



**CabinetOffice**

**Government response to the public  
consultation on the revised guidance on**

**Business continuity advice and assistance  
to business and the voluntary sector  
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 8 has been re-named Business Continuity Advice and Assistance to Business and the Voluntary Sector to reflect more accurately the nature of the duty resting on local authorities.
3. More case studies have been included to reflect current good practice and share the experiences of local authorities, in discharging their duties under the Act. The duty to promote business continuity to local businesses can be challenging, however, a number of local authority areas have made significant strides in this area. Some of these stories have been told in the case studies, so that others can follow in an approach that has proved to work well.
4. Chapter 8 has not been designed as a step-by-step guide but provides a framework for the design, implementation and maintenance of Category 1 responders' business continuity management promotion systems.
5. The consultation, which ran from Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> July to Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011, was announced on the CCS Gateway and made available on the Cabinet Office UK resilience website and the National Resilience website. Only 57 of the 86 respondents who responded to the consultation expressed an opinion on this chapter.

**Table 1: Organisations who responded to the consultation by CCA category**

CCA Category	Class	Number
Category 1 responders	Environment Agency	1
	Fire and Rescue Services	8
	Local Authority	20
	NHS	4
	Police Forces	2
Category 2 responders	Transport organisations	2
	Utilities	7
Voluntary		2
Individual		1
Government department		0
Other	Associations	3
	Regulators	0
	Local Resilience Forums	7

The detailed list of organisations is shown in Annex A.

**Table 2: Responses to the Consultation**

No.	Question	Content % (Number)	Not content % (Number)	No opinion/Don't Know % (Number)
1	Do you agree that showing real life and recent examples of how other areas have undertaken this duty will be helpful to others?	89.5 (51)	1.8 (1)	8.8 (5)
2	The revised chapter now places less emphasis on specific advice to individual organisations and more on a wider audience approach, such as websites and conferences. Do you think this is the correct approach?	64.9 (37)	3.5 (2)	31.5 (18)

### Summary

- 90 per cent of respondents agreed that having examples and case studies of how others were undertaking this duty was helpful.
- Responders also supported the move away from targeting individual organisations to a wider audience approach including through the use of websites and conferences.

### Detailed Responses

**Q - Do you agree that showing real life and recent examples of how other areas have undertaken this duty will be helpful to others?**

- 90% of respondents agreed that it was helpful to have examples of best practice and recent case studies showing how others were carrying out their duty.
- Responders commented that giving advice on the basis of real life planning and events puts emphasis on lessons learned rather than anticipating the outcome of a plan or action. Others felt that it showed theory in practice; provided good practical advice and ideas; gave ideas to other LRFs; and successful practices are useful as reference points.
- One responder thought including development costs and officer hours would be helpful. However, this is not possible, as separate exercises would have to be undertaken to do this which would not be cost effective and would not necessarily add value to the studies.

- Another responder felt that the case studies and contact details would become outdated. The contact details were asked for by responders when initially scoping the changes to the Chapter, and names have been included, with permission from the individuals concerned as they are happy to be contacted to share the methods they employ to undertake the duties. The phone numbers are 'office' numbers so will be relevant as long as the office exists.
- One response suggested moving the case studies to a separate annex. This had already been considered and a dedicated site on the National Resilience Extranet has been set up and will host best practice case studies in support of all the CCA duties.

**Q - The revised chapter now places less emphasis on specific advice to individual organisations and more on a wider audience approach, such as websites and conferences. Do you think this is the correct approach?**

- 65% agreed with the wider audience approach of the new Chapter with many also citing the current financial climate, and reduced resource, as an inhibiting pressure.
- One commented that while it is allowed, and is desirable to cost recover for conferences and events, local authorities don't charge as there is often a lack of interest, or an unwillingness, to attend such events.
- Others felt that a mixed approach worked best; using wider local knowledge to take a risk based approach targeting specific organisations that would have an economic impact in the local area in the event of an emergency. But also recognising the benefit of a wider approach for the majority of organisations through cost efficient use of websites and conferences.

**Q – Is there anything further you would like to see in Chapter 8?**

- A number of minor factual errors were highlighted and these have now been corrected.
- Two respondents felt that a nationally integrated approach, including a national marketing campaign, could be developed that would make better use of resources, deliver an integrated approach and reduce costs. However, to co-ordinate business continuity promotion from the centre would run counter to the move towards localism, and would undermine relationship building opportunities at local level.
- Another felt that there was still a problem over what 'promotion' of BCM actually meant and how much of it a local authority should be doing.
- One respondent requested the inclusion of a definition of an emergency in support of the section of that name, and this has now been included.

**List of Respondents**

**Anglian Water Services Ltd**  
**ATOC Ltd. (Association of Train Operating Companies)**  
**Bedfordshire & Luton Local Resilience Forum (BLLRF)**  
**Birmingham City Council**  
**Bradford Council**  
**Bristol Water plc**  
**Cheshire local resilience forum**  
**City of London Police**  
**Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit and LRF**  
**Continuity Forum**  
**Cornwall Council**  
**County Durham and Darlington Local Resilience Forum**  
**East Staffordshire Borough Council**  
**East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service**  
**Emergency Planning Shared Service Rotherham and Sheffield**  
**Emergency Planning Society - West Midlands Branch**  
**Environment Agency**  
**Great Ormond Street Hospital**  
**Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service**  
**Health Protection Agency**  
**Heathrow Travel Care**  
**Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service**  
**Hertfordshire County Council**  
**Highways Agency**  
**Humber Emergency Planning Service (joint local authority)**  
**International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM)**  
**Lancashire County Council**  
**Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS)**  
**Lancashire Resilience Forum Business Continuity Sub Group. Employed by**  
**Blackpool Council**  
**London Borough of Barnet**  
**London Borough of Hillingdon**  
**London Fire Brigade**  
**Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service**  
**Metropolitan Police Service**  
**National Grid**  
**Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd**  
**NHS Sussex**  
**NHS Sussex (Sussex PCT Cluster)**  
**North Yorkshire County Council Emergency Planning Unit. Also on behalf of:**  
**NYCC Health and Adult Services and City of York Council EPU**  
**North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service**  
**Northumbrian Water Limited**  
**Oxfordshire County Council**  
**Plymouth City Council**

**Private individual**  
**South Kesteven District Council**  
**Southampton City Council Emergency Planning Unit**  
**Southern Water Services Ltd**  
**Staffordshire Civil Contingencies Unit (CCU)**  
**Suffolk Resilience Forum**  
**Surrey County Council**  
**Sussex Resilience Forum**  
**Thurrock Council**  
**United Utilities**  
**Water UK**  
**West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service**  
**West Yorkshire Resilience Forum**  
**Worcestershire County Council**