



Meeting	Performance and Resources Board	Agenda no.	11
Meeting Date	20th May 2024		
Report Authors	Amanda Johnson, GM Dan Kirk		
Presented By	Andy Smith, Director of Operations		
Subject	Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 and Grenfell - Update		
Type of Report	Information		
Action Point No.	N/A	For Publication	Yes

RECOMMENDATIONS

To note progress on the actions of the Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 recommendations and Recommendations relating to Grenfell Phases 1 and 2.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers an update on progress against the Grenfell Recommendations and the MAI2 Recommendations relevant to ECFRS.

SRO is the Director of Operations, the Project Manager is the Senior Projects Manager for Collaboration, Amanda Johnson. A new Sponsor is to be appointed following the retirement of AM Fenwick.

The Project Board is chaired by the Director of Operations. The recommendations for both inquiries are managed via MS Planners with every recommendation 'owned' by an Assistant Director/Area Manager.

Grenfell Status

Grenfell sits within the Portfolio of Change, with highlight reports completed for the Portfolio Management Board. All 46 recommendations, have been closed and assured.

This aspect of the Project is now Business As Usual. All of the recommendations are listed under the Strategic Risk SRR150034 as control measures with a BAU Plan which will detail how the Service will remain compliant.

The publication of the Grenfell Phase 2 is still awaited. From the January update most of the report is drafted and the Inquiry is in the process of carrying out Maxwellisation. We believe it may be published at the end of June/early July. Whilst this report is much larger in scope than Phase 1, there is unlikely to be a significant impact for the Fire Service.

MAI2 Status

Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 (MAI2) sits with the Emergency Services Collaboration Portfolio for oversight of all 149 recommendations. The Project Board receives updates and progress against the Fire specific recommendations from the Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 report published in November 2022.

The NFCC have asked for a total of 48 recommendations that all FRS need to consider their compliance against.

- 14 of these are Fire related: National FRS, GMFRS and NW Fire Control and ECFRS have already completed the gap analysis against.
 - 11 have no gap identified and the Statements of Compliance and Closure are completed, one is awaiting L2 Assurance, the others are Assured and Completed.
 - The three with an identified gap have an allocated AM and a Target date for completion and a Definition of Done for full assurance.
- The remaining 34 are directed at other Agencies and have undergone a full gap analysis, to determine the current compliance status with ECFRS and what the ask of the FRS is against them as some do not mention the FRS. Seven have an identified gap and potential risk which will require full assurance.

There are 33 recommendations directed to JESIP, of which and requiring a multi-agency approach to compliance. 28 are included in the NFCC listed ones and require input and engagement with ECFRS to meet compliance.

BACKGROUND

Phase 1 of the Grenfell Tower Inquiry, released its report, including 46 recommendations based on 14 areas of interest identified by the inquiry. These are managed within ECFRS through a robust governance and assurance process using MS Planner.

Following the publication of the Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 in Nov 2022 the team have applied the same governance and assurance process to the management of the 149 recommendations. This report covers an update on those that are directed at the FRS or on the national NFCC Tracker.

OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

Grenfell Tower Inquiry Recommendations

46 Recommendations

All recommendations are now Closed and Assured. All have auditable evidence and solutions/activity, which is suitable, sufficient and sustainable to meet the requirements of the recommendations. Dashboard Update on Actions within the Grenfell Plan.

All 49 recommendations are individual control measures under the Corporate Inquiry Compliance risk SRR150034 on JCAD, with the measures detailing the sustainable BAU plan for each one to maintain compliance.

Appendix A is the report up to March 2024.

The reporting of spend against the Protection Uplift Fund is reported to SLT via the

Protection team and by this Board to P&R. In order to avoid duplication, the AD/AM Prevention and Protection report to SLT, and this Board will have oversight of what has been spent in regard to Grenfell recommendations.

Grenfell Inquiry Phase 2. The report is not expected to publish before the end of June/early July. The Phase 2 report is expected to be significantly larger than Phase 1 – given the number of topic areas covered and the amount and range of evidence heard – while firefighting was considered in Phase 2, it is expected that the focus of the Phase 2 report to be on other matters. The Phase 2 Inquiry did not hear any further evidence about the events of the night of 14 June 2017.

For information, below are the modules of Phase 2:

1. The primary refurbishment (overview and cladding)
2. Cladding products – testing/certification, product marketing/promotion
3. Active and passive fire safety measures internal to building, management of building, compliance RRO 2005, Fire Risk Assessment, including complaints and communication with residents
4. Aftermath
5. Firefighting
6. Government
7. Experts
8. Evidence relating to the deceased

Module 5 examined the role and functions of the following leading up to 14 June 2017, and any recommendations for FRS will be related to these and will be picked up as a BAU activity for Protection:

- Fire Risk Assessment
- London Fire Commissioner
- Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005
- Responsible Person
- Section 7(2)(d) visits [in relation to preparations for fighting fires in high-rise buildings]

Manchester Arena Inquiry Volume 2 Recommendations

149 Recommendations across multiple agencies. These are currently being managed as follows:

1. All recommendations have a designated 'lead' agency, agreed in conjunction with relevant sponsors from ECFRS, Essex Police (EP), East of England Ambulance Trust (EEAST), JESIP and the Essex LRF(ERF).
2. Recommendations led by ECFRS, EP, JESIP or the ERF are being managed as a Programme within the Emergency Services Collaboration Portfolio and each have their own Project Board and Strategic Board, with each set of recommendations managed through an MS Planner with ownership and assurance processes. Those not within that programme which are being led by a different agency e.g. BTP and EEAST are reporting by exception to the JESIP Project Board [ESCP Senior Projects Manager is Deputy Chair], and then into the ERF Executive Board.
3. We have also implemented an 'Oversight' Board with the Sponsors (ECFRS, EP/JESIP, ERF, EEAST) and ESCP SRO to review, manage and deconflict national and regional reporting requirements ensuring that there is a consistent

message from Essex. This Board also acts as the Level 2 Assurance for recommendations delegated to JESIP.

For those recommendation directed to the FRS:

1. FRS related recommendations are as follows:

- National FRS – two recommendations, only one of which is specific to each Service, the other is for the Fire Service College/NFCC
- GMFRS has 4 recommendations
- NW Fire Control have 8 recommendations
- Currently the NFCC have also listed a further 34 recommendations which are multi-agency but have asked FRS to produce evidence around progress in their NFCC tracker.
 - These recommendations are managed by other Agency’s but will be tracked on the ECFRS MAI2 Planner for reporting purposes. For the purposes of this report, only the work-strand for ECFRS is reported on.
 - Of these, 28 are managed through the JESIP Planner process. They will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. Seven have been identified as having a gap for the ECFRS aspect and have Definitions of Done and Target Date for Completion set for the ECFRS work-strand. All others have a statement of compliance and will have the statements of closure ready for L2 assurance by the end of March 2024.
- All other recommendations will be tracked through other agency Boards with oversight being held by the Emergency Services Collaboration Programme.

4. Based on the above governance and assurance structure, the status for the ones directed to Fire or JESIP related (requires Fire input) is as follows:

Current status of the 48 Fire recommendations (30/04/2024)

Gap identified	11	Open Progressing	10
		Complete Requires Assurance	3
		Complete Assured requires Board verification	0
		Complete Assured	35
		L3 Assured further evidence required	0

Gaps in red on table	Target Date	Owner
R30	Apr-24	TBA
R29	Apr-24	TBA
R28	Apr-24	TBA
R45	TBA	TBA
R53	TBA	TBA
R55	TBA	TBA
R56	Apr-24	James Taylor
R57	TBA	TBA
R69	TBA	TBA

R71	Jul-24	TBA
R113	TBA	TBA

**TBA as AMs Fenwick, Adams and Palmer are retired/retiring
GM Dan Kirk has ownership on a temporary basis

Note: Following the retirement of AM Fenwick in March 2024, AMs Palmer and Adams in May and June, owners of the recommendations will need to be revised and may affect the Target Dates.

National FRS	NW Fire Control	GMFRS	On NFCC Tracker	Where managed
			1	JESIP
130	28	36	9	JESIP
131	29	37	10	JESIP
	30	38	16	Fire(EEAST)
	31	39	17	Fire(EEAST)
	32		20	Fire(EEAST)
	33		24	Fire(EEAST)
	34		45	JESIP
	35		46	JESIP
			47	JESIP
			50	JESIP
			51	JESIP
			52	JESIP
			53	JESIP
			54	JESIP
			55	JESIP
			56	JESIP
			57	JESIP
			60	Fire(Police)
			67	JESIP
			68	JESIP
			69	JESIP
			70	JESIP
			71	JESIP
			72	JESIP
			73	JESIP
			83	Fire(ERF)
			84	JESIP
			85	JESIP
			86	JESIP
			87	JESIP
			88	JESIP
			99	Fire (ERF)
			113	JESIP

Gaps	Recommendation with Gap for ECFRS	Definition of Done and Update
R30	All North West Fire Control staff should be trained on the best practices for responding to a Major Incident, as identified through its participation in exercises. North West Fire Control should ensure that learning is kept under review.	Delegated to ECFRS only ECFRS to evidence how we record and identify best practices and how ECFRS control staff are trained to respond. ECFRS to develop an exercise plan specifically for the control room.
R29	North West Fire Control should ensure that it regularly tests how it operates, by ensuring that its staff participate in regular exercises and practical tests. These should include multi-agency exercises	Delegated to ECFRS only ECFRS Control to prove that when regular exercises/practical tests/major incidents/multi agency exercises take place and staff record attendance as CPD on pdrPro. ECFRS to have a control specific exercise plan.
R28	North West Fire Control should take steps to ensure that it is involved in multi-agency exercises, particularly those that test mobilisation and the response to a Major Incident in line with the Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP).	Delegated to ECFRS only ECFRS control room are active members of all planned multi-agency exercises and major incident training and staff record as CPD on pdrPro. Evidence of the creation and delivery of an exercise plan for control.
R45	<p>The Home Office, His Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services, the College of Policing, the Fire Service College, the National Ambulance Resilience Unit and JESIP should review and, as necessary, update the Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (the Joint Doctrine) and Responding to a Marauding Terrorist Firearms Attack and Terrorist Siege: Joint Operating Principles for the Emergency Services (the Joint Operating Principles). The following matters should be considered in that review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. achieving a situation in which risk appetite is common across the three emergency services – this will require collaborative work; b. achieving a situation in which risk appetite is common across the three emergency services - this will require collaborative work c. achieving a situation in which forward deployment of specialist resources is the presumption, to be displaced only in the presence of a properly evidenced basis for not deploying resources forward; and d. achieving a situation in which the possibility of a secondary device does not delay forward deployment of resources, unless there is a proper basis for believing that such a device exists. 	<p>ECFRS currently works to current JESIP principles and will look to adopt any recommendations that come from this process (JOPS 3). NOTE: This is a gap as JOPS 3 has not been agreed by the Rep Bodies and is going to JNCC on 18th March 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ECFRS have put training in place for Level 2 and 3 commanders. Not all Commanders have undertaken the training and will not do so as it is not in Role Maps (interpretation). ECFRS to determine the mitigations and level of risk that is acceptable. b) ECFRS, EP and EEAST exercise together to understand common risk appetite in line with current JESIP principles c) ECFRS, EP and EEAST train and exercise together, particularly the NILO cadre who will be at the FCP, to understand the deploying of resources in line with current JESIP principles d) ECFRS, EP and EEAST train regularly and exercise together, particularly the NILO cadre who will be at the FCP to understand how to deploy when there is the possibility of a secondary device <p>This recommendation will be 'Done' when ECFRS adopt MTA JOPS 3 in its entirety.</p>

<p>R53</p>	<p>The emergency services should prepare, train and exercise for how they will maintain effective radio communications between emergency responders on the ground, commanders and control rooms, during the response to a Major Incident.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>In order to be compliant, ECFRS have purchased sufficient Airwaves radios for all Flexi Duty Officers and NILOS to have two. There is a long lead time for these radios which are hampering progress being made.</p> <p>Control rooms are monitoring ESCTRL1 and utilise this channel when a Major Incident occurs.</p> <p>Due to the lack of Airwave radios for ECFRS L2 Tactical Commanders, there is the potential for ineffective situational awareness at incidents and the lack of ability to communicate tri-Service without the use of a NILO.</p>
<p>R55</p>	<p>The Home Office, the College of Policing, the Fire Service College and the National Ambulance Resilience Unit should consider together whether an app giving ready access to the contact details for all on-duty and on-call commanders is feasible and, if so, likely to be of benefit in the response to a Major Incident.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>This will be achieved when ECFRS have a system in place which will readily provide contact details for the relevant commanders without impacting on the Control Room. ECFRS are currently developing an app where skill sets will be identified and can be utilised for incidents.</p>
<p>R56</p>	<p>The College of Policing and Counter Terrorism Policing Headquarters should take steps to ensure that each police service establishes a hotline that enables those within the command structure of the three emergency services to make contact with the Force Duty Officer in the event of a declaration of Operation Plato.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap</p> <p>This recommendation will be achieved when there is a robust system in place which allows ECFRS and EEAST to make and maintain contact with Essex Police Control room without tying up a 999 emergency line. ECFRS and Essex Police are currently working towards this. Availability to contact via 'Oscar 1' and ES1 currently exists. This is limited to NILO's and Officers in Control only. Control staff currently have to ring 999.</p> <p>The MAIT falls under the phase 2 of the Control Room Upgrade. It is recommended that Daily email from EP Control to ECFRS Control is sent with the contact details for that specific day.</p> <p>Update: 15/2/24 - The MAIT will not be an acceptable solution for this as it is being funded for FRS Only.</p>

R57	<p>The College of Policing, the Fire Service College and National Fire Chiefs Council should consider devising training packages for operators within control rooms, to enable them to give guidance on basic trauma care to 999 callers.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>Working with the National Operational Guidance Team, this guidance is explored along with training material to support it and implemented. If agreed by the Service and Rep Bodies, this will be adopted, this training will be delivered to Control Room Staff and supported by prompts on the Guardian Mobilising System. Control Room staff currently do not have the training in place to offer any type of first aid advice to a member of the public calling 999.</p>
R69	<p>The Home Office, His Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services, the College of Policing, the Fire Service College, the National Ambulance Resilience Unit and JESIP should ensure that all emergency services use common terminology to describe the zoning of hazardous areas in non-Operation Plato Major Incident situations and that all services have a common understanding of those terms. The terms should be different from those used when Operation Plato is declared.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>Although through JESIP training ECFRS have an understanding of other agencies terminology some gaps exist, for example zoning at a water related incident or aircraft hijacking.</p> <p>ECFRS trains and will continue to train with and attend exercises with other agencies to understand their operational guidance. Through the Incident Command Training team, Incident Commanders are exposed to incidents which require the assistance of other agencies to achieve the common goal. Page 62 of the ECFRS Major Incident plan also has a list of acronyms in use.</p>
R71	<p>The Home Office, His Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services, the College of Policing, the Fire Service College and the National Ambulance Resilience Unit should oversee the development and implementation of action cards for the police, fire and rescue service, and ambulance service for use in a Major Incident. This should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ensuring that all control room staff and commanders are trained in the use of the action cards; b. ensuring that action cards act as a checklist, setting out the key functions of each command role, the role of control room staff and the need for joint working; c. ensuring that action cards are available immediately to commanders and control room staff during the course of the response 	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>The Emergency Preparedness and Resilience Dept are reviewing the Major Incident Plan in July to update in line with other Services, in particular the addition of Action Cards.</p> <p>This recommendation will be done when the Major Incident Plan has been amended in July and includes the action cards.</p> <p>This recommendation will be done when the MIP has a number of role specific action cards and commanders are familiarised in the use of them.</p> <p>Action cards have been added to the Guardian mobilising system for Major Incidents, Control are trained to follow the actions and DSP’s attached to each NITL Type. When a Critical</p>

	<p>to a Major Incident, whether in hard copy or electronically;</p> <p>d. ensuring that the use of action cards is tested regularly through exercising; and</p> <p>e. ensuring that the action cards within the control rooms include a prompt to the first commander on scene to co-locate with other emergency service commanders.</p>	<p>Incident is called, there are specific action cards for the officers and loggists within the CIT room. The major incident plan, post review, will have additional Action Cards for specific roles.</p>
<p>R113</p>	<p>The team led by Philip Cowburn has devised a tool that is designed for use by a wide range of emergency responders in a mass casualty situation. It is known as Ten Second Triage. The National Ambulance Resilience Unit, the College of Policing and the Fire Service College should consider as a matter of urgency whether all of their frontline staff should be trained in the use of Ten Second Triage.</p>	<p>Delegated to JESIP – will require a tri-service sign-off for full compliance in Essex. ECFRS have identified their aspect has a gap.</p> <p>ECFRS - must fully implement TST, including the use of snap bands for categorising casualties. TST is already on the well embedded JESIP App which can be utilised to assist crews.</p> <p>ECFRS do not currently undertake TST, although the flowchart is on the JESIP App, which is well embedded, we have not trained our staff in this.</p> <p>TST was presented to the OCM in Feb 2024 however it did not get passed. It will now be raised through an extraordinary JNCC meeting.</p> <p>ECFRS must fully implement TST, including the use of snap bands for categorising casualties. TST is already on the well embedded JESIP App which can be utilised to assist crews.</p>

Assurance Process –

- Gaps Identified: Added to Open Progressing. These will go through full governance and assurance, requiring a Definition of Done and owned by an AM.
- No gap identified and ECFRS is compliant then a Statement of Compliance explaining how ECFRS have this embedded, with auditable and verifiable evidence.
- Prior to L2 Assurance all recommendations will also need a Statement of Closure which details the BAU plan for on-going and sustainable compliance to be maintained.

Fire only:

- Level 2 Assurance sits with ECFRS Organisational Assurance Team
- Level 3 Assurance sits with the Project/Performance Board

JESIP only:

- Each agency will take the recommendation to Level 2 Assurance

- Level 2 Assurance will be undertaken by the MAI2 Strategic Oversight Board once all the Agencies have completed their individual Level 2 statements of Compliance and Closure.
- Level 3 Assurance will be undertaken by the ERF Planning and Assurance Group

RISKS AND MITIGATIONS

JCAD Risk SRR150034: There is a risk that the Service does not implement, within required timescales and sustainably, recommendations from external Inquiries into similar organisations; resulting in a failure to prevent a repeat of the mistakes highlighted and to restore public confidence.

Trigger: A failure to adequately, govern and assure the action plan put in place to deliver against the recommendations from the relevant Inquiry.

Impact: Mistakes could be repeated, with subsequent loss of life, and the 'public concern' about the event/events leading to the Inquiry are not addressed.

Mitigation: Project Board set up to deliver compliance to Inquiry recommendations and ensure compliance is sustainable and maintained. Once in BAU recommendations will become control measures within the JCAD Strategic Risk.

Mitigations:

- Grenfell Inquiry Phase 1 – All Grenfell recommendations will become control measures under the corporate risk in JCAD, with the BAU plan of how the Service will maintain compliance by 31st December 2023.
- Manchester Arena Inquiry Volume 2 – published in November 2022. Governance and Assurance process implemented, using the learning from the Grenfell Inquiry. All Fire directed recommendations go through a Level 3 with ECFRS Organisational Assurance Team. Recommendations allocated to the main agency to which they are directed at, with oversight for Essex maintained by the Emergency Services Collaboration Team.

LINKS TO FIRE AND RESCUE PLAN

Links to the Fire and Rescue Plan:

- Make best use of our resources
- Annual Plan AP202122- 08

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Appendix A is the Financial Report for the Protection Uplift Grant.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Changes to Fire Safety legislation are anticipated following Grenfell Inquiry Phase 2 which is likely to drive changes in inspection regimes and statutory responsibilities in high rise residential buildings. This has driven changes to ECFRS Protection Strategy which has been reviewed to take this into account. The strategy and the accompanying Risk Based Inspection Programme have been approved.

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

Proposed project resources and project management team structure are stated in the PID [para. 2.3 and 4]

EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

The actions being taken will not have a disproportionate impact on individuals with protected characteristics (as defined within the Equality Act 2010), when compared to all other individuals and will not disadvantage people with protected characteristics.

Race	N	Religion or belief	N
Sex	N	Gender reassignment	N
Age	N	Pregnancy & maternity	N
Disability	N	Marriage and Civil Partnership	N
Sexual orientation	N		

The Core Code of Ethics Fire Standard has been fully considered and incorporated into the proposals outlined in this paper.

HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

Under the Health and Safety at Work Act etc 1974 we have a duty to protect the Health, Safety and Welfare at work of all employees as well as others who may be affected by our work including the general public. The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 also identifies our obligation to continually assess risks. The proposed piece of work seeks to identify any gaps in the approach to the management of operational risk in relation to high rise residential fire procedures and ultimately to contribute to the Health and Safety of responders and residents of High Rise residential buildings.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

The Project has a Communications Strategy where appropriate consultation and engagement is considered.

Engagement with Rep Bodies will be undertaken by the project Sponsor through the standard JNCC process.

FUTURE PLANS

We will look to maintain compliance with all recommendations following closure of the Grenfell Inquiry project using Risk SRR150034. This model will be followed for the Manchester Arena Inquiry Vol 2 recommendations.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS AND APPENDICES

Appendix A – Protection Update finance report