



## OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)

### Surrey Local Resilience Forum Update

6<sup>th</sup> March 2008

#### KEY ISSUE

To update Members on the work of the Surrey Local Resilience Forum (SLRF) and the development of plans for the delivery of emergency arrangements.

#### SUMMARY

Following a review of emergency planning arrangements in the UK in 2000, the Government concluded that the existing legislation no longer provided an adequate framework for modern civil protection efforts, and that new legislation was needed. A draft Civil Contingencies Act was developed following public consultation across the country.

The guidance and regulations set out clear expectations and responsibilities for front line responders at the local level to ensure that they are prepared to deal effectively with the full range of emergencies. With the introduction of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 the Surrey Local Resilience Forum (SLRF) has focused on ensuring that the generic duties of the act were met. The key direction of the planning is to ensure that the SLRF responders are in particular, able to react to the 'very high risks', such as flooding, terrorism and flu pandemic

#### OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper sets the context for this work and is for information only.

#### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Following a review of emergency planning arrangements in the UK in 2000, the Government concluded that the existing legislation no longer provided an adequate framework for modern civil protection efforts, and that new legislation was needed. A draft Civil Contingencies Act was developed following public consultation across the country.
2. The act delivers a single framework for civil protection in the United Kingdom, and provides a framework for the use of special legislative measures and to meet many of the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The Cabinet Office – Civil Contingencies Secretariat in consultation and in partnership with practitioners from various professional groups developed comprehensive regulations and guidance that accompanies the Act, and came into force in April 2005.
3. The guidance and regulations set out clear expectations and responsibilities for front line responders at the local level to ensure that they are prepared to

deal effectively with the full range of emergencies, from localised Major Incidents through to Catastrophic Events.

4. The duties imposed by the Act can be grouped broadly into six categories:
  - Cooperation
  - Information Sharing
  - Risk Assessment
  - Emergency Planning
  - Business Continuity Planning
  - Warning and Informing
5. Local authorities also have the duty to promote Business Continuity Management to businesses and voluntary organisations operating within the geographic area of responsibility.

## **ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY**

### **SURREY LOCAL RESILIENCE FORUM (SLRF)**

6. With the introduction of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 the Surrey Local Resilience Forum has focused on ensuring that the generic duties of the act were met. This has placed the partnership in a strong position and allows the SLRF to now focus on the detail of the key risks facing Surrey.
7. To support this approach the SLRF has adopted a project-based approach to the delivery of the emergency arrangements. By this means the SLRF will be able to show accountable practices and offer transparency to the scrutiny of the Chief Officers accountable for the delivery of the requirements of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and to the SLRF overview group.

### **WORK PLAN GROUP 07/08**

8. A Work Plan Group was established and planning assumptions were made on a basis of 'risk' versus 'capability'.
9. The Community Risk Register identified the 'very high risks' as:
  - Terrorism
  - Flooding
  - Flu Pandemic Planning
10. In line with the guidance for the Civil Contingencies Act it was agreed that the response to the three risk areas should be responded to using generic response plans where possible, and should follow national capability work streams. However, it should be acknowledged that in certain areas there is a need to have specific plans in place to deal with identified issues.

#### **Flooding**

11. It was felt by the group that arrangements for flooding could be included entirely in the generic planning arrangements, and as such the actions relating to the capabilities would cover the majority of the multi-agency response needs for flooding events. Each organisation should look at its own response arrangements to ensure that they are able to provide the support within these multi-agency arrangements.

#### **Terrorism**

12. The group felt that the arrangements in place for the multi agency response to a terrorist incident were largely in place and had been tested through exercising for a number of scenarios. The review of the capabilities will need

to ensure that the outcomes of these exercises are actioned and that plans are able to meet the needs of the response to such incidents.

### **Flu Pandemic**

13. The group felt that Flu Pandemic was the ‘very high risk’ partners maybe least prepared to respond to. All agreed that work should be progressed as soon as possible looking at the following work streams:
- Command and control
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - Anti viral distribution
  - Mass Vaccination
  - Excess Deaths
  - Communication with the Public

### **DELIVERY OF WORK STREAMS**

14. Actions are based on the need to ensure that the capabilities are addressed to ensure the SLRF multi-agency response plans are able to deal with the three very high risks.
15. The Surrey Local Resilience Forum is focused on delivering plans and response arrangements by the most effective means. To this end, the decision to adopt a project-based process has been made by the partners.
16. The process builds on the Surrey Local Resilience Forum structure and allows the transition of the planning process from conception to inclusion in the Surrey Local Resilience Forum suite of plans and emergency.
17. Further work will be undertaken to standardise the information and to allow for the scrutiny of the process to assess performance of the Surrey Local Resilience Forum.
18. Following the project process it will also be possible to understand the resource commitment made by organisations, and ensure resources are made available at the different stages of the project cycle.
19. Further information on planning can be found on the SCC website – [www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk).

### **CONSULTATION**

20. None.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

21. Revenue and capital budget implications will be included as part of budget planning for the future.

### **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

22. None.

### **CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

23. Crime and disorder implications will be considered as part of the processes

### **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

24. Equalities and diversity implications will be considered as part of the processes.

**CONCLUSION**

25. With the introduction of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 the Surrey Local Resilience Forum (SLRF) has focused on ensuring that the generic duties of the act are met.
26. The key direction of the planning is to ensure that the SLRF responders are in particular, able to react to the 'very high risks', such as flooding, terrorism and flu pandemic.
27. The Local Committee is asked to note the report.

**LEAD OFFICER:** Ian Good, Head of Contingency Planning

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 08456 009 009

**E-MAIL:** [ian.good@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:ian.good@surreycc.gov.uk)