



CabinetOffice

**Government Response to the Public
Consultation on the Revised Guidance on**

**Collaboration and co-operation between Local
Resilience Forums in England under the Civil
Contingencies Act 2004**

Introduction

1. *Emergency Preparedness* is the statutory guidance relating to Part I of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and its supporting regulations. As part of the Civil Contingencies Act Enhancement Programme (CCAEP) the guidance is being updated to introduce greater clarity and to reflect new practices and arrangements. These changes are aimed at better supporting responders to fulfil their duties under the Act.
2. Chapter 16 has been revised to merge the two former chapters 17 and 18 to take account of the closure of the Government Office Network and the establishment of the DCLG Resilience and Emergencies Division which now has responsibility for resilience at the sub-national level.
3. The consultation, which ran from Monday 31 October 2011 to Friday 23 December 2011, was announced on the CCS Gateway and made available on the Cabinet Office UK resilience website and the National Resilience Extranet. Of the 27 people that responded to the questions, 15 expressed an opinion on the chapter.

Table 1: Responses to the consultation by CCA category

CCA Category	Class	Number
Category 1 responders	Environment Agency	0
	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	0
	Fire and Rescue Services	3
	Local Authority	7
	NHS	0
	Police Forces	2
Category 2 responders	Transport organisations	1
Other	Associations	2
	Voluntary organisations	0
	Individual	0
	Regulators	0
	Local Resilience Forums	0

The detailed list of respondents is shown at Annex A.

Table 2: Responses to the Consultation

No.	Question	Yes %	No %	No opinion/Don't Know %
1	Does the merger of the two chapters work effectively?	100.0	0	0
2	Does the revised guidance 'Collaboration and Co-operation between Local Resilience Forums in England' adequately describe multi-LRF co-operation and planning arrangements in England?	66.7	26.7	6.7
3	Is the role of the Department for Communities and Local Government Resilience and Emergencies Division (DCLG RED) adequately explained?	66.7	13.3	20.0
4	Does the revised guidance clarify the new flexibilities around collaboration and co-operation between Local Resilience Forums?	80.0	6.7	13.0
5	Is there any further information you would like to see included in this chapter?	33.3	60.0	6.7

Summary

Does the merger of the two chapters work effectively?

- All respondents agreed that the merger works effectively.

Does the revised guidance 'Collaboration and Co-operation between Local Resilience Forums in England' adequately describe multi-LRF co-operation and planning arrangements in England?

- 67% of respondents indicated that the chapter adequately describes collaboration and co-operation between LRFs in England. 27% disagreed and 6% didn't know or had no opinion.

Is the role of the Department for Communities and Local Government Resilience and Emergencies Division (DCLG RED) adequately explained?

- 67% of respondents indicated that the role of DCLG RED is adequately explained. 13% disagreed and 20% didn't know or had no opinion.

Does the revised guidance clarify the new flexibilities around collaboration and co-operation between Local Resilience Forums?

- The majority of respondents (80%) indicated that the guidance does clarify new flexibilities around collaboration and co-operation between LRFs. 7% disagreed and 13% didn't know or had no opinion.

Is there any further information you would like to see included in this chapter?

- 60% of respondents were content with the content of the chapter.
- 33% indicated that they would like to see additional information included and detailed comments around this are included in the section below.
- 7% of respondents had no opinion.

Detailed Responses

Does the revised guidance 'Collaboration and Co-operation between Local Resilience Forums in England' adequately describe multi-LRF co-operation and planning arrangements in England?

The majority of respondents (67%) felt that the revised guidance does adequately describe multi-LRF co-operation and planning arrangements in England. 27% felt that it doesn't but only 5 respondents commented on the new arrangements.

Those comments centred on the perceived ineffectiveness of previous regional resilience arrangements and how their removal, and the move towards more flexible arrangements for cross-boundary LRF working, is a backward step. Another comment suggested that it was too early following the closure of the Government Office Network to tell whether the description of multi-LRF co-operation and planning arrangement is adequate or not. Two respondents felt that there was a lack of clarity on structure which requires a central steer.

The decision to remove the regional resilience tier has been made and the successor arrangements for co-operation and collaboration at local level are deliberately flexible to support the move towards localism, more autonomous localities and the move away from central direction and control. RED resilience advisors are in place to work with LRFs to enable and support co-operation and collaboration across LRF boundaries.

Is the role of the Department for Communities and Local Government Resilience and Emergencies Division (DCLG RED) adequately explained?

Two thirds of respondents felt that the DCLG RED role was adequately explained whilst only 13% felt that it wasn't. The majority of comments on this question were brief and simply stated that the role was not adequately explained.

One respondent felt that there was too little information provided on the RED role to enable full understanding of what they will provide whilst another felt that the RED role was not adequately explained but that it was too early, since the division was established, to assess their effectiveness.

Emergency Preparedness guidance is deliberately non-prescriptive to reflect the government's localism agenda. LRFs are encouraged to work with their allocated RED resilience adviser to understand the role and how it might work within their respective area to support better co-operation and collaboration.

Does the revised guidance clarify the new flexibilities around collaboration and co-operation between Local Resilience Forums?

Only 7% of respondents didn't agree that the revised guidance clarifies the new flexibilities around collaboration and co-operation between LRFs. One respondent commented on the criticality of national organisations, such as utilities and transport operators, having proper channels for communicating and sharing information with individual LRFs.

Information sharing between Category 1 and Category 2 responders is a duty on both types of responder under the Act and guidance on information sharing between these types of organisations is covered in *Emergency Preparedness* chapter 2 – referenced within this chapter (16).

Is there any further information you would like to see included in this chapter?

A third of respondents felt that there should be further information included in this chapter, however, comments and suggestions for inclusions were limited. One respondent felt that the CCAEP was an opportunity to place LRFs under the general rules of local authorities in relation to the publication of LRF information such as meeting agendas, minutes and reports. This approach had worked well in the respondent's LRF area and they suggested that it should be recommended to other LRFs as a case study.

Other respondents felt that the chapter would benefit from practical examples of good practice in collaboration, co-operation and working with RED. Following feedback from stakeholders in the earlier stages of CCAEP, CCS has developed a work stream focussing on the collection of good practice case studies for dissemination to

responders via the National Resilience Extranet. Publicising examples of good practice through this medium rather than incorporating them into guidance allows the flexibility to regularly update and refresh information and negates the need for constantly updating guidance.

Other comments about the use of terminology and the format of consultation questionnaires were received. All have been reviewed and corresponding changes made to the chapter as appropriate.

ANNEX A

List of Respondents

Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service

South Yorkshire Police

Transport for London

Gateshead Council

Lancashire County Council

North Yorkshire County Council and on behalf of City of York Council

Newcastle City Council

East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service

North Wales Fire and Rescue Service

Emergency Planning Society - West Midlands Branch

Central Bedfordshire Council

Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit and LRF Manager (Employing Authority - Hartlepool)

Institute of Civil Protection and Emergency Management (ICPEM)

East Staffordshire Borough Council

Cumbria Constabulary