Critical National Infrastructure – How Resilient is our Future?’;
- Session Four ‘Watch This “Space” – The Power of Mother Nature’

The Conference also provided an excellent opportunity to network with representatives of other relevant agencies and organisations and the information gained would be used to inform the further development of plans and procedures in Tyne and Wear.

16. RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Report on the Response to the 2009 Influenza Pandemic

The Committee considered a report by the Chief Emergency Planning Officer on the results of the review by Dame Deidre Hines of the United Kingdom’s strategic response to the 2009 influenza pandemic.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

The purpose of the review was to review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the UK strategy for responding domestically to the H1N1 pandemic and to make recommendations to update and refine planning for any future influenza pandemic.

The review considered several key factors in determining the response to the pandemic. These were:-

- The central government response;
- Scientific Advice;
- The containment Phase;
- Treatment;
- Vaccine; and
- Communications.

The review concluded that the strategic response in the UK was 'highly satisfactory' and the key successes highlighted in the report were as follows:

- planning for a pandemic was well developed;
- the personnel involved were fully prepared;
- the scientific advice provided was expert;
- communication was excellent;
- the NHS and public health services right across the UK and their suppliers responded splendidly; and
- the public response was calm and collaborative.

The strategic central response provided local responders with up to date information which needed to be translated into planning and activity at local level. The LRF Pandemic Influenza Working Group, Chaired by Newcastle City Council and supported by the TWEP, was able to adapt to changing planning assumptions and clinical data and was reactive and dynamic in its approach.

Councillor Bell asked if H1N1 was still a major threat. Lindsey Horwood stated that one of the characteristics of a pandemic was the second wave period and it was therefore sensible to include the vaccine alongside the seasonal flu vaccinations.

The Committee welcomed the report and noted the exceptional level of preparedness the UK had attained.

17. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the report be noted; and
- (ii) the Committee receive updated and related reports as necessary.

Major Hazard Exercise: Exercise Cornerstone (NGN Ltd)

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer submitted a report (copy circulated) on a Major Accident Hazard Pipelines (MAHP) multi agency table top exercise carried out with Northern Gas Networks at West Denton Community Fire Station on 8 September 2010. The event was entitled "Exercise Cornerstone 2010".

(For copy report – see original minutes).

The testing of emergency plans was required to ensure that they were accurate, complete and practicable. "Exercise Cornerstone" had been developed as an important element of the Northumbria Local Resilience Forum (LRF) Training and Exercising programme 2010/2011.

Councillor Wright noted the success and value of such exercises and the statutory requirement to train and exercise on every plan. He referred to the review of the Emergency Planning Unit and asked who would instigate these exercises in the future. Joy Brindle stated that there would be an opportunity to explore these issues when the review of the Emergency Planning Unit was considered at the next Authority meeting.

Exercise Cornerstone was a successful and very useful exercise. Many lessons had been learnt to aid the development of The Major Accident Hazard Pipelines Plan. A further outcome of the exercise would be a revision of Standard Operating Procedures by Emergency Services and Partner Agencies.

18. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the report be noted; and
- (ii) the continued integrated emergency management of Major Accident Hazard Pipelines in Tyne and Wear be supported.

Business Plan 2010 and Performance Report

The Committee considered a report by the Chief Emergency Planning Officer on the Business/Work Plan for 2010/11 and progress against targets for the first two quarters of the period (April to September 2010).

(For copy report – see original minutes).

An annual work plan, for the financial year 2010/11, detailing agreed outputs and timescales had been developed at the direction of the Strategic Management Board (SMB).

Several changes in the business planning process were implemented in 2009/10. The key changes were introduced by SMB who recognised that in order to take a holistic view of resilience across Tyne and Wear, it would now need to take responsibility for setting the business planning priorities, both for TWEPU and for Councils.

The work to be carried out by the Tyne and Wear Resilience Operational Planners Group (TWROP) was also included in the plan for the first time. TWROP was made up of Resilience Officers from each of the five councils. The plan now reflected all of the work being carried out across the whole Tyne and Wear area.

Over the last few months, the resilience function within Tyne and Wear had been subject to review. This process had required a significant amount of work, by the Chief Emergency Planning Officer and SMB members. This, along with restructuring and change within the local authorities had consequently resulted in the late publication of this year's TWEPU Work Plan. The work plan was attached to the report.

Some work areas from the 2009-10 Business Plan were not completed and were due to be carried forward into the 2010-11 Business Plan. Changing priorities meant that some of these work areas would now not be completed and had been put on hold. Some of the outstanding work had been added to the 2010/11 Business Plan.

In addition to work set out in the 2010/11 Work Plan, a significant resource had been provided by both TWEPU and SMB members on the ongoing review of resilience arrangements in Tyne and Wear. Officers from Councils and TWEPU had formed part of the Review Team which had worked to set out terms of reference for the review and conduct activity around developing alternative delivery models.

The dynamic and fluid approach to the work plan for 2010/11 had meant that new items were being automatically incorporated into the plan following review by SMB.

19. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the TWEPU Business/Work Plan for 2010-2011 be agreed;
- (ii) the progress against targets for Quarters 1 and 2 of 2010/11 be noted;
and
- (iii) other reports be received as necessary.

Local Resilience Forum (LRR) Review

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer submitted a report on the review of the Local Resilience Forum.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

The revised structure of the Local Resilience Forum was shown schematically in the report and comprised of an Executive Board, a Business Management Group and a set of Theme Groups.

Theme Leads were scheduled to meet with the Chair of the Business Management Group (BMG) in the next few weeks to discuss proposals for the development of terms of reference for their respective groups, the development of action plans and the establishment of and/or rationalisation of working groups/task groups.

There was also a piece of work currently under consideration by a representative of South Tyneside Council which would produce proposals around how to engage elected members within the LRF process. Further reports would be brought to the committee when this had been considered further.

20. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the report be noted;
- (ii) the role of TWEPU in leading this important review be acknowledged;
- (iii) further reports be received on the outcomes once the Review had concluded.

National Training Awards

The Committee considered a report by the Chief Emergency Planning Officer on the National Training Awards.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

The EPU and TWFRS had been awarded a Regional Training Award. The award nomination was submitted in conjunction with a number of partners including Northumbria Police and the North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust in recognition of the Guardian exercise series.

The National Training Awards was a scheme which recognised the impact that excellent training, learning and development had on achieving outstanding organisational and individual success and provided a benchmark for standards of excellence in training in the UK.

The Guardian Team submitted an entry in the Partnership and Collaboration category which aimed to acknowledge and celebrate the positive impact and success created through the use of a collaborative approach to learning. This category was aimed at two or more organisations combining resources to work together on the development and delivery of the training.

On Tuesday 21 September 2010, the annual NTA Regional Ceremony was held at the Discovery Museum, Newcastle.

The ceremony was attended by members from the Guardian Planning Team and their commitment and hard work was rewarded when the Exercise Guardian submission was awarded a Regional Award. The Judges identified the uniqueness of the submission and were particularly impressed by the excellent multi-agency working evident throughout the planning, preparation, delivery and review of the Guardian Series.

The recognition from a national panel of highly respected judges of the Guardian Series of exercises highlighted the improvements made in responder capabilities from both a single and multi-agency standpoint. It also underlined the position the area maintained nationally in CBRN preparedness and response.

The Committee welcomed the report and thanked all Officers involved for their contribution to gaining the award.

21. RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006

At the instance of the Chairman, it was:-

22. RESOLVED that in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 the public be excluded during consideration of the remaining business as it was considered to involve a disclosure of information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information (Local Government Act 1972) Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, Schedule 12A, Part I, Paragraph 3).

(Signed) J. BELL,
Chairman.

Note:-

The above minutes comprise only those relating to items during which the meeting was open to the public.

Additional minutes in respect of other items are included in Part II.



**TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT**

Committee Report

Item No. 4

**Meeting: CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE - 31 JANUARY 2011
Subject: UPDATE OF NORTHUMBRIA COMMUNITY RISK REGISTER**

Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the update of the Northumbria Local Resilience Forum (LRF) Community Risk Register (CRR).
- 1.2 The CRR is an important document produced following extensive work by partners within the LRF area. It provides a basis for local responders to consider which emergency plans are required, and whether any existing plans should be modified in the light of continuing risk assessment. It is also used to determine priorities for the LRF annual training and exercising calendar.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 According to 'Emergency Preparedness' - the Guidance to the Civil Contingencies Act (CAA) 2004, risk assessment is the first step in the emergency planning and business continuity planning processes. It ensures that Category 1 and 2 responders make plans that are sound, and proportionate to risks.
- 2.2 As part of the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) process, Category 1 and 2 responders co-operate with each other in maintaining the CRR. The Register provides an agreed position on the risks affecting a local area and on the planning and resourcing priorities required to prepare for those risks.
- 2.3 Its purpose is to enable Responders to:
 - be fully informed of the risks of emergency in its area;
 - benefit from the range of views on risk of its partners on the LRF;
 - identify collectively the main local emergency plans and resources which are needed;
 - decide which of the plans and capabilities should properly fall to it; and
 - know which of its partners in the LRF acknowledges responsibility for developing plans and capabilities against the various risks.
- 2.4 The Guidance advocates a six-step process for risk assessment that reflects widely accepted good practice. It involves a cycle of identifying

potential hazards within the local context, assessing the risks, and considering how those risks should be managed.

3. NORTHUMBRIA LOCAL RESILIENCE FORUM RISK ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP (RAWG)

3.1 The RAWG is chaired by the Head of Resilience for Northumberland County Council, with an officer from Tyne & Wear Emergency Planning Unit representing the 5 x Tyne and Wear Local Authorities and providing support to the Chair.

3.2 Other RAWG members include representatives of; the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Northumbria Police, Tyne & Wear Fire and Rescue Service (also representing Northumberland Fire and Rescue Service), North East Ambulance Service Trust, the Health Protection Agency, the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive. Meetings are also attended by representatives of Northumbrian Water, Transco, CE Electric and the Government Regional Resilience Team.

3.3 The RAWG tasks include;

- To facilitate co-operation on risk assessment between all relevant Category 1 and 2 Responders, other local bodies or regional and national organisations.
- To identify and recommend the adoption of sound methodology for risk assessment using best available guidance.
- To facilitate the creation and maintenance of a Community Risk Register for the Northumbria Local Resilience Forum area, and make it available to the public.

4. ASSESSMENT OF RISK

4.1 There is a duty placed on Category 1 and 2 responders to assess the risk of an emergency within, or affecting, a geographical area for which each responder is responsible. The term 'Emergency', as defined in the Act, is an event or situation which threatens serious damage to human welfare in a place in the United Kingdom, an event or situation which threatens serious damage to the environment of a place in the United Kingdom, or war, or terrorism, which threatens serious damage to the security of the United Kingdom.

4.2 It must also meet either of the following criteria:

- The hazard is of a sufficient scale and nature that it is likely to seriously obstruct a Category 1 or 2 responder in the performance of its functions.
- The hazard requires the Category 1 or 2 responder to undertake a special mobilisation.

5. COMPILATION OF THE COMMUNITY RISK REGISTER

- 5.1 Each year the Government produces a 'Local Risk Assessment Guidance' for LRF RAWGs. It is intended to support RAWGs in developing their local risk assessments by providing central guidance on the likelihood of some potential disruptive challenges, and promote consistency in approach across the country.
- 5.2 In addition, the Government also publishes an unclassified National Risk Register (NRR) that sets out its assessment of the likelihood and potential impact of a range of different risks that might affect the UK.
- 5.3 The Northumbria RAWG met regularly during 2010 to review the CRR, identify appropriate risks within the area, and undertake assessments of those risks. This allowed comparisons to be made, and facilitated the procedure of risks being prioritised. The assessments and guidance contained within the LRAG and NRR were considered when making these assessments.
- 5.4 A draft CRR was circulated to the Northumbria LRF in December. The CRR Version 6 was presented to the Business Management Group of the LRF for ratification on the 13th January 2011 to be endorsed by Executive Board at its meeting in March.

6. UTILISATION OF THE REGISTER

- 6.1 Risks identified in the CRR are prioritised into four categories;
 - Very High
 - High
 - Medium
 - Low
- 6.2 This allows organisations to develop control measures, and plans and response arrangements for the highest risks.
- 6.3 The Very High risks in the Northumbria Register are
 - Industrial Accident – involving large toxic release e.g. of Chlorine
 - Flooding – coastal / tidal, fluvial (river), and
 - Influenza – pandemic and epidemic
- 6.4 These all have specific emergency response plans prepared for them; on-site and off-site plans for the industrial accident site (under the Control of Major Accident Hazard Regulations 1999), The LRF Multi Agency Flood Plan, and an LRF Influenza Plan.
- 6.5 There are a range of other risks in the High, Medium and Low categories. While some of the have specific response arrangements, incidents involving others would normally be dealt with using generic emergency arrangements including the appropriate Council Major Incident / Emergency Response Plan.
- 6.6 The prioritisation of the CRR also allows training and exercising to be targeted at those risks which figure highest. The Register is therefore a

useful tool for the LRF Training and Exercising Group when determining priorities for developing the annual LRF training and exercising programme.

7 PUBLICATION OF THE COMMUNITY RISK REGISTER

- 7.1 The Civil Contingencies Act requires that the Register be published. The latest version (V6) of the CRR is available on the LRF web-site; <http://www.northumberland.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=8179>
- 7.2 Having the CRR hosted on a central web-site, with links from the web-sites of partner organisations, is an effective method of meeting the public information requirements of the Act.

8 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The update of the Northumbria LRF CRR, developed by the RAWG, has been duly published. It provides the basis to determine priorities for the LRF annual training and exercising calendar for 2011.

9 RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Members are asked to note the publication of Version 6 of the Northumbria LRF Community Risk Register.

Background Papers

The under-mentioned Background Papers relate to the subject matter of the above report and are held in the EPU office:-

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004
- “Emergency Preparedness’ Guidance on Part 1of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004
- The National Risk Register 2010
- The Local Risk Assessment Guidance 2010 (Restricted)
- Northumbria Local Resilience Forum Community Risk Register Version 6



**TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT**

Committee Report

Meeting : CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE : 31 JANUARY 2011

**Subject : NORTHUMBRIA LOCAL RESILIENCE FORUM MULTI AGENCY
FLOOD PLAN**

Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members on a report presented to this Committee in July 2010, and to advise of the current status of the Northumbria Local Resilience Forum (LRF) Multi Agency Flood Plan.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Members will recall that the Northumbria LRF Flood Group was established in September 2008, and is chaired by a senior officer from the Environment Agency, with an officer from the Tyne & Wear Emergency Planning Unit (TWEPU) currently carrying out the role of Secretariat.
- 2.2 A range of relevant Category 1 and 2 responders from the Local Resilience Forum are represented on the group, including the five Tyne and Wear Councils, Northumberland County Council, and the Fire and Rescue Services of Tyne and Wear and Northumberland. The Flood Group sits within the environment theme of the LRF architecture.

3. FLOOD PLAN DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1 The Group is tasked with a range of responsibilities regarding flood planning and related issues, including the development of a Northumbria wide Multi Agency Flood Plan.
- 3.2 Defra, The Environment Agency (EA) and The Cabinet Office jointly issued guidance documents to assist with the development of LRF multi agency flood plans, and this guidance was adhered to as the original Plan was being drafted by the Group. There were particular issues in our area to be resolved, including the fact that Northumbria is a mixture of urban and rural environments and has a wide range of flood risks including rivers, surface water, and coastal flooding. Tyne and Wear is affected by all of these risks to a greater or lesser extent. These concerns were successfully addressed as the Plan was being developed.

- 3.3 It was decided that that there should be a single plan for Northumbria LRF area, with Part 1 - the strategic element being coordinated by the TWEPU officer. The 6 Sections in part 2 based upon the six local authority areas covered by Northumbria LRF (i.e. Northumberland, North Tyneside, Newcastle, Gateshead, South Tyneside and Sunderland), were compiled by the Resilience Officer for that council area. The main plan writers had assistance and support from the other members of the Flood Plan Group.
- 3.4 The aim of the Plan is to provide a mechanism to co-ordinate the multi-agency response to a flooding incident with severe impacts on one council area, or affecting more than one local authority area in the Northumbria LRF area. For smaller scale flooding incidents elements of the plan can be used.
- 3.5 The Plan was published on schedule in February 2010.

4. PLAN VALIDATION

- 4.1 An important part of plan development is exercising the plan to validate it and assess whether it is fit for purpose, while identifying any improvements needed.
- 4.2 To realise validation a 'walk through' exercise was held at the EA offices in Newcastle on the 17th June, facilitated by a member of TWEPU. This exercise which was programmed into the LRF Training and Exercising calendar enabled the Flood Group particularly the main plan writers to assess the effectiveness of the alerting, command and control elements, and the co-ordination arrangements specified in the plan.
- 4.3 A number of potential improvements to the plan were identified, resulting in the development of a programme of work to identify who would be responsible for the improvements, and the projected timescale to complete the tasks prior to publication of the latest version.

5. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

- 5.1 In September 2010 Defra, the Environment Agency and the Civil Contingencies Secretariat of the Cabinet Office jointly issued a revised 'Multi Agency Flood Plan Guidance.' The purpose of this document is to help achieve standardisation in LRF Flood plans across the country. The Guidance includes as 'good practice' a 'Flood Indexing Tool' which is an extract from the Northumberland Council area part of the Northumbria Flood Plan.
- 5.2 The Guidance was circulated to the Northumbria LRF main plan writers so they could utilise the document when preparing the update of their particular part of the Plan.
- 5.3 Additionally, the EA issued simplified the Flood Warning Codes in December 2010. These codes act as trigger points in the Plan for the various levels of actions for those organisations which are the plan users. The new codes have been included in the revised version of the plan.

- 5.4 Also in December, the EA issued revised Surface Water Flood map information to allow plan writers to better identify the risk from surface water flooding.
- 5.5 This revised version (V2.2 December 2010) has been published and distributed to partner organisations, and will be validated in a tabletop exercise being held as part of the national flood exercise 'Watermark' in March 2011. Northumbria LRF will be participating in 'Watermark' not as part of the 'core' exercise, but in a 'bolt on' capacity.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 There continues to be significant activity in relation to flooding, both locally and nationally.
- 6.2 New responsibilities have been placed upon some organisations by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, in particular Councils such as the Tyne and Wear Authorities have been designated as 'Lead Local Flood Authorities' and given responsibility for developing flood risk mitigation strategies for their area in conjunction with partner organisations.
- 6.3 The multi agency LRF Flood Plan Group continues to develop response arrangements, to address any significant flooding events which occur in the future.
- 6.4 The LRF Flood Plan has been updated to address:
- Additional information indicated by Defra;
 - Surface Water flooding information provided by the EA;
 - issues identified in the 'Walk Through' exercise of July 2010;
 - the updated Flood Plan Guidance;
 - the revised Flood Warning codes devised by the Environment Agency.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Members are asked to note the plan has been updated to include the improvements / changes detailed above.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Tyne and Wear Civil Contingencies Committee Report – Flooding Issues Update – 05 July 2010
- Templates, Figures & Tables for developing a Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) For Local Resilience Forums and Emergency Planners - September 2010 v3

- The Flood and Water Management Act 2010
- Northumbria Local Resilience Forum Multi Agency Flood Plan – December 2010 (Restricted)

Copies of these documents are available in the Emergency Planning Unit



TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT

Committee Report

Item No. 6

Meeting: CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE: 31 JANUARY 2011

Subject: GREAT NORTH RUN 2010

Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The 30th Great North Run was held on Sunday 19th September 2010. The event, sponsored by BUPA, is now a firm fixture in the international sporting calendar and has become embedded in our cultural heritage as the premier event in the North East.
- 1.2 This report informs Members of the detailed planning required to ensure that the event is delivered safely.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Great North Run is the World's largest half marathon with runners from every postcode area in the UK being represented. This year there were 54,000 entrants from around the world.
- 2.2 A number of diverse events take place during the Great North Run weekend in addition to the main half marathon. These include the junior categories, i.e. 9, 10, and 11, and 12 to 16 year groups competing over 1 to 2 miles. The junior races are held on the Saturday with both events starting and finishing on Newcastle Quayside. This year there was also a Mini North Run over a distance of 1 mile for children from 3 to 8 years.
- 2.3 The main event though is the half-marathon race held on the Sunday. The BBC provides extensive coverage of the day beginning with top presenters interviewing participants including elite athletes from around the world, show business personalities, and 'fun runners' most of whom take part for sponsorship and raise large amounts to support a host of charities.
- 2.4 Following the start by local celebrities Ant and Dec, a now traditional element was the Red Arrows flying over the runners on the Tyne Bridge at 11.00 o'clock releasing red white and blue smoke and providing an iconic image recognised worldwide. The Red Arrows later appeared at the Finish to provide a spectacular display over South Shields for runners, spectators and television viewers.

- 2.5 This year's race was won by Ethiopian Haile Gebrselassie, widely recognised as the worlds greatest ever distance runner. The women's title went to Berhane Adere also from Ethiopia.

3 THE COURSE

- 3.1 The race begins on the Central Motorway in Newcastle, and crosses the Tyne Bridge into Gateshead. The route then proceeds along the A184 past the Gateshead International Stadium on the Felling By-pass before turning onto the A194 at White Mare Pool. It then turns onto the A1300 John Reid Road, then Prince Edward Road towards the coast, and finishes on the seafront in South Shields opposite the Bamburgh Public House. All of these roads are closed off to normal vehicular traffic to ensure the safety of the participants.
- 3.2 A detailed aspect of the pre-planning arrangements relate to the road closure and re-opening schedules which have to be carefully coordinated to ensure as little disruption as possible, and to ensure the speedy and safe restoration of the highway system.

4 SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP

- 4.1 Towards the end of the 1990s the Northumbria Senior Officer Co-ordination Group (now the Local Resilience Forum) agreed a Safer Events Policy with the aim of ensuring that public events taking place in the Northumbria Police area were delivered safely.
- 4.2 The Great North Run Safety Advisory Group was formally established in 1999. Prior to that time, during the development of the event in the 1980s and 1990s safety procedures were developed and refined through a less formal planning group comprising relevant organisations that would meet prior to each Event to co-ordinate the safety arrangements for the Run.

Northumbria LRF Safer Events Policy

- 4.3 In accordance with nationally recognised good practice a Safer Events Policy was formulated in 1999 jointly between:
- Local Authorities in Northumberland and Tyne and Wear;
 - Northumbria Police;
 - North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust;
 - Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Service;
 - Northumberland Fire and Rescue Service;
 - Tyne and Wear Emergency Planning Unit; and
 - Northumberland Emergency Planning Department.
- 4.4 Its purpose is to provide a rational framework for organisations to ensure event safety and ensure uniformity in the application of safety requirements and guidance across the locality.

- 4.5 The Policy requires that for any relevant event, irrespective of licensing requirements, a Safety Advisory Group be established and an 'Event Safety Management Plan' be produced by the event organiser.
- 4.6 In general terms membership of a safety advisory group comprises representatives of the core constituent bodies (local authority, police, fire and rescue service, ambulance service and emergency planning unit) together with the event organiser and any other body considered appropriate.
- 4.7 Safety Advisory Groups are ordinarily co-ordinated and Chaired by a senior representative of the lead local authority.

Great North Run Safety Advisory Group – Terms of Reference

- 4.8 The role of the Great North Run Safety Advisory Group is to ensure, as far as possible, that any risk to public, participant or worker safety is minimised. In particular the Safety Advisory Group:
- Ensures that a Safety Officer is appointed who can demonstrate their competence throughout the planning and the duration of the event;
 - Ensures that the Event Safety Management Plan is validated by all Safety Advisory Group members;
 - Ensures that there is an agreed contingency plan in existence for dealing with major incidents;
 - Ensures that, when appropriate, a Statement of Intent is prepared which sets out the responsibilities of the relevant organisations involved in the event; and
 - Ensures that a thorough debrief is held after the event, making recommendations as necessary.
- 4.9 It should be noted that the Great North Run does not require an entertainment licence from the local authority and that the Safety Advisory Group approach is an essential aspect of planning for the event.

Great North Run Safety Advisory Group – Membership

- 4.10 In respect of the Great North Run the core constituent members of the Safety Advisory Group are:
- South Tyneside Council
 - Gateshead Council
 - Newcastle City Council
 - Tyne & Wear Emergency Planning Unit
 - Northumbria Police
 - Tyne & Wear Fire and Rescue Service

- North East Ambulance Service

4.11 South Tyneside Council is the lead local authority, and as such has responsibility for co-ordinating and chairing the Group.

4.12 The event organiser, Nova International Limited, is represented at meetings of the Great North Run Safety Advisory Group.

Great North Run Safety Advisory Group - Working Groups

4.13 The scale of the event demands significant detailed planning and organisation and for this purpose a number of working groups, overseen by the Safety Advisory Group, have been established, each of which focuses on particular planning aspects. These working groups are as follows:

- Start Working Group;
- Course Working Group;
- Finish Working Group;
- Medical Working Group;
- Traffic and Travel Working Group;
- Event Control Working Group; and
- Contingency Planning Working Group.

4.14 Each of these working groups meets on a regular basis over a number of months in advance of the event and is responsible for the planning and development of respective aspects of the event. This work culminates in the production of the Event Safety Management Plan for consideration and agreement of the Safety Advisory Group.

Start Working Group

4.15 The 'Start Working Group' is concerned with safety planning issues concerned with the start of the event including such matters as the start infrastructure, start scheduling, stewarding and participant baggage handling. The group meets on a 6 weekly basis from May onwards.

Course Working Group

4.16 The 'Course Working Group' is concerned with safety planning issues associated with the route of the course and their work extends to matters such as the scheduling of road closures and re-opening, the provision of water stations, stewarding and spectator management. The Course Working Group meets on a 6-8 weekly cycle from February/March onwards.

Finish Working Group

- 4.17 The 'Finish Working Group' is responsible for safety planning aspects associated with the finish infrastructure, including matters such as stewarding, security, crowd management and all matters relating to the safety of ancillary events held in the locality of the event finish. The Finish Working Group meets on a 6 weekly basis from May onwards.

Medical Working Group

- 4.18 The 'Medical Working Group' is responsible for the planning of all aspects of medical provision in relation to the event extending to such matters as the provision of first aid/medical treatment, Field Hospital provision, casualty and fatality procedures. The Medical Working Group meets on a 6 weekly basis following the event debrief of the previous year's event (October/November) through to completion of the Event Safety Management Plan. From 3 months prior to the event the Medical Working Group meets on a monthly basis – and more frequently if considered necessary.

Traffic & Travel Working Group

- 4.19 The 'Traffic and Travel Working Group' is responsible for the development of the traffic management plan which sets out vehicular access and egress routes, car parking, Metro, ferry and road signage etc. Further the working group is responsible for the regional public transport planning ensuring the adequacy of public transport provision for the event. The Traffic and Travel Working Group meets on a 6-8 weekly basis from February/March onwards.

Event Control Working Group

- 4.20 The 'Event Control Working Group' is concerned with planning the necessary support infrastructure to ensure that the event is safely delivered; such support infrastructure extends to the establishment of the necessary 'Command and Communications Structure' identifying the lines of communication and responsibilities of personnel throughout the day of the event. The Event Control Working Group meets twice between July and the finalisation of the Event Safety Management Plan.

Contingency Planning Working Group

- 4.21 A 'Contingency Planning Working Group' is established in the event of a particular issue being identified that requires a specific planning approach. As such the membership of this working group would be determined according to the particular issue. For the 2010 event a working group was established to test the road closure and re-opening arrangements and to review the loss of the Tyne Bridge route options.

Event Safety Management Plan

- 4.22 The in-depth event safety planning undertaken by each of the working groups contributes to and culminates in the production of a comprehensive Event Safety Management Plan by Nova International. Throughout this planning process, progress is formally reported to the Safety Advisory Group which meets on a 6-8 weekly basis.
- 4.23 The Event Safety Management Plan is submitted in draft form to the Safety Advisory Group in late August/early September. In the case of the 2010 Great North Run the Event Safety Management Plan was submitted to the Safety Advisory Group at its meeting of 2nd September 2010.
- 4.24 Members of the Safety Advisory Group were requested to consider the Event Safety Management Plan in advance of reconvening for its final pre-event meeting.
- 4.25 The Safety Advisory Group held its final pre-event meeting on 13th September 2010 and formally accepted the Event Safety Management Plan as being fit-for-purpose.

5 EVENT SAFETY CONTROL

- 5.1 'Event Control' was located in the Police 'Gold Command' Suite, Southern Communications Centre at Mill Bank, South Shields, from where the safety aspects of the event were monitored by the Police, the Event Safety Officer and representatives of the other relevant organisations including the three Local Authorities.
- 5.2 The Plan has a well developed communications system through which information can be disseminated from Event Control to the Race Director and through to the relevant Directors (Start, Course and Finish) and their staff.
- 5.3 The emergency procedures are well rehearsed, and should an incident have occurred which necessitated a Major Incident response, then Event Control would have become the multi-agency 'Strategic Control'. Arrangements are also in place for the Event Safety Officer to relinquish command to the Police in the event of a major incident, and to make all event resources available to respond to the situation.

6 EVENT DE-BRIEF

- 6.1 Every year following the event each of the Working Groups reconvenes to hold a debrief in respect of their area of planning responsibility. These meetings take place in the weeks immediately following the event and their findings are then formally reported to the Safety Advisory Group.

- 6.2 The Safety Advisory Group met in November 2010 to consider what worked well, and which aspects could possibly be improved for future events. The meeting was held in accordance with the LRF De-brief Protocol, and is part of the continuous process of striving to improve the safety of the Run.
- 6.3 The de-brief meeting identified 24 items to be addressed where improvements can be made, and an Action Plan has been developed whereby particular actions are allocated to the appropriate Working Group. This will allow the Safety Advisory Group to oversee the process and ensure the identified improvements are actioned.
- 6.4 The majority of these items are minor such as ‘tweaks’ to transport arrangements and parking facilities which will help to improve the experience for runners and spectators. It was particularly pleasing to note that the Medical Working Group reported that although the Field Hospital at the Finish did experience high demand, the Medical Team arrangements worked effectively.
- 6.5 Although the 2010 Run was another great success, and the detailed safety arrangements set out in the Event Safety Management Plan worked well, the Safety Advisory Group is constantly seeking to improve the safety management arrangements in place for the event.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The comprehensive safety planning arrangements for the event have aided in the delivery of a successful 30th Great North Run.
- 7.2 A wide-ranging de-brief process is now underway which will help inform further improvements in the planning arrangements for next year’s event.

8 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Members are asked to note the collaborative arrangements in place for ensuring the effective planning and management of safety for the Great North Run.

Background Papers

The under-mentioned Background Papers relate to the subject matter of the above report and are held by the Service Lead – Risk Management and Resilience, South Tyneside Council:

- BUPA Great North Run 2010 – Event Safety Plan.
- Great North Run Safety Advisory Group Minutes 2010.

- Great North Run Safety Advisory Group Working Group Minutes 2010.
- Northumbria LRF – Safer Events Policy.
- Health and Safety Executive – The Event Safety Guide (HSG195)



**TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT**

Committee Report

Meeting : CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE : 31 JANUARY 2011

**Subject : DAME HINES PANDEMIC INFLUENZA REVIEW -
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 At the last meeting of the Civil Contingencies Committee on 5th November 2010, a report was presented on the findings of a review of the UK response to the influenza pandemic of 2009. Members asked for a summary of those recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Dame Hines concluded in her report that she considered the UK response to the pandemic to be 'highly satisfactory' and 'proportionate and effective'. However, several recommendations were made and this report seeks to clarify those recommendations.

2.2 The review considered several key factors in determining the response to the pandemic. These were:

- The central government response;
- Scientific Advice;
- The containment Phase;
- Treatment;
- Vaccine; and
- Communications

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 The review made 28 recommendations, many of which were intended for consideration by central government. The following recommendations relate to the review of the central government response:

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Ministers should determine early in a pandemic how they will ensure that the response is proportionate to the perceived level of risk and how this will guide decision-making. This approach should be reflected in the revised pandemic-specific Concept of Operations by summer 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

The Cabinet Office should enshrine the position of the four nations (within the UK) mechanism for certain types of emergencies in a revised Concept of Operations by summer 2011. The mechanism should then be included in the exercise programme for emergencies in a devolved matter.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

The four health ministers should meet to discuss emergency preparedness (and a range of other issues) at least once a year. Officials should aim to meet face to face more regularly.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

The Cabinet Office should review the technological support available for emergency ministerial and official meetings, to ensure that those joining in meetings remotely can be engaged as fully as possible in the discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

Departments should consider how best to increase the resilience arrangements for key roles in an ongoing crisis response, including those in charge of the response and committee members, and revise their resilience arrangements accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION 6: By December 2010:

(i) Ministers should decide the levels of deaths for which planning is appropriate as part of the process of revising '*Pandemic flu: A national framework for responding to an influenza pandemic*'.

(ii) The Home Office, working with others including the Ministry of Justice, the Department of Health, the Cabinet Office, Communities and Local Government and the devolved administrations, should ensure that plans are in place to deal with those levels of deaths during a pandemic, linking with other elements of mass fatality management and specifying clear responsibilities for the collection, transportation, storage and burial or cremation of bodies.

- 3.2 The UK Government have not issued any formal response to the recommendations it is anticipated that the document *Pandemic flu: A national framework for responding to an influenza pandemic* will be updated to reflect these recommendations. This document has formed the basis for all pandemic influenza plans locally. The level of consistency in response and planning across the UK has been praised by Dame Hines and is due, in no small part, to this guidance being implemented effectively at local level.
- 3.3 As with any policy or framework change, local responders will review their plans and arrangements in line with any changes implemented by central

government. The new structure of the LRF has included a Health Theme Group and this would be the most appropriate mechanism to ensure that any changes are reflected locally.

- 3.4 The Strategic Health Authority (SHA) has advised local health agencies to continue to review plans in line with *current* guidance and policy. This means that the LRF Multi Agency Pandemic Influenza Plan will not undergo any significant alterations until further guidance is implemented by central government and the Department of Health (DH). A revised framework is expected to be published before spring 2011 and will inform further updates of plans after its release.
- 3.5 Recommendation 6(ii) relates to planning for excess deaths during a pandemic. Work is currently being coordinated by the TWEPUs to ensure that arrangements and business continuity plans are in place to deal with multi agency responsibilities. It is anticipated that this work will fall under the new Capacities Theme Group of the LRF when the new structure is formally implemented in 2011.
- 3.6 The following recommendations relate to the Scientific Advice part of the review:

RECOMMENDATION 7:

The Government Office for Science, working with lead government departments, should enable key ministers and senior officials to understand the strengths and limitations of likely available scientific advice as part of their general induction. This training should then be reinforced at the outbreak of any emergency.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

The four Chief Medical Officers should jointly commission further work to support key decision-making early in a pandemic by January 2011. This should consider the practicalities of developing methods to measure the severity of a pandemic in its early stages. In particular, further exploration of population-based surveillance, such as serology, should be considered.

RECOMMENDATION 9:

The Government Chief Scientific Adviser and the Department of Health should ensure that there is an appropriate balance of contribution in the Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies for future pandemic outbreaks.

RECOMMENDATION 10:

The Cabinet Office, with the Government Chief Scientific Adviser (GCSA) and the four Chief Medical Officers (CMOs), should devise a process through which UK government ministers and the devolved administrations are presented with a unified, rounded statement of scientific advice. This process should engage CMOs (or CSAs for

other emergencies) and should be included in a revised Concept of Operations by summer 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 11:

The Government Chief Scientific Adviser and UK health departments should convene a working group to review the calculation of planning scenarios and how they are used in public. This should report by April 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 12:

The Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation should report directly to the central emergency meetings in a future pandemic, although the Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies should be used at the appropriate time to provide its challenge function. This should be clarified in a revised *COBR Response Guide for Pandemic Influenza* by summer 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 13:

The Department of Health should build relationships between the Behaviour and Communication sub-group of the Scientific Pandemic Influenza Advisory Committee (SPI-B&C) and the Department of Health's policy and communications teams so that the SPI-B&C's expertise can be used in addition to in-house resources in planning for vaccine uptake and other relevant policy areas.

RECOMMENDATION 14:

Any future Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies should adhere as closely as possible to the established principles of scientific advice to government and should release its descriptive papers and forecasts (as distinct from any policy advice) at regular intervals. This should be clarified in a revised Concept of Operations by summer 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 15:

The Government Chief Scientific Adviser should provide expert technical briefings to respected scientists not directly involved with the Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies. This would enable a wider group of experts to comment in an informed manner on the government's approach.

- 3.8 The recommendations for Scientific Advice relate to policy, guidance and frameworks to be implemented centrally. As with other recommendations, any changes will be reflected locally in plans and arrangements and coordinated by the LRF Health Theme Group.
- 3.9 Scientific and Technical Advice Cells (STAC's) are groups which may be established at strategic LRF or Regional level in the response to an influenza pandemic. A North East Science and Technical Advice (STAC) Framework exists and has been recently updated. This is in draft consultation format as at December 2010 and is again based on *current* guidance.

- 3.10 As with many other recommendations made by Dame Hines, further updates will consider any changes in national guidance and policy once these recommendations are implemented at central government level. The Northumbria LRF also has plans to implement a STAC training regime in 2011/12.
- 3.11 The following recommendations relate to the containment phase findings of the review:

RECOMMENDATION 16:

The Department of Health, working with others through the revision of the National Framework, should explore a more flexible, evidence-based approach to triggering actions during a pandemic than the current WHO phases and UK alert levels. In particular, this work should ensure that clear guidance is set out to enable the rapid adjustment of the prophylaxis policy as more is learned about the nature of the virus. Work to revise the National Framework should be concluded no later than March 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 17:

The Department of Health, working with others through the revision of the National Framework, should ensure that there is an appropriate balance between local flexibility and UK-wide public confidence in the response. A national strategic approach can and should be compatible with increased subsidiarity and therefore increased variation according to circumstances; triggers agreed and understood on a UK-wide level could be applied flexibly in different geographical areas on the basis of local circumstances. This should be set out in the revised National Framework and published no later than March 2011.

- 3.12 As with many other recommendations made by Dame Hines, these recommendations relate to inclusion of good practice into an updated version of the document '*Pandemic flu: A national framework for responding to an influenza pandemic*'. Local plans and arrangements will be updated to reflect any changes in this document which forms the basis of pandemic influenza planning.
- 3.13 The following recommendations were made in relation to the treatment phase:

RECOMMENDATION 18:

The Department of Health and the devolved administrations should agree triggers responsive to the capacity of primary care in the activation and stand-down of the National Pandemic Flu Service at both national and regional levels. These triggers should be set out in

the revised National Framework and published no later than March 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 19:

The Department of Health should commission an independent evaluation of the National Pandemic Flu Service, covering value for money, risk analysis and any potential for wider application.

RECOMMENDATION 20:

The four health departments should reflect on the proposals identified by the Swine Flu Critical Care Clinical Group and incorporate them, as appropriate, into the revised National Framework no later than March 2011.

- 3.14 As with previous recommendations, the National Framework will be adapted and implemented locally through the LRF.
- 3.15 Recommendation 20 relates to the Swine Flu Critical Care Clinical Group which was established in September 2009 to provide advice to the DH and the NHS on the practical issues around surging and sustaining critical care capacity within health organisations during the anticipated second wave of the pandemic during October, November and December.
- 3.16 The membership of the clinical group was drawn from medical, nursing, pharmacy and managerial colleagues and included representatives of the professional bodies involved with critical care and had members from all four countries of the UK. The key learning points identified by this group for inclusion in the National Framework revision were:

SHA's should revisit and re-energise their critical care networks, learning the lessons from the H1N1 (2009) pandemic;

The UK health departments should incorporate the learning from the pandemic into national policy and guidance to the NHS in their countries;

Engagement is needed by the professional bodies, working together, to develop further clinical advice;

The health departments, regulators and employers need to build on the work to put in place support to staff during the pandemic;

SHA's should take forward the approaches to bed management developed during the pandemic;

Work should be supported to assess the long-term capacity needed for extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) as part of the range of treatments available for patients in severe respiratory failure; and

Local organisations should ensure that they have multi-speciality arrangements in place to support triage in surge situations and that these processes are well documented and rehearsed.

- 3.17 The following recommendations were made in relation to the Vaccine phase of the UK response:

RECOMMENDATION 21:

The Department of Health should negotiate advance-purchase agreements that allow flexibility over the eventual quantities purchased.

RECOMMENDATION 22:

The Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation should be asked to advise on vaccination strategies across a range of scenarios, including severe and less severe pandemic viruses. This advice should incorporate the views of behavioural scientists and economic analysis, and be published in the revised National Framework no later than March 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 23:

The four health ministers should commission officials to put in place arrangements to ensure the rapid implementation of a vaccination programme during a pandemic. For example, a sleeping contract with GPs and/or other willing providers could be negotiated.

- 3.18 The recommendations are expected to be incorporated into the revised National Framework. Overall, Dame Hines commented that the DH followed good procurement practice when setting up advance-purchase agreements and that there was significant flexibility in the amount the UK could purchase. However, Dame Hines found there was less flexibility once contracts had been signed, with one supplier agreeing to a break clause but another not being willing to do so. The report recommended that advance-purchase agreements are a valuable tool in the preparedness strategy and should be pursued.

- 3.19 The following recommendations were made in relation to the Communications phase of the review report:

RECOMMENDATION 24:

The Department of Health and the devolved administrations should explore what more can be done to raise levels of public awareness and understanding about the key characteristics of a pandemic and the core response measures.

RECOMMENDATION 25:

The four UK health departments should review their use of language during pandemics to ensure that it accurately conveys the aims of the response efforts and the levels of risk. In particular, the use of the terms 'containment' and 'reasonable worst case' should be reconsidered as they are easily misunderstood. The National Framework and communications strategies should be amended to reflect such revisions by no later than March 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 26:

The four UK health departments should consider new ways of proactively engaging with both journalists and the public. These could include disseminating transcripts of media briefings, using podcasts and making more use of social networking and digital technology to reach specific sections of the public. The National Framework and communications strategies should be amended to reflect any changes no later than March 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 27:

The Cabinet Office should ensure that the communications approach (weekly briefings, Q&A sessions, regular releases of facts and figures) adopted by the Department of Health and the devolved administrations is used, where appropriate, as a model of best practice for future emergency situations.

RECOMMENDATION 28:

The Department of Health and the devolved administrations should discuss with professional health bodies how best to create sources of direct clinical advice for health professionals during a pandemic. This may be most appropriately hosted by one or more of the professional bodies.

- 3.20 Communication is vital in the response to an emergency. These recommendations relate to the strategy deployed nationally in the UK wide public health campaigns such as 'Catch it, Kill it, Bin it', the terminology used by clinicians and responders and the use of the media and social networking facilities. Although the findings upon which the recommendations are based relate to the 2009 influenza pandemic and will be incorporated in the National Framework revision, they are also useful when considered in a range of other scenarios. The LRF Communications Theme Group will be a good conduit for sharing these recommendations on a wider basis once the new LRF structure is formally implemented in 2011.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The implementation of these recommendations largely relies on the publication of a revised version of the document '*Pandemic flu: A national framework for responding to an influenza pandemic*' in 2011. Local responders and the LRF collectively will be the key means of

implementation at local level. The Northumbria LRF Multi Agency Pandemic Influenza Plan will be a key document to aid local responders in adapting to changes in policy and guidance.

- 4.2 The LRF Health Theme Group, once formally established, will be able to disseminate the wider issues identified, such as the use of social media and communications with the media, back to the LRF Communications Theme Group for consideration.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Members are asked to:

- a) Note this report; and
- b) Agree to receive any further updates as necessary.

Background Papers

Background papers are held in the offices of the Tyne and Wear Emergency Planning Unit.-



**TYNE AND WEAR FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY
EMERGENCY PLANNING UNIT**

Committee Report

Meeting : CIVIL CONTINGENCIES COMMITTEE : 31 JANUARY 2011

Subject : PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGETS - QUARTER 3 2010/11

Report of the Chief Emergency Planning Officer

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with a progress report on performance against targets for the financial year 2010/2011 as detailed in the EPU Business Plan for 2010/11.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Progress reports relating to the performance of the EPU are normally produced five times per year: i.e. one report is produced at the end of each quarter relating to the preceding quarters targets; and a final summary report is produced at the year end on the overall delivery outputs relating to stated business plan commitments.

2.2 This report details performance activity for quarter 3 of the financial year 2010/11.

3 SCHEDULED WORK COMPLETED TO QUARTER 3

3.1 The table appended to this report provides information on the work completed in quarter 3 of the financial year 2010/11 by the EPU.

3.2 It should be noted that due to changes in the structure of the Local Resilience Forum (LRF), it is anticipated that some of the LRF roles and responsibilities allocated to EPU staff will change over the coming weeks. The EPU will continue with current duties on behalf of councils until these changes are formally implemented.

4 UNSCHEDULED WORK COMPLETED TO QUARTER 4

4.1 There have been no requests from SMB members to complete additional work.

5 SUMMARY

5.1 This report details both work areas that are completed and also those which have been commenced and are ongoing pieces of work.

6 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Members are requested to note this report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The under mentioned Background Papers held in the EPU offices relate to the subject matter of the above report:-

- Business Plan 2008/10
- Work Plan 2010/11

Tyne and Wear Strategic Resilience Objectives

1. To work with all communities to build their resilience and ability to cope with crises
2. To identify, quantify and treat risks and threats
3. To ensure robust arrangements are in place to enable an effective response
4. To effectively respond to emergencies
5. To develop robust arrangements to enable the rebuilding, restoring and rehabilitation of the community after an emergency
6. To develop and maintain relationships and co-ordinated arrangements across agencies in preparing for, responding to and recovering from emergencies
7. To develop and maintain appropriate skills to enable effective preparedness, response and recovery
8. To validate and test the integrity of arrangements
9. To ensure effective communication before, during and after an emergency
10. To ensure that arrangements are in place to support vulnerable people before, during and after an emergency

Contents

Working with Communities	2
Risk Management	3
Emergency Preparedness	4
Emergency Response	6
Emergency Recovery	7
Partnership working	8
Training and Exercising	9
Communications	11
Vulnerable People	12

Working with Communities

To work with all communities to build their resilience and ability to cope with crises

Community Resilience

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Evaluate mapped risks against socio economic, deprivation and vitality information at neighbourhood level (Step 3)	South Tyneside	End Sept 10	Evaluation of mapped risks against socio-economic, deprivation and vitality information at neighbourhood level complete	EPU	Completed
Using the data set created up to Step 3, establish a programme of resilience work in the form of a 3 year plan	South Tyneside	End Oct 10	Establish a risk based programme of resilience work (i.e. programmed list of neighbourhoods)	EPU	This work is being taken forward by council resilience staff
Establish risk-based programme of resilience development work (Step 4)	South Tyneside	End Dec 10	Establish support for a risk based programme of resilience development work (i.e. programmed list of neighbourhoods)	EPU	This work is being taken forward by council resilience staff
Work with each neighbourhood to facilitate hazard identification (Step 5)	South Tyneside	End Dec 10	Identify ways of working with each neighbourhood	EPU	This work is being taken forward by council resilience staff.

Business Continuity Promotion

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
-------------	-----------	---------------	-------------------------	--------------	--------

To organise a follow up event to the LRF BCM Conference held in March 2009.	All	March 2011	Events delivered and feedback evaluated.	EPU	Work commenced and events scheduled to take place on 22 nd March (Sunderland) and 24 th March (Newcastle)
---	-----	------------	--	-----	---

Risk Management
 Identify, quantify and treat risks and threats

Community Risk Register

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Continue to represent councils on the LRF Risk Assessment Working Group	All/LRF	Ongoing	Input to the Northumbria Community Risk Register on behalf of councils	EPU	Ongoing
Update and publish the CRR on behalf of the RAWG	All/LRF	December 10	CRR signed off by the LRF's Business Management Group (BMG). The meeting cancelled in Dec due to severe weather.	EPU	Update completed, awaiting presentation at the BMG

Horizon scanning for new and emerging risks

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Maintain horizon scanning activities to identify new and emerging risks	All	Ongoing	Reports to SMB as required	All	Continuous throughout the year

Emergency Preparedness
 Ensure robust arrangements are in place to enable an effective response

CBRN					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Continue role as Regional CBRN Chair	All/RRT	Ongoing	Chair and direct work of the Regional group	EPU	Continuous throughout the year

Mass Fatalities					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Represent Tyne and Wear Councils at RRF Mass Fatalities Group	All	Ongoing	Feedback and reports to SMB and TWROPS	EPU	Continuous throughout the year
Represent Tyne and Wear Councils at LRF Mass Fatalities Group	All	Ongoing	Feedback and reports to SMB and TWROPS	EPU	Continuous throughout the year
Update and maintain LRF Northumbria Emergency Mortuary Plan (plan authors)	All	End Dec 10	Updated plan in place once SLRO document is received from the Home Office	EPU	Not complete – Home Office has delayed the release of the SLRO document due to changes in national and regional government following CSR.

Pandemic Flu					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Update and maintain LRF MAPIP as necessary	All/LRF	Ongoing as required	Updated plan in place and part of a review cycle	EPU/LRF Group	Awaiting further direction from LRF Review outcomes

Excess Deaths					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Continued development of LRF Excess Deaths Plan at direction of PIWG Chair	All/LRF	End Dec 10	Updated plan in place and part of a review cycle	EPU/LRF Group	Not completed at multi agency level. Awaiting further direction from LRF Review outcomes. Commenced work with Tyne and Wear councils as an interim measure.

Flood Planning					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Update and maintain LRF Multi Agency Flood Plan	All/LRF	End Dec 10	Updated plan in place and part of a review cycle	EPU/LRF Group	Review and partner consultation underway.

Animal Diseases					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Update and maintain Animal Diseases Plan	All	End Sept 10	Updated plan in place and part of annual review cycle	EPU	Further work required with Council animal health teams to ensure plan is fit for purpose.
Update and maintain Rabies Plan	All	End Sept 10	Updated plan in place and part of annual review cycle	EPU	Further work required with Council animal health teams to ensure plan is fit for purpose.

Emergency Response					
To effectively respond to emergencies					

Support to Local Authorities					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Maintenance of EPU Duty Officer scheme	All	Ongoing	Responses to incidents via incident logs	EPU	Continuous through the year
Duty Officer response to incidents as required	All	Ongoing - as necessary	Responses to incidents via incident logs	EPU	Continuous through the year as required

Support the Debrief Process					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Participate in debrief activities as requested by the Local Authorities.	All	As necessary	Debrief documentation produced as necessary	EPU	Continuous through the year

Emergency Recovery

To develop robust arrangements to enable the rebuilding, restoring and rehabilitation of the community after an emergency

Support to Local Authorities					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
To support the councils in the development of Recovery and Restoration issues in individual areas	Newcastle and North Tyneside	Ongoing - as necessary	Support in place	EPU	Work has largely comprised of action cards and assistance with the update of internal guidance and plans. Work requested to date has been completed.
To provide recovery action cards to support the North Tyneside Council and Newcastle Council Recovery Plans	Newcastle and North Tyneside	End Sept 10	Action cards produced	EPU	Completed for North Tyneside. Work ongoing with Newcastle.

Partnership working
 To develop and maintain relationships and co-ordinated arrangements across agencies in preparing for, responding to and recovering from emergencies

Facilitate Working Between Agencies

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Support Newcastle City Council as Chair of Core Cities Group	Newcastle	As required	Support provided	EPU	Continuous throughout the year
Support Newcastle City Council as Chair of LRF Humanitarian Assistance Group	Newcastle/LRF	Ongoing	Support provided	EPU	Continuous through the year. Awaiting further direction from LRF Review outcomes.

Tyne and Wear Resilience Review

Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Participate in review activities as directed by the Review Team	All	Ongoing into Mar 2011	Completion of review and timetable for implementation of recommendations	EPU Councils	Continuous through the year

Training and Exercising
To develop and maintain appropriate skills to enable effective preparedness, response and recovery and also to validate and test the integrity of arrangements

Training					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Development and delivery of Strategic training ahead of strategic Norland exercise	North Tyneside	November 10	Training delivered	EPU/North Tyneside Council	Completed
Revival of Core Modules Prospectus (incorporating previous separate action for Recovery Training and Awareness Session)	All	As required, depending on staff availability	Core modules ready to be delivered as necessary	EPU	Core module prospectus distributed. Discussion ongoing for delivery dates for some of the modules.

LRF Exercise and Training Group					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Continue with role of E&TG Chair	All/LRF	Ongoing	Agreement of group members	EPU	Continuous throughout the year
Actively participate in setting the LRF E&TG Calendar	All/LRF	Ongoing	Publication of calendar	EPU	Work has been completed and awaiting discussion at the Business Management Group at LRF level.

Norland					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Continue as leading member of Norland Planning and Steering Groups, representing LA's at the Norland Planning and Steering Group to support the continued development of the Norland exercises based on lessons learnt and in conjunction with the rest of the Group.	All/LRF	Ongoing	Successful delivery of the Norland Series of exercises	EPU	Continuous throughout the year
To facilitate the delivery of the Norland exercise calendar for the 6 Councils in Northumbria as one of the directing staff .	Ongoing	End March 11	Delivery and evaluation feedback	EPU	Tactical Exercises delivered to date: Gateshead 14.04.10, Sunderland 27.05.10, Newcastle 01.07.10, Strategic exercises delivered to date: South Tyneside 03.11.10 North Tyneside was scheduled for 01.12.10, but was cancelled due to severe weather. This will now take place on 02.02.11.

Develop and Deliver Exercise Prospectus					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Work with Newcastle to develop a strategic and tactical level Mass Fatalities exercise	Newcastle	October 2010 (19 th)	Exercise developed and delivered	Laura Mayhew	Delivered on 19 th October 2010.

Communications
To ensure effective communication before, during and after an emergency

Communications					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Support the Chair of the LRF Public Communications Group	Gateshead LRF	Ongoing	Support as required	EPU	Awaiting further direction from the outcomes of the LRF Review

Vulnerable People

To ensure that arrangements are in place to support vulnerable people before, during and after an emergency

Vulnerable People					
Description	Council/s	Delivery date	Outcome/Success Measure	Delivered by	Status
Support the Chair of the LRF Vulnerabilities Group in delivery of the Vulnerability Strategy	All/LRF	Ongoing	Support as required	EPU	Awaiting further direction from the outcomes of the LRF Review
Maintenance and update of Vulnerability Strategy	All/LRF	As necessary	Updated strategy in place	EPU	Continuous throughout the year.