



**CabinetOffice**

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

**Other sectors that should be involved in  
Emergency Planning under the Civil  
Contingencies Act 2004**

## Introduction

1. The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 Enhancement Programme (CCAEP) was established to review the Act, its Regulations and Statutory Guidance (*Emergency Preparedness*) (*EP*) to ensure they remain fit for purpose. Phase 2 of the programme has included the review of Chapter 15, Sectors not covered by the Act.
2. The revisions to the chapter reflect support for the change of title to strengthen engagement with those organisations currently outside the Act. An emphasis has also been given to the need to be aware of all sectors that need to be included to ensure an integrated approach to emergency planning arrangements.
3. The consultation, which ran from Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010 to Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2011, was announced on the CCS Gateway and made available on the CCS website. It drew responses from 57 stakeholders, 42 of which expressed a view on the changes to this chapter (details as below). The respondents were largely content with the proposed guidance.

**Table 1: Responses to the consultation by CCA category**

<b>CCA Category</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Number</b>
Category 1 responders	Environment Agency	1
	Fire and Rescue Services	4
	Local Authority	12
	NHS	2
	Police Forces	5
Category 2 responders	Transport organisations	1
Other	Associations	3
	Voluntary Organisations	5
	Regulators	1
	Local Resilience Forums	8

The detailed list of respondents is shown in Annex A.

**Table 2: Responses to the Consultation**

No.	Question	Content %	Not content %	No opinion/Don't Know %
1	Does the change to the title of chapter 15, from <i>Sectors not covered by the Act</i> to <i>Sectors that Should be Involved in Emergency Planning</i> , help emphasise the importance of the inclusion of these sectors in emergency planning.	54	7	39
2	Should any further changes be made to clarify how and when sectors should be involved in the planning process?	27	25	48

### Summary

- 54% of respondents supported the renaming of the chapter; 39% were of no opinion and only 7% against.
- Only 52% expressed an opinion as to further changes clarifying other sector involvement, and these were fairly evenly split for and against.

### Detailed Responses

#### Renaming the Chapter

- 54% of respondents who supported the chapter name change felt it was more 'positive' and 'may encourage more engagement with sectors outside of the CCA than the previous title would suggest'. It was noted that a more accurate title would be *Other sectors that should be involved in emergency planning*.
- It was also felt that 'it emphasises the need for other sectors to have emergency planning arrangements in place' and that it 'helps encourage,

whilst not putting too much onus, on organisations without a duty, to be part of the process’.

- One respondent noted that while it was better than the previous title, it would be helpful if it was more robust, while another commented that the wording ‘should be involved’ is not strong enough.
- A number of respondents commented that there was good practice already in existence with Category 1 responders engaging with sectors outside the ‘normal’ emergency planning sphere.
- However, another raised the issue of organisations attempting to maximise profits during an emergency.

#### Further clarification of other sector involvement in the planning process

- 52% of respondents commented on this question, and of those 52% were in favour of change and 48% against.
- Comments were mixed with some respondents being content with the current guidance, and one stating that the subject of who to involve in the planning process was linked to, and covered in, the new Chapter 19 CCA and the Fit with Other Legislation.
- One respondent felt that private sector organisations should be included if they aren’t contractually tied to respond to an emergency. This was supported by another who also commented that ‘it can still be problematic getting Category 2 responders engaged’.

We have reviewed all comments made and, in light of the comments received we have amended paragraphs: 15.5 (The armed forces), 15.6 (Retail companies, including supermarkets), 15.7 a new reference to the Food Standards Agency, 15.10 (Taxi firms and coach companies), 15.14 (Private communications networks dedicated to public safety users) and additional text has been added to paragraph 15.20 (Private Veterinary Surgeons): *‘For large animal rescue work, Category 1 responders will need to consider the training requirement needed for veterinarians in*

Other sectors that should be involved in Emergency Planning

*their area which is available from the Fire and Rescue Service, the RSPCA and specially trained vets.'*

A new paragraph has been added: '15.21 Other sectors that may be considered within the emergency planning process are:'

#### General comments

- Some respondents included the possibility of involving social networking sites in planning and testing to assist in warning and informing, and also to encourage responsible reporting when incidents do occur. Also the involvement of the banking sector, as the inability to undertake financial transactions, or even purchase basic items, is a bar to self-help in an emergency.
- Others mentioned the changes occurring in the NHS, and the loss of regional resources such as regional Brigade Headquarters, which may impact on the involvement of linked organisations.

New text has been added at 15.4: '*This list is not exhaustive and organisations that are relevant to particular emergency plans but have not been referenced within this chapter should still be included within the preparation process where appropriate.*'

## **ANNEX A**

### **List of Respondents**

**Cumbria Constabulary**

**NHS Coventry**

**London Borough of Bexley**

**Stockport Council**

**NHS Nottinghamshire County**

**Telford and Wrekin Council**

**Civil Nuclear Constabulary**

**Lichfield District Council**

**South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service**

**Rotherham MBC**

**Emergency Planning Society – West Midlands Branch**

**West Midlands Police**

**Civil Aviation Authority**

**Sheffield City Council**

**Northants LRF**

**Suffolk Resilience Forum**

**IAEM Europe**

**Cleveland LRF**

**Cleveland Emergency Planning Joint Committee**

**Bedfordshire and Luton LRF**

**Manchester City Council**

**St John Ambulance National HQ**

**British Red Cross**

**Essex Fire and Rescue Service**

**West Yorkshire Resilience Forum**

**Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue Service**

**Norfolk Resilience Forum**

**Institute of Civil Protection and Emergency Management**

**Worcestershire County Council**

**The Radio Amateur's Emergency Network**

**Northumbria Police**

**Environment Agency**

**Transport for London**

**Community Resilience UK**

Other sectors that should be involved in Emergency Planning

**London Borough of Newham**

**Strathclyde Police**

**Hertfordshire Resilience**

**North Yorkshire County Council**

**London Borough of Hillingdon**

**Cheshire LRF**

**Durham and Darlington Fire and Rescue Service**

**RSPCA (London East)**