UK Government

COBR
Cabinet Office Briefing Rooms

National Resilience Standards for Local Resilience Forums

Author	**COBR Directorate**
Date	**November 2026**
Version	**Version 4**

© Crown copyright 2026
Produced by Cabinet Office

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/.

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Contents

Contents **3**
Revision History **5**
.Chapter 1. Introduction **6**
Purpose 6
Audience 8
Scope 8
Structure 8
Linkages 8
.Chapter 2. An overview of Local Resilience Forums **10**
Local Resilience Forums 10
Role of Local Resilience Forum Chair 11
Role of Chief Resilience Officers 11
Role of the LRF Executive 12
Role of the LRF Secretariat 12
Role of Category 1 and 2 Responders 12
Relationship with UK Government 13
Relationship with the whole of society 14
.Chapter 3. The National Resilience Standards for Local Resilience Forums **15**
.Standard 1. LRF governance and support arrangements 17
Desired Outcome 17
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 17
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 19
Guidance and supporting knowledge 19
.Standard 2. Risk Assessment 21
Desired Outcome 21
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 21
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 22
Guidance and supporting knowledge 23
.Standard 3. Communicating with the public 24
Desired Outcome 24
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 24
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 25
Guidance and supporting knowledge 26
.Standard 4. Emergency planning 28
Desired Outcome 28
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 28
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 29
Guidance and supporting knowledge 30
.Standard 5. Business continuity 31
Desired Outcome 31

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 31
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 32
Guidance and supporting knowledge 33
.Standard 6. Whole of society resilience 33
Desired Outcome 34
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 34
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 35
Guidance and supporting knowledge 36
.Standard 7. Training 38
Desired Outcome 38
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 38
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 39
Guidance and supporting knowledge 40
.Standard 8. Exercising 41
Desired Outcome 42
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 42
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 43
Guidance and supporting knowledge 44
.Standard 9. Multi-agency response 45
Desired Outcome 45
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 45
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 47
Guidance and supporting knowledge 47
.Standard 10. Human aspects 49
Desired Outcome 49
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 49
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 50
Guidance and supporting knowledge 51
.Standard 11. Recovery management 53
Desired Outcome 53
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 53
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 54
Guidance and supporting knowledge 55
.Standard 12. Continual improvement 57
Desired Outcome 57
At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should: 57
For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could: 58
Guidance and supporting knowledge 59
Glossary **60**

Revision History

The revision history of the National Resilience Standards for Local Resilience Forums is summarised below.

Version	Date of issue	Change history	Authorisation
Version 1	July 2018	The 2015 Strategic Defence and Security Review included a commitment to produce a set of National Resilience Standards. Version 1 of the National Resilience Standards was published on ResilienceDirect in July 2018.	Civil Contingencies Secretariat, Cabinet Office
Version 2	December 2019	Version 2 of the National Resilience Standards extended the initial set of standards, with the addition of the community resilience development standard and two risk-specific standards: cyber incident preparedness and pandemic influenza preparedness.	Civil Contingencies Secretariat, Cabinet Office
Version 3	August 2020	Version 3 of the National Resilience Standards introduced updated terminology and standards to improve transparency and better reflect local resilience arrangements.	Civil Contingencies Secretariat, Cabinet Office
Version 4	November 2026	Version 4 of the National Resilience Standards introduces updated content and structural changes, reflecting the evolving developments and expectations of Local Resilience Forums. This iteration marks the withdrawal of business continuity promotion and risk-specific standards, alongside the addition of dedicated standards for human aspects and continual improvement. Furthermore, it consolidates previous guidance set out in ‘The Role of Local Resilience Forums’ (2013, V2).	COBR Directorate, Cabinet Office

Chapter 1 Introduction

Purpose

1. The landscape of civil contingencies faces an increasingly complex, interconnected, and demanding array of risks. Managing the compounding pressures of modern emergencies requires local responders to operate with agility, coherence, and shared purpose. Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) are the cornerstone of frontline co-operation - serving as the principal multi-agency partnership through which responder organisations plan, prepare, and co-ordinate local civil contingencies arrangements.

2. In this challenging operational context, establishing greater consistency across LRFs is essential to enhancing interoperability, building collective capacity, and ultimately strengthening the resilience system as a whole. The National Resilience Standards provide a unified baseline for multi-agency civil contingencies activities, establish a clear standard set to drive continual improvement, and form a consistent, evidence-led basis for self-assessment and assurance of local arrangements.

3. The National Resilience Standards set out a shared, consensus-driven view of the arrangements, capabilities and activities that underpin effective multi-agency working. Developed in close collaboration with LRFs, Category 1 and 2 responder organisations, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, other government departments, the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, the UK Resilience Academy and the Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles team, these standards reflect a broad consensus on what LRFs should co-ordinate in practice and the evidence they can use to demonstrate their readiness for emergencies.

4. The statutory basis for UK civil contingencies is established by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and the Civil Contingencies Act (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005. Under this legislative framework, an LRF is a multi-agency partnership, bringing together Category 1 and 2 responder organisations, to facilitate the co-ordination of statutory duties. The National Resilience Standards are non-statutory. They do not create new legal obligations, alter existing statutory duties, or transfer statutory responsibilities from Category 1 and 2 responder organisations to the LRF Partnership or Secretariat. Rather, the standards build on and complement existing duties established under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, associated legislation, sector-specific professional standards and guidance, and single-agency assurance mechanisms. The standards establish a progressive, two-tier framework - structured around minimum expectations and good practice - for LRFs to self-assess collective arrangements, address capability gaps, and drive continual improvement.

5. The National Resilience Standards embed vital lessons identified from past emergencies, exercises, independent reviews, and public inquiries. By weaving these lessons directly into

the standards - specifically across areas such as multi-agency co-ordination, public communications, business continuity, societal resilience, human aspects, and recovery - the standards ensure that LRFs develop, test, and evaluate their arrangements against a comprehensive baseline.

6. Recognising that LRFs are collaborative multi-agency partnerships, not standalone legal entities or operational delivery bodies, the National Resilience Standards are designed to be outcome-based rather than process-driven. The standards clearly define the desired outcomes and required arrangements for the LRF to facilitate, while leaving the overall method of delivery to local determination. This reinforces the core principle of subsidiarity, ensuring LRFs retain the primacy, flexibility, and autonomy to tailor their arrangements to local risks and circumstances.

7. Ultimately, the purpose of the National Resilience Standards is to:

    a. **clarify expectations of LRFs:** outline what LRFs are expected to achieve in line with their local responsibilities for multi-agency civil contingencies. The standards remain flexible and scalable to accommodate differing local demographics, geographies, risk profiles, and operational circumstances, while also driving national consistency. The standards guide joint working across LRF boundaries, as well as with UK government, the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, and wider partners and stakeholders.

    b. **enhance interoperability of partner organisations:** multi-agency interoperability is an essential enabler that underpins all aspects of preparedness, response and recovery. The standards support LRFs to develop, embed, and sustain routine interoperability between responder organisations and wider partners, through shared understanding, joint decision-making, co-ordinated operations, and effective information sharing.

    c. **support continual improvement:** drive a culture of learning and continual improvement by focusing on achievable multi-agency outcomes rather than prescribing rigid processes. By defining minimum baseline expectations and good practice, the standards establish a clear benchmark for what LRFs should have in place, what they could develop further, and what evidence demonstrates progress over time.

    d. **guide self-assessment and form a basis for assurance:** the standards provide a consistent, structured framework for LRFs to self-assess their readiness, identify capability gaps, and engage in constructive challenge. They support this through underpinning self-assessment and external challenge (including peer review as a form of external, peer-led challenge focused on learning and improvement), which together form part of a wider assurance framework for understanding and improving LRF effectiveness. Differences in perspective between self-assessment and external challenge are expected and should be welcomed as catalysts for learning and continual improvement. Importantly, Category 1 and 2 responder organisations remain solely responsible for their own internal statutory compliance, governance, and assurance.

Audience

8. The primary audience for the National Resilience Standards are LRFs, comprising their constituent Category 1 and Category 2 responder organisations.

9. The National Resilience Standards are also relevant to wider partners and stakeholders who routinely interact and work with LRFs. This includes UK government departments, public bodies and agencies, the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, and businesses involved in resilience. The standards help wider partners and stakeholders understand how their own structures, capabilities, and statutory responsibilities interact with and support LRF arrangements.

Scope

10. The National Resilience Standards apply to all LRFs as they define the multi-agency arrangements they should have in place, what they could develop further, and the evidence they can use to demonstrate readiness for emergencies. The National Resilience Standards only apply to wider partners - including UK government departments, devolved governments, public bodies and agencies, the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, and businesses involved in resilience - in relation to how they interact with and support LRF arrangements.

Structure

11. Following this 'Chapter 1: Introduction', the National Resilience Standards for LRFs is organised into two core chapters:

    a. **Chapter 2:** provides a foundational overview of LRFs and general arrangements.

    b. **Chapter 3:** details the specific National Resilience Standards for LRFs.

Linkages

12. The National Resilience Standards for LRFs should be read in conjunction with the following legislation, guidance, and doctrine:

    a. Civil Contingencies Act 2004: delivers a single legislative framework for civil contingencies in the UK. It establishes roles and responsibilities for those involved in multi-agency emergency preparation and response at the local level. The Act is supplemented by the CCA 2004 (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, which define the duties of Category 1 and 2 responder organisations and provide greater detail on how they are to be performed.

b. Emergency Preparedness: statutory guidance on Part 1 of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, its associated Regulations, and non-statutory arrangements.

c. Emergency Response and Recovery: guidance aimed at establishing good practice for emergency response and recovery, based on lessons identified in the UK and internationally.

d. The Amber Book - Managing Crisis in Central Government: UK government's emergency management framework and Concept of Operations.

e. The Lead Government Department Expectation Set: provides national expectations for Lead Government Departments, other government departments and the Cabinet Office. This includes expectations on working with the local resilience tier and working with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector.

f. National Risk Register (updated regularly and found on gov.uk): UK government's public facing assessment of the most serious risks facing the UK, which complements the internal National Security Risk Assessment.

g. Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP) Joint Doctrine: provides a framework of common models and principles to improve interoperability between responder organisations during emergencies.

h. National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies: provides a comprehensive, structured national resource to support the development of the resilience workforce. The National Occupational Standards outline the knowledge, skills, and understanding required to effectively prepare for, respond to and recover from emergencies.

Chapter 2 An overview of Local Resilience Forums

13. This chapter provides a foundational overview of LRFs as part of the local resilience system. It defines the core purpose of an LRF and sets out the roles, responsibilities, and relationships of the wider partners involved in preparedness, response and recovery at the local level.

Local Resilience Forums

14. An LRF is a collaborative, multi-agency partnership, rather than a standalone legal entity or operational delivery body. An LRF brings together responder organisations with responsibilities under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and the Civil Contingencies Act (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, to work collectively to identify risk, co-ordinate planning, build capability, and strengthen local resilience.

15. While many duties are delivered through LRF arrangements, legal duties remain the responsibility of individual Category 1 and Category 2 responder organisations. The LRF provides a principal mechanism through which partner organisations co-ordinate the delivery of responsibilities requiring multi-agency co-operation.

16. The core purpose of an LRF is to ensure the effective delivery of duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 that require multi-agency co-ordination. Specifically, the LRF must deliver:

    a. a compilation of agreed risk profiles for the area, through a Community Risk Register;

    b. a systematic, planned and co-ordinated approach to encourage Category 1 responder organisations, according to their functions, to address all aspects of policy in relation to:

        - risk;
        - planning for emergencies;
        - business continuity management;
        - publishing information about risk assessments and plans;
        - arrangements to warn and inform the public;

- other aspects of civil protection duty, including the promotion of business continuity management by local authorities; and
- support for the preparation of multi-agency plans and other documents, by all or some of its partner organisations, including protocols and agreements for the co-ordination of multi-agency training and exercising.

17. To deliver these functions, the LRF should operate effectively as a collective body managing a comprehensive work programme. As LRFs are not legal entities with formal powers of direction, their success relies on shared ownership, collective effort, and mutual trust among partner organisations. Their responsibilities are best fulfilled when the LRF is organised as a collaborative mechanism, equipped to achieve mutual aims through shared leadership and consensus-based decision-making, while remaining active in monitoring its own progress and identifying necessary improvements.

18. While certain aspects of LRF delivery are directly mandated, for example the minimum frequency that the principal LRF group meets, the partnership operates heavily on the principle of subsidiarity. This flexibility ensures that structures and approaches are tailored to suit local demographics, geographies, risk profiles, and operational circumstances.

19. A total of 38 LRFs have been established in England, defined by the boundaries of police areas. Equivalent structures and approaches within the devolved governments are Local Resilience Forums in Wales, Local Resilience Partnerships in Scotland, and Emergency Preparedness Groups in Northern Ireland.

Role of Local Resilience Forum Chair

20. The LRF Chair provides strategic leadership to the LRF partnership, helping to set direction, build consensus, and maintain focus on the LRF's priorities and effectiveness. The Chair should be sufficiently senior to speak with authority on local resilience matters, convene partner organisations around shared objectives, and act as a point of contact with UK government departments and wider partners. The role of the Chair is to lead through influence, co-ordination and consensus rather than formal powers of direction, reflecting the set-up of LRFs as multi-agency partnerships.

Role of Chief Resilience Officers

21. Chief Resilience Officers are a developing senior leadership role that helps strengthen how local resilience is organised and delivered. They work with the LRF Chair, Executive, Secretariat and wider partners to help drive priorities, improve co-ordination, and support engagement across the LRF partnership. The Chief Resilience Officer helps ensure resilience is regularly considered in wider local plans, decisions, and arrangements, not just in emergencies. The Chief Resilience Officer also acts as a point of contact for elected leaders, helping to improve visibility, accountability, and links with local governance.

22. The Chief Resilience Officer supports the overall work of the LRF, but does not replace the statutory responsibilities of Category 1 and 2 responder organisations or, where separate, the leadership role of an LRF Chair. Adoption of the Chief Resilience Officer role varies nationally, and arrangements for the delivery of the role may differ at the local level.

Role of the LRF Executive

23. The LRF Executive Group, referred to as the Chief Officers Group in the Civil Contingencies Act (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, provides senior-level oversight of the LRF's priorities and work programme, helping to translate strategic direction into delivery across the partnership.

24. The LRF Executive Group should include sufficiently senior representatives, with the authority to allocate their organisations' resources, resolve issues, and maintain collective accountability for progress. Executive-level representation should be of sufficient seniority to avoid dilution of engagement, and to ensure that decisions, commitments, and escalations can be made effectively on behalf of partner organisations.

Role of the LRF Secretariat

25. The LRF Secretariat, sometimes referred to locally as the LRF Partnership Team or LRF Support Team, provides the co-ordination, programme management and organisational support needed to sustain the LRF's work programme and overall effectiveness.

26. The LRF Secretariat supports the LRF Chair, Executive, and wider partnership by co-ordinating governance arrangements, maintaining records, tracking actions, supporting information flow, managing forward plans, monitoring progress against agreed priorities and helping co-ordinate assurance, training, exercising, lessons management and continual improvement activity, where this forms part of local arrangements.

27. The LRF Secretariat often plays a significant role in maintaining partner organisation relationships, supporting the delivery of the work programme and acting as a point of contact between partner organisations, wider partners and stakeholders.

Role of Category 1 and 2 Responders

28. Under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, responder organisations are divided into two categories, each with distinct statutory duties:

    a. **Category 1 responders** are the organisations at the core of emergency preparedness and response, and are subject to the full set of duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

b. **Category 2 responders** are co-operating bodies with a more limited set of duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, focused particularly on co-operation and information sharing.

29. While their statutory responsibilities differ, the delivery of effective resilience activity depends on active partnership working, with both Category 1 and Category 2 responder organisations contributing appropriately to the collective understanding of risk and the development of coherent local arrangements.

Relationship with UK Government

30. The relationship between LRFs and UK government is a mutual, two-way partnership based on the principle of subsidiarity, where local areas retain the primacy to manage their own arrangements without an overly prescriptive national approach.

31. **The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) acts as the strategic interface between the UK government and the local resilience tier in preparing for, responding to and recovering from emergencies.** It provides stewardship of local resilience through funding, facilitating the two-way flow of information to strengthen situational awareness of risks, and building long term system capability and capacity.

32. MHCLG Resilience Advisers work with LRFs throughout the resilience cycle[1], supporting preparedness and risk management for whole-system risks, as well as emergency response and recovery. During crisis response, MHCLG provides a 24/7 function, with Resilience and Recovery Directorate (RED) Government Liaison Officers deployed into local response structures to support co-ordination, especially where issues cut across local boundaries or require wider UK government engagement. This relationship strengthens rather than directs, as local partners lead multi-agency co-ordination while MHCLG helps align government support and escalate issues where necessary.

33. **The COBR Directorate plays a dual role in its relationship with LRFs, spanning both crisis response and long-term preparedness and resilience.** During the acute stage of a national emergency, the COBR Directorate acts as the centre of UK government's operational command, relying on LRFs as the primary mechanism for local intelligence and implementation within local multi-agency response. The COBR Directorate also supports long-term preparedness and resilience, driving national standards through guidance, delivering risk intelligence through products such as the National Security Risk Assessment and the Civil Contingencies Forward Look, and works to strengthen LRF capabilities through shared planning and engagement initiatives.

34. **The National Situation Centre within the COBR Directorate runs ResilienceDirect**, the UK government's secure multi-agency information-sharing platform. While partner organisations naturally optimise their internal IT systems for daily business, ResilienceDirect is specifically

[1] See the resilience cycle in 'The Amber Book: Managing Crisis in Central Government', Page 10.

designed to share information, plans, and situational data across partner organisation boundaries.

Relationship with the whole of society

35. Modern resilience extends beyond the role of Category 1 and 2 responder organisations to encompass the whole of society, recognising the vital roles of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, defence representatives, community groups, academics, businesses, and the public in building resilience at the local level.

36. LRFs should support and facilitate a strategic and co-ordinated approach to strengthen the resilience of local areas, considering the whole of society through the integration of the wider partners and stakeholders throughout the resilience cycle.

Chapter 3 The National Resilience Standards for Local Resilience Forums

37. This chapter includes the current set of National Resilience Standards for LRFs:
    1. LRF governance and support arrangements
    2. Risk assessment
    3. Communicating with the public
    4. Emergency planning
    5. Business continuity
    6. Whole of society resilience
    7. Training
    8. Exercising
    9. Multi-agency response
    10. Human aspects
    11. Recovery management
    12. Continual improvement

38. While the National Resilience Standards are designed to move logically through the phases of the resilience cycle, they are organised by specific arrangements, capabilities and activities. This approach supports LRFs to make informed assessments about their readiness across the resilience cycle and within specific arrangements.

39. The National Resilience Standards represent a cohesive and interrelated framework, and **should be read and implemented as a whole, rather than as isolated standards**. Each standard reinforces the others, reflecting the natural dependencies throughout the resilience cycle.

40. For ease of use, each of the National Resilience Standards shares a common and consistent template structure. Each standard is subdivided into the following four sections:

    a. **Desired outcome**: sets out the strategic outcome and collective multi-agency capability that the LRF should work together to co-ordinate, facilitate, and achieve. Desired outcomes are designed to be outcome-focused rather than process-driven, allowing LRFs the flexibility to determine the most effective delivery models, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity.

    b. **LRFs at a minimum should:** sets out the baseline expectations of what LRFs are expected to have in place, deliver, and demonstrate as standard practice. Minimum baseline expectations represent arrangements that fulfil statutory requirements under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 thoroughly, align consistently with established national guidance, and operate effectively within the local multi-agency environment.

    c. **For good practice, LRFs could:** sets out developmental, progressive, and aspirational arrangements that LRFs could adopt to drive a culture of learning and continual improvement beyond the minimum baseline.

    d. **Guidance and supporting documentation:** signposts further sources of core guidance, thematic guidance, and good practice, to support LRFs when working towards the desired outcome. Guidance and supporting documentation is sub-categorised to help differentiate the materials based on their relative authority and intended use under the following headings:

        - **Core guidance:** statutory and overarching multi-agency guidance and reference, often from the UK government. Crucially, this is where the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and other relevant legislation will be linked when a standard crosses over to statutory duties or requirements. Users should consult the legislation, regulations and associated guidance for details.

        - **Thematic guidance:** specific documents on defined subjects that elaborate on and support the core guidance.

        - **Good practice:** supporting guidance, benchmarks, and competence standards published by recognised professional bodies, non-governmental organisations, and sector authorities. These serve as informative reference materials for driving continual improvement.

Standard 1 LRF governance and support arrangements

Desired Outcome

The LRF operates through effective leadership, clear strategic direction, and agreed, proportionate, and sustainable resourcing from partner organisations. Supported by an effective and efficient LRF Secretariat, partner organisations collaborate through clear decision-making, shared funding, and comprehensive information management to deliver a coherent and flexible work programme. While statutory duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 remain strictly with partner organisations, the LRF operates through strong relationships, collective commitment, and a culture of learning and continual improvement to strengthen local civil contingencies and resilience.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

Leadership and governance

A. Form and maintain an LRF Executive Group (or similar strategic leadership forum) to provide overall strategic direction and build partnership consensus. The Executive Group should meet at a minimum twice a year, with more frequent meetings encouraged.

B. Implement a clearly defined process for the appointment, selection and tenure of the LRF Chair, Co-chairs and Deputies, Manager, and where appropriate, the Chief Resilience Officer.

C. Establish a clear and commonly understood multi-agency arrangement for collective decision-making, recording actions, resolving conflicts and escalating issues constructively.

D. Establish a formal expectation that representatives attending LRF meetings possess sufficient authority, delegated authority and/or clear internal escalation routes to make decisions, influence priorities, and allocate resources on behalf of their organisations.

E. Establish a formal, documented process for onboarding and inducting new LRF Executive Group members, and wider relevant personnel, to ensure they understand the LRF's governance structures, local risk profile and current work programme.

LRF co-ordination and resourcing

F. Establish and appropriately resource a dedicated LRF Secretariat to provide co-ordination, programme management, and organisational support to enable the successful delivery of the LRF's strategy and work programme.

G. Maintain an agreed approach to funding and resourcing the LRF's Secretariat, strategy and work programme. The approach should seek appropriate contributions from partners - which include financial contributions, in-kind support, hosted functions or shared posts - and should aim to avoid unsustainable reliance on a small number of partner organisations.

H. Keep LRF finances and resourcing under regular review, with risks to financial sustainability, capacity and delivery identified, recorded and escalated through LRF governance structures.

Work programme and engagement

I. Demonstrate a commitment to collaborative ways of working, underpinned by shared values and professional behaviours. This involves maintaining a professional, trust-based approach that encourages inclusive collaboration, supports the collective ownership of priorities, and enables continual improvement.

J. Maintain a multi-year partnership strategy supported by a coherent, flexible work programme agreed by the appropriate LRF group (Executive or non-Executive). The work programme should set out specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound objectives, with clear ownership and review arrangements that can be adapted to meet changing local priorities.

K. Maintain effective LRF governance structures (for example, groups, sub-groups and workstream leads) to oversee the delivery of the work programme and drive continual improvement. These structures should include clear arrangements for managing risk ownership, tracking actions to closure, and escalating delivery issues through LRF governance arrangements.

L. Maintain a reliable process to ensure that all partner organisations and wider partners are consistently notified of and invited to appropriate LRF meetings. Meetings should be focused, purposeful, and subject to regular, proportionate review to ensure their ongoing value.

M. Maintain inclusive, flexible and effective engagement with necessary and appropriate wider partners and stakeholders.

Information management

N. Maintain a robust information management and governance system that enables the work of the LRF and the secure, lawful, and timely sharing of sensitive information across LRF partners. Information sharing should be underpinned by a pragmatic, risk-based approach to determining required security clearances and handling procedures.

O. Deliver an agreed multi-agency process to identify and share appropriate and proportionate data and information across relevant partner organisations, particularly about individuals and groups with additional support requirements, during an emergency. Arrangements

should also include an agreed approach to data protection and an awareness of lawful data-sharing practices.

P. Use appropriate and collaborative digital communication platforms and applications to communicate and share information securely to maximise partner engagement, support remote, hybrid and virtual working, mitigating the operational impacts of distributed organisations and constrained resources.

Q. Use ResilienceDirect as the primary digital tool to share information. If ResilienceDirect is not to be used, the decision should be formally agreed by the majority of partner organisations through LRF governance structures and be evidenced as fit for purpose.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

R. Engage and work with neighbouring LRF areas. This could include adopting common systems, terminology, and information-sharing platforms to support multi-agency arrangements across LRF boundaries.

S. Engage with UK government, devolved governments, and/or national representative forums to help shape national policy and resilience initiatives. This could include proactively sharing lessons identified and notable practice to drive system-wide improvement.

T. Extend its reach and influence beyond usual LRF activities to engage with related networks and agendas (for example, public safety, security, climate adaptation, sustainability, social cohesion, and broader national or international resilience initiatives).

U. Establish and promote succession planning arrangements across LRF Executive and Secretariat roles to support operational continuity, preserve institutional knowledge, and strengthen LRF resilience.

V. Establish arrangements to enable local democratic scrutiny and oversight of the LRF (for example, through the host of the Secretariat or Chief Resilience Officer).

W. Establish, maintain, and regularly review a formal, overarching LRF data sharing agreement.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 2, Section 4: Co-operation and Local Resilience Forums - England and Wales
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 2: Co-operation, Cabinet Office

Thematic Guidance:

- Expectations and indicators of Good Practice Set of Category 1 and Category 2 responders (2013), Cabinet Office

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 37000 - Governance of Organisations

Standard 2 Risk Assessment

Desired Outcome

The LRF maintains a thorough, dynamic, and collectively understood assessment of risks to the local area, informed by the National Security Risk Assessment and local likelihood and impact. The assessment of risk includes the consideration of common consequences, to identify collective vulnerabilities, interdependencies, and capability gaps. This shared understanding directly informs the prioritisation, resourcing, and work programme of the LRF, guiding the development of proportionate multi-agency emergency plans, business continuity arrangements, training and exercising, and recovery arrangements. The outcomes of the risk assessment also inform the public-facing Community Risk Register and the wider approach to public communications.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Establish a multi-agency mechanism (for example, a Risk Assessment Working Group) to collectively develop, review, and agree local risk assessment processes. This mechanism should facilitate a shared understanding of local risks, impacts, and consequences across partner organisations. It should serve as a collaborative mechanism to identify and constructively discuss differences in how partner organisations perceive, accept, and tolerate risk.

B. Maintain a process to identify, analyse and evaluate hazards and threats relevant to the local area, using the National Security Risk Assessment alongside wider local evidence, to identify any risks that pose a significant challenge locally but are not captured in the National Security Risk Assessment.

C. Produce an assessment of the most significant risks to the local area, based on a Reasonable Worse-Case Scenario. Partner organisations should collectively determine the local likelihood and impact of these scenarios, applying standardised and agreed scoring scales (for example, 0 to 5, ‘very low’ to ‘very high’).

D. Evaluate and document the level of uncertainty, information gaps, and any assumptions that may affect the risk assessment process, using confidence ratings.

E. Consider, within the risk assessment process, how risks might disproportionately impact particular groups of people and what additional support they might require.

F. Compare assessed risks and identify their common consequences to establish local

planning assumptions.

G. Facilitate multi-agency capability mapping against local planning assumptions to identify, assess, and prioritise capability gaps.

H. Use the outcomes of the risk assessment process to inform decision-making, prioritisation, resourcing, and the LRF's strategy and work programme.

I. Use the outcomes of the risk assessment process to inform, publish, and update the public-facing Community Risk Register and the wider approach to public communications.

J. Maintain dynamic risk assessment processes where assessments are regularly reviewed, and where necessary updated, in response to updates to the National Security Risk Assessment, relevant government guidance, emerging risks, lessons identified from exercises or emergencies, and changing local circumstances and/or capabilities.

K. Take into account the sensitivity of risk information and set up appropriate security protocols, drawing on the example set by the National Security Risk Assessment. Risk Assessment Leads (or equivalents) should raise any questions on security classification and how sensitive information should be handled, with the Cabinet Office.

L. Engage with neighbouring LRF areas and/or those with similar risk profiles to collectively improve understanding, assessment and mitigation of risk.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

M. Develop risk assessments that explore realistic alternative scenarios and variations to the Reasonable Worst-Case Scenario.

N. Integrate assessments of complex, cascading and concurrent risks. This analysis could explicitly evaluate interdependencies and vulnerabilities affecting essential services and Critical National Infrastructure, factoring in prioritised function restoration.

O. Evaluate the implications of chronic risks within the local area using the national Chronic Risk Analysis, considering the interactions between acute and chronic risks.

P. Use independent peers to provide objective challenge and fresh perspectives within the risk assessment process.

Q. Work with neighbouring LRF areas and/or those with similar risk profiles to develop joint risk assessments and capability assessments.

R. Engage with the Cabinet Office and the wider risk assessment community of practice to

collectively improve the understanding and assessment of risk.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 3: Duty to assess risk of emergency occurring
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 4: Local Responder Risk Assessment Duty, Cabinet Office
- Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (2024), JESIP

Thematic Guidance:

- National Risk Register, Cabinet Office (updated regularly and found on gov.uk)
- A Guide to the 2026 National Risk Register (2026), Cabinet Office
- Chronic Risk Analysis (2025), Cabinet Office and Government Office for Science
- Identifying and supporting persons who are vulnerable in an emergency (2025), Cabinet Office
- Data Protection and Sharing - Guidance for Emergency Planners and Responders (2007), Cabinet Office
- National Security Risk Assessment (available to all resilience practitioners)
- Local Risk Management Guidance (LRMG) (available to resilience practitioners)
- National Resilience Planning Assumptions (available to resilience practitioners)

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management - Guidelines

Standard 3 Communicating with the public

Desired Outcome

The LRF promotes whole of society resilience by co-ordinating an inclusive, timely and flexible approach to communicating with the public before, during and after emergencies. Co-ordinated public communications and education initiatives are proportional to the phase of an emergency, delivering accessible, plain-language advice tailored to diverse local communities. By supporting people and communities to understand why they need to take action and what practical actions they can take, the LRF empowers the public to strengthen their own resilience. This collective effort ensures that multi-agency messaging remains consistent, aligns with and amplifies national, regional and/or single-agency campaigns, and is directly informed by community insights.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

Risk information, public preparedness and response communications

A. Develop and publish, through multi-agency collaboration, a public-facing version of the Community Risk Register. The Community Risk Register should:

   i. Provide a clear, plain-language overview of local risks, potential consequences and protective measures;

   ii. Be readily accessible, regularly reviewed, and aligned to the National Risk Register and other authoritative sources; and

   iii. Include the consideration of local and/or regional community demographics, the impact of risks on people with pre-existing vulnerabilities, and those who may become vulnerable in certain emergencies.

B. Co-ordinate and facilitate clear, proactive multi-agency public preparedness and resilience communications that explain practical, actionable steps people and communities can take to mitigate local risks, improve overall preparedness, and safely help themselves during emergencies.

C. Take into account the sensitivity of risk information and set up appropriate security protocols, drawing on the example set by the National Risk Register and other national risk and resilience communication, information and advice.

D. Signpost, align with, and amplify existing national, regional and/or single-agency risk, preparedness and resilience campaigns, adapting these resources, where appropriate, to suit local risk profiles, demographics and circumstances.

E. Collectively support the design, co-ordination, testing and regular review of local multi-agency warning and informing procedures, ensuring the integration of UK government's Emergency Alerts capability in local response plans, alongside alternative communication channels.

F. Establish clear, pre-planned multi-agency arrangements for communicating with affected communities and stakeholders, across a range of media platforms, during response and recovery. These arrangements should deliver clear, actionable advice, signpost available support, include protocols to transition public communications from response to recovery, and be documented in emergency plans.

Communication channels and delivery

G. Establish multi-agency co-ordination arrangements that use the communication channels, reach, and authority of partner organisations to maximise message impact, ensuring public messaging is consistent, co-ordinated, and aligned across all partners.

H. Co-ordinate the provision of communications in appropriate, accessible, and diverse formats that meet community needs, with specific consideration of those who may be typically excluded from traditional communication approaches.

I. Support partner organisations to identify and work with trusted voices, local networks, community leaders, and local organisations to amplify risk, preparedness and resilience communications.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

J. Maintain a Community Risk Register that considers local and regional community demographics as well as the impact of risks on individuals with pre-existing vulnerabilities who may require additional support in an emergency. The Community Risk Register could include relevant and useful material for all parts of society to develop their own resilience, including individuals, communities and local businesses.

K. Co-ordinate public communication with neighbouring LRF areas and regional partners to align messages, ensuring the provision of consistent and relevant risk, preparedness and resilience communication with the public across wider geographical footprints.

L. Involve people and communities who may require additional support before, during or after an emergency in the development of risk, preparedness and resilience communications, ensuring that information is developed with communities rather than simply adapted for them.

M. Support partner organisations to identify and work with trusted local networks, community leaders, and organisations to gather feedback and community insights that directly shape and improve the effectiveness of communications.

N. Promote community resilience by highlighting practical ways for individuals to connect with their local community and acquire resilience capabilities. This could include signposting opportunities to join community resilience groups, participate in local preparedness activities, engage in local volunteering schemes, and undertake emergency first aid courses or other relevant training.

O. Co-ordinate opportunities for members of the public to co-develop and/or provide feedback on communications to ensure they are responsive, inclusive, and reflect the needs and concerns of the communities. This public engagement could use methods like public meetings, focus groups, surveys, citizen assemblies and panels.

P. Co-ordinate and support partner organisations' engagement with schools, colleges, and youth organisations to provide age-appropriate risk, preparedness and resilience information for children and young people, alongside tailored advice for parents, carers, and education settings.

Q. Co-ordinate and work with partner organisation communication teams, and wider partners and stakeholders (for example, local or regional media), to collectively develop and test communications before, during and after an emergency.

R. Participate in national training offers for the UK government's Emergency Alerts capability to develop understanding, share activation lessons identified and improve overall confidence in the system.

S. Support efforts to improve public awareness and understanding of false and manipulated information, helping people and communities to engage critically with the reliability of information they encounter before, during and after emergencies.

T. Establish multi-agency arrangements to monitor, assess, and co-ordinate joint responses to misinformation and disinformation that threaten public safety, responder operations, or public confidence during an emergency.

U. Define success metrics, milestones, and timelines prior to communications delivery, then collect data to evaluate impact, measure audience reach, and drive continual improvement in public communications.

V. Engage with the wider public communications community of practice by exchanging communications resources, tools, and lessons.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 5: Publication of plans and assessments
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 6: Arrangements for warning and provision of information and advice to the public
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 7: Communicating with the Public, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Cabinet Office
- Be Ready campaign, UK government

Thematic Guidance:

- Identifying and supporting persons who are vulnerable in an emergency (2025), Cabinet Office
- A behavioural approach to crisis communications (2026), Government Communications, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Planning checklist (2021), Government Communications, Cabinet Office
- STOP: crisis communications planning guide (2024), Government Communications, Cabinet Office
- RESIST 3: building resilience to information threats (2025), Government Communications, Cabinet Office

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines

Standard 4 Emergency planning

Desired Outcome

The LRF maintains a coherent and proportionate set of multi-agency emergency plans, frameworks, and procedures to reduce, control, or mitigate the effects of emergencies during response and recovery phases. Based on a shared, collective assessment of local risks, these arrangements are tailored to the local circumstances and available resources, while also providing the necessary scalability and flexibility to co-ordinate effective multi-agency operations during complex, cascading and concurrent emergencies. These multi-agency planning arrangements are designed to complement and co-ordinate the interaction of relevant single-agency arrangements.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

Risk-based and generic planning

A. Develop multi-agency plans, frameworks and/or procedures that address the risks as prioritised within the Community Risk Register and the National Security Risk Assessment. These arrangements should address the common consequences, local planning assumptions and capability gaps identified in the risk assessment process.

B. Define a clear, documented rationale for the balance between generic planning and specific planning for defined risks and functions.

C. Maintain a coherent set of concise, accessible and operationally usable multi-agency emergency plans, frameworks and/or procedures that complement and co-ordinate the interaction of relevant single-agency plans. These arrangements should be based on a shared and common understanding of local risks, common consequences, local planning assumptions and relevant legislation and regulations.

Governance and plan maintenance

D. Establish a multi-agency mechanism to collectively develop, review, and agree local multi-agency plans. This mechanism should define clear responsibilities, approval routes, maintenance schedules, and review triggers, while ensuring plans are regularly tested and evaluated.

E. Use a multi-agency mechanism to address variations in capabilities and expected response arrangements that could impact multi-agency preparedness, response or recovery. These insights should then be used to inform multi-agency planning.

Plan components

F. Maintain scalable multi-agency plans that evaluate resource and capacity demands across a range of local planning assumptions, identifying the capabilities and resources of partner organisations and wider partners.

G. Ensure multi-agency plans include an agreed process for seeking external support (for example, mutual aid, Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, spontaneous volunteers, Military Aid to Civil Authorities, and national capabilities).

H. Explicitly identify where regional, national, and specialist capabilities are likely to be required in multi-agency plans, recognising and documenting associated planning assumptions, dependencies, and limitations.

I. Develop multi-agency plans that enable partner organisations to anticipate rising tide emergencies, outlining triggers for pre-emptive, precautionary, and preparedness actions.

J. Ensure multi-agency plans and related arrangements are flexible for complex, cascading, and concurrent emergencies, which may require sustained response and recovery operations over an extended period.

Integration and interoperability

K. Reflect and promote the Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles and principles of effective Emergency Response and Recovery, ensuring compatible terminology is embedded across plans and supporting materials.

L. Ensure multi-agency plans, where appropriate, take account of relevant national emergency plans, frameworks and procedures shared with the LRF.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

M. Maintain and use a clear, commonly understood definition and typology that distinguishes between emergency plans, frameworks, protocols, standard operating procedures and guidance notes to ensure the LRF produces the most appropriate and proportionate planning product for a given risk.

N. Format emergency plans to maximise usability by incorporating clear signposting, digital accessibility, and structured tools like action cards, diagrammatic instructions, detachable annexes, and directories.

O. Incorporate planning assumptions that address the interactions between acute and chronic risks.

P. Identify where local areas, communities, or neighbourhoods have developed their own community emergency plans, and establish clear pathways to link and co-ordinate these plans with multi-agency plans.

Q. Ensure multi-agency plans, frameworks and protocols identify those who might be disproportionately impacted by an emergency, and what additional support they may require. Plans and response arrangements should outline and be adaptable to the evolving needs during emergencies, including the use of appropriate impact assessments to support affected people and communities.

R. Work with neighbouring LRF areas, where risks or local planning assumptions indicate, to share, develop, and test joint emergency plans and protocols to support cross-border interoperability and co-ordinated response and recovery arrangements.

S. Share multi-agency plans, frameworks, and protocols with wider partners where appropriate and proportionate.

T. Develop and review multi-agency plans directly with wider partners and stakeholders, ensuring that response and recovery plans are designed with affected communities rather than simply adapted for them.

U. Use independent evaluators from neighbouring LRF areas to assess emergency plans, frameworks and protocols.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 4: Duty to maintain plans
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 5: Emergency Planning, Cabinet Office
- Amber Book - Managing Crisis in Central Government (2025), Cabinet Office
- Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (2024), JESIP

Thematic Guidance:

- Expectations and indicators of Good Practice Set of Category 1 and Category 2 responders (2013), Cabinet Office

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 21110:2019 Information and documentation - Emergency preparedness and response

Standard 5 Business continuity

Desired Outcome

The LRF facilitates multi-agency collaboration, peer learning, and shared risk-mitigation to improve the collective understanding of shared vulnerabilities, critical interdependencies and prioritised functions. While statutory duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 remain strictly with partner organisations, the LRF provides an effective mechanism to build mutual awareness, support compatibility between partner organisations' business continuity arrangements, and share notable practice.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Establish a multi-agency mechanism (for example, Business Continuity Working Group) comprising important business continuity personnel from partner organisations, wider partners and other relevant stakeholders. This mechanism should facilitate discussion, mutual support, and peer learning to improve the compatibility and co-ordination of business continuity approaches across the LRF.

B. Develop a strategic approach that establishes business continuity management as an enabler in the design and delivery of resilient multi-agency preparedness, response and recovery arrangements.

C. Develop a shared understanding of how local risks identified within the Community Risk Register, local planning assumptions, and lessons identified from emergencies and exercises may impact partner organisations' business continuity and multi-agency co-ordination functions.

D. Support the identification and discussion of interdependencies, vulnerabilities, and business continuity assumptions (for example, loss of personnel, systems, communications, facilities and/or essential services) to promote collective mitigation arrangements.

E. Facilitate and promote a shared understanding of prioritised functions across partner organisations, highlighting where service disruptions would cause serious damage to human welfare, the environment, and/or security. This includes evaluating partner organisation risk tolerances, recovery priorities, and minimum acceptable service levels during disruption to identify where differences could impact multi-agency decision-making, resource allocation, and/or co-ordination.

F. Facilitate structured, proportionate, and secure information sharing between partner organisations regarding their interdependencies, vulnerabilities, and business continuity

assumptions that may become relevant during complex, cascading and concurrent emergencies.

G. Establish agreed arrangements and triggers for partner organisations to rapidly share information when experiencing a significant single-agency business continuity disruption that has the potential to cause cascading impacts, disrupt partner operations, or affect the wider community.

H. Encourage partner organisations to review their internal workforce resilience, including identifying succession plans for important roles, managing single-person dependencies, and ensuring sufficient backup capacity to maintain sustained participation in LRF activities.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

I. Encourage partner organisations to ensure business continuity personnel are trained and competent to the required level (for example, aligned to National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies).

J. Encourage partner organisations and wider partners to ensure business continuity plans and arrangements are in place, kept current, support responder organisation duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, and aligned to appropriate standards and approaches.

K. Incorporate the resilience of supply chains, third-party contractors, and essential service providers directly into local planning assumptions, supporting partner organisations to identify and mitigate shared vulnerabilities in outsourced services that are critical to multi-agency response and recovery.

L. Encourage partner organisations to establish and review their digital and cyber resilience arrangements, including robust cyber incident response plans, data backups and security protocols, in order to mitigate cyber threats, maintain operational continuity and safeguard shared multi-agency information platforms during a major digital or cyber disruption.

M. Share notable practice and co-ordinate peer-learning sessions to support partner organisations in integrating business continuity with related networks and agendas (for example, security, cyber resilience, and organisational resilience), aligning to appropriate standards and approaches.

N. Work with wider partners and stakeholders to develop, enhance and promote effective business continuity.

O. Support local authorities in co-ordinating and/or amplifying business continuity messaging to local businesses and Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations through wider LRF channels, ensuring consistency and avoiding duplication of effort.

P. Signpost, align with, and amplify existing national, regional and/or single-agency business continuity campaigns, adapting these resources, where appropriate, to suit local risk profiles, demographics and circumstances.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 4: Duty to maintain plans
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 7: Advice and assistance to business and voluntary organisations
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 6: Business Continuity Management, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 8: Business continuity advice and assistance to business and the voluntary sector, Cabinet Office

Thematic Guidance:

Good Practice Guidance:

- Promote business continuity management (2005), National Occupational Standards, Workforce Development Trust
- The BCI Good Practice Guidelines, The Business Continuity Institute

Standard 6 Whole of society resilience

Desired Outcome

The LRF's approach to strengthen and improve the resilience of local areas considers the whole of society, through the integration of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, community groups and business networks throughout the resilience cycle. LRFs and partner organisations work with each other to support people and communities to become more prepared for emergencies at the local and community level.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Maintain a multi-agency community resilience strategy, which is co-ordinated and developed collaboratively by relevant partners, and agreed at the LRF Executive Group. The strategy should aim to improve local civil contingencies throughout the resilience cycle, through:

   i. Strengthening partnership working with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector and business networks, by identifying shared priorities and opportunities for partnership working;

   ii. Outlining flexible arrangements which are proportionate and tailored to local risk profiles, demographics, geographies, existing networks, and operational circumstances;

   iii. Encouraging local Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations to take an active role in developing and promoting resilience;

   iv. Facilitating and supporting community-led resilience activities; and

   v. Developing a communications and engagement plan to promote community resilience.

B. Establish a multi-agency mechanism (for example, Community Resilience Working Group) either for the LRF or across neighbouring LRFs, which includes representation from the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector.

C. Integrate the expertise and capabilities of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations within LRF arrangements, which should involve:

   i. An approach to enable frequent two-way communication between the LRF and Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations to strengthen community resilience activities; for example, a dedicated forum to ensure Voluntary, Community

and Faith Sector engagement reflects the needs of local people and communities, particularly those who may be harder to reach in an emergency;

ii. A process for regularly identifying and mapping the roles and capabilities of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations to strengthen local arrangements for response and recovery;

iii. A consideration of community demographics in risk assessment processes;

iv. An understanding of the role of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations within emergency plans, as well as volunteers within partner organisations; and

v. Structured engagement with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, including a clear definition of roles, responsibilities and activation processes that are agreed and communicated prior to an emergency. Arrangements should, where appropriate, ensure Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations can be integrated into multi-agency command, control and co-ordination structures.

D. Have an agreed multi-agency approach to identify and share appropriate and proportionate data and information across relevant partners, for example trusted Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, before, during and after emergencies.

E. Have easily accessible and regularly updated information for the public on LRF and partner organisation community resilience services, resources, and points of contact (for example, details available on a LRF website).

F. Involve and support Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations in relevant LRF training and exercising.

G. Support partner organisations to develop locally agreed arrangements to manage spontaneous support to affected people and responding organisations, including financial and physical donations, unaffiliated spontaneous volunteers, and in-kind resource or expertise.

H. Encourage an awareness of capabilities that exist across businesses and/or business networks that could become available to support emergency response and recovery.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

I. Have a Community Resilience Lead, who works within or across the LRF, to co-ordinate and facilitate local and/or regional community resilience activity.

J. Identify opportunities to improve partnerships with other organisations working in, or championing, community, business, and organisational resilience, including representatives

from the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector, who would not necessarily identify local civil contingencies or resilience as part of their core activity.

K. Create opportunities for shared learning, collaboration and information exchange for people and organisations across the whole of society.

L. Support the development of community emergency groups or resilience networks that act as focal points for local preparedness, information sharing and mutual aid, and the integration of community resilience within broader place-based agendas.

M. Enable and promote community networks and volunteering as a mechanism to support wider community capacity, social cohesion and long-term resilience of the local area.

N. Gather community insight and intelligence to shape risk assessment and prioritisation, through a process for ongoing consultation and collaboration with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector.

O. Have a mechanism to identify and, where necessary, engage with spontaneous community support and mutual aid groups during emergency response, including identifying and working with community groups that may not be typically involved in resilience activities.

P. Encourage and support partner organisations to develop and maintain appropriate, up-to-date, partnership arrangements with relevant Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, for example bilateral agreements for specific capabilities, a Memorandum of Understanding, or Service Level Agreements.

Q. Have an understanding of businesses and organisations that the community depend on, the risks that impact them, and the societal implications of business closure and/or failure on local communities.

R. Encourage and enable partner organisations to work with children and young people, through schools, colleges, and youth organisations, to integrate risk, preparedness and resilience information into education or extracurricular activities.

S. Proactively share community resilience approaches, programmes, lessons and notable practice with neighbouring LRFs and use existing trusted national networks.

T. Facilitate and enable Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations to deliver aspects of the LRF's community resilience activity. This could include facilitating access to relevant resources, assets, and training to support Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector participation in multi-agency preparedness, response and recovery activities.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004, Section 2: Duty to assess, plan and advise
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Regulation 23
- Equality Act 2010, Chapter 1: The Public Sector Equality Duty
- Emergency Preparedness (2011), Chapter 14: The Role of the Voluntary Sector, Cabinet Office

Thematic Guidance:

- Identifying and supporting persons who are vulnerable in an emergency (2025), Cabinet Office
- Community Resilience Development Framework (2019), Cabinet Office
- Be Ready campaign, UK government
- Planning the coordination of spontaneous volunteers (2019), Cabinet Office
- Community Resilience: Resources and Tools (2011), Cabinet Office

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 22319:2017 Guidelines for planning the involvement of spontaneous volunteers
- ISO 22354:2026 Guidelines to develop local resilience capability
- Community Emergency Hubs as a local resilience capability (2026), National Consortium for Societal Resilience [UK+], The University of Manchester
- Spontaneous volunteers as a local resilience capability (2026), National Consortium for Societal Resilience [UK+], The University of Manchester
- Essential sectors for vulnerable people (2026), National Consortium for Societal Resilience [UK+], The University of Manchester
- Civil society as a local resilience capability (2026), National Consortium for Societal Resilience [UK+], The University of Manchester

Standard 7 Training

Desired Outcome

The personnel within LRF partner organisations are competent to fulfil their respective roles in multi-agency civil contingencies through a structured, single- and multi-agency training programme. This programme co-ordinates with local, regional, and national arrangements, and involves necessary and appropriate wider partners. This training programme balances essential learning and training with opportunities for familiarisation, confidence-building, and relationship building. The LRF embeds training as part of continual improvement to develop collective competencies, enhance interoperability and strengthen multi-agency capability.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Establish an appropriate multi-agency mechanism (for example, sub-group) to co-ordinate and facilitate training, learning, and development activities, integrated within a culture of learning and continual improvement.

B. Co-ordinate a multi-agency Training Needs Analysis, updated on an agreed cycle, focused on roles, capabilities, and functions requiring multi-agency interoperability. The Training Needs Analysis should reflect the local risk profile and multi-agency capability requirements, respect the differing statutory duties of partner organisations, and align with relevant National Occupational Standards.

C. Use the Training Needs Analysis to inform, prioritise and develop a collective training programme with a clear aim and learning objectives. The plan should also outline agreed role profiles and minimum competencies (aligned with relevant National Occupational Standards), proportionate learning pathways, and recommended refresher cycles for important multi-agency roles, while explicitly recognising that partner organisations remain responsible for monitoring, recording and assuring the competency of their personnel.

D. Ensure multi-agency training content reflects relevant legislation, guidance, doctrine and local considerations, as well as lessons identified from training, exercises and emergencies to close the learning loop.

E. Use suitably qualified and experienced people to design training and support delivery. The selection of trainers should consider both formal qualifications and demonstrable operational experience, having due regard to relevant professional standards, for example relevant National Occupational Standards and competency frameworks.

F. Co-ordinate and arrange suitable multi-agency training sessions for partner organisations by utilising local, regional, and national resources, shared commissioning, and blended

delivery models to ensure maximum cost-effectiveness. Partner organisations remain strictly responsible for staff induction, attendance, and recording individual competence and compliance.

G. Establish arrangements to ensure multi-agency training actively promotes partnership working and embeds Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles doctrine, terminology, and principles. Multi-agency training should develop an understanding of partner organisations' roles, responsibilities, capabilities, constraints, decision-making processes, and operational priorities, enabling participants to build a shared understanding of how organisations work together during preparedness, response and recovery.

H. Maintain arrangements to invite and facilitate the involvement of necessary and appropriate wider partners, for example Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, in suitable training, learning, and development activities.

I. Recognise and promote training as valuable opportunities for relationship building, informal networking, and shared peer-to-peer learning.

J. Promote a safe learning-focused environment across training, learning, and development activities to support honest reflection, constructive challenge, and no-fault collective learning.

K. Maintain proportionate arrangements to evaluate the quality, currency, relevance and effectiveness of multi-agency training, covering both its content and delivery. Evaluation should include participant feedback and structured review arrangements to support continual improvement.

L. Support flexible, accessible learning pathways that give partner organisations additional opportunities to develop essential multi-agency competencies, including Strategic and Tactical Co-ordinating Group leadership.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

M. Identify a dedicated Training Lead to develop, manage, and facilitate multi-agency training, learning, and development activities.

N. Establish arrangements for collaborating with neighbouring LRF areas, regional partners, and national bodies to co-ordinate and deliver training where this improves consistency, affordability, access, and cross-boundary resilience arrangements.

O. Encourage and, where appropriate, facilitate shadowing and mentoring opportunities for personnel across the LRF to support professional development.

P. Establish learning pathways for personnel who may be called upon at short notice to support co-ordination, response and recovery roles.

Q. Co-ordinate multi-agency training explicitly designed for support personnel and wider partners who may be less routinely engaged, to strengthen collective surge capacity and operational continuity during complex, cascading and concurrent emergencies.

R. Actively share locally developed multi-agency training packages, Training Needs Analysis materials, and notable practices with other local, regional, or national partners to reduce administrative duplication and support the wider training community of practice.

S. Establish clear, outcome-based criteria to evaluate the long-term impact of multi-agency training, assessing whether learning has successfully translated into collective competencies, enhanced interoperability and strengthened multi-agency capability.

T. Use independent observers and evaluators from neighbouring LRF areas or wider partners to assess training.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, Regulation 25
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, Regulation 31
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 5: Emergency Planning, Cabinet Office
- National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies, The Workforce Development Trust

Thematic Guidance:

- Training Products, JESIP

Good Practice Guidance:

- Guide to National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies (2025), The Workforce Development Trust
- National Occupational Standards Resources, The Workforce Development Trust
- Case study: Embedding the Resilience and Emergencies National Occupational Standards in practice, Worcestershire County Council, Skills for Justice
- Case study: Embedding the Resilience and Emergencies National Occupational Standards

in practice, Newcastle City County Council, The Workforce Development Trust

- Case study: Embedding the Resilience and Emergencies National Occupational Standards in practice - The Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital, NHS Trust (2026), Skills for Health

Standard 8 Exercising

Desired Outcome

The LRF develops, trains, and assures multi-agency capabilities through a structured, risk-based exercising programme. This exercising programme tests and evaluates collective arrangements, capabilities, and training, and validates multi-agency plans. Co-ordinated with local, regional, and national arrangements and involving necessary and appropriate wider partners, this exercising programme balances essential learning and training with opportunities for familiarisation, confidence-building, and relationship building. The LRF embeds exercising as part of continual improvement to evaluate outcomes, enhance interoperability, and strengthen multi-agency capability.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Establish an appropriate multi-agency mechanism (for example, sub-group) to agree, co-ordinate and communicate a regular schedule of exercising activities, integrated within a culture of learning and continual improvement.

B. Bring together individuals with relevant expertise and experience to plan, develop, deliver, debrief and evaluate multi-agency exercises.

C. Establish arrangements to ensure multi-agency exercises have an agreed aim, defined scope, clear objectives, and use the most appropriate form of exercising to meet those pre-defined requirements.

D. Develop realistic and challenging exercise scenarios that reflect the National Security Risk Assessment, Community Risk Register, and local planning assumptions.

E. Promote a safe learning-focused environment across exercising activities to support honest reflection, constructive challenge, and no-fault collective learning.

F. Maintain arrangements to invite and facilitate the involvement of necessary and appropriate Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations and wider partners in exercising activities.

G. Engage with neighbouring LRF areas and/or those with similar risk profiles to collectively improve exercising.

H. Use the exercise programme to co-ordinate opportunities to test and evaluate multi-agency capabilities and interoperability. Where appropriate, this should assess how partners communicate, share information, build shared situational awareness, make joint decisions

and apply agreed multi-agency doctrine.

I. Test and evaluate multi-agency arrangements for sustained operations against Reasonable Worst-Case Scenarios, including shift handovers, resourcing parallel meetings, the transition from response to recovery, and recovery-specific capabilities.

J. Periodically test and evaluate the interfaces between single-agency command structures and multi-agency co-ordination arrangements, including virtual and hybrid environments.

K. Establish an agreed process for debriefing and evaluating exercise outcomes, which includes producing a Post-Exercise Report to document the exercise, evaluate pre-defined objectives, and detail observations and lessons identified (which may have a restricted audience).

L. Periodically conduct a multi-agency and/or multi-command, control and co-ordination level exercise, unless an emergency has necessitated a comparable level of response and has been formally evaluated and debriefed.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

M. Maintain a centralised process to co-ordinate upcoming exercise activities across all partner organisations (for example, shared calendar) to ensure multi-agency exercising opportunities are visible, reduce duplication, and enable partner organisations to plan their involvement.

N. Support partner organisation personnel to develop specialised exercising skills, including exercise design, delivery, facilitation, debriefing, and evaluation, through ongoing professional development and training opportunities.

O. Use a diverse and innovative range of exercise formats (for example, tabletop exercises, discussion exercises, live play exercises, and red teaming).

P. Actively incorporate risks that are bespoke to the individual LRF area (for example, due to geographic conditions or unique essential service circumstances), and complex, cascading, or concurrent risks into exercise scenarios.

Q. Incorporate business continuity scenarios (for example, the concurrent loss of personnel, systems, communications, facilities, and/or essential services) into multi-agency exercises where there is a shared vulnerability or significant disruption risk that could impact the wider community.

R. Work with neighbouring LRF areas, where risks or local planning assumptions indicate, to test plans and cross-border interoperability and co-ordinated response and recovery arrangements (for example, mutual aid).

S. Participate in regional or national exercises, using them as opportunities to test and evaluate cross-boundary interoperability and co-ordinated response and recovery arrangements (for example, mutual aid, national capabilities).

T. Engage with the wider exercising community of practice by exchanging exercise resources, tools, scenarios, and lessons.

U. Use independent observers and evaluators from neighbouring LRF areas or wider partners to assess exercise outcomes.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 5: Emergency Planning, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Cabinet Office
- Amber Book - Managing Crisis in Central Government (2025), Cabinet Office
- Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (2024), JESIP

Thematic Guidance:

- National Risk Register, Cabinet Office (updated regularly and found on gov.uk)
- National Security Risk Assessment (available to all resilience practitioners)
- Exercising Best Practice Guidance (2024), UK Resilience Academy

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 22398:2013 Societal Security - Guidelines for Exercises
- UK Resilience Lessons Digest, specifically Issue 4: Learning to Adapt (2024) and Issue 5: Learning to Manage Lessons (2024), UK Resilience Academy
- Multi-Agency Debrief Template, JESIP
- Umpire Evaluation Template, JESIP

Standard 9 Multi-agency response

Desired Outcome

The LRF has agreed multi-agency response arrangements to support and sustain the effective co-ordination across the strategic and tactical levels. Scalable and proportional to the nature, scale, and complexity of the emergency, these arrangements are activated promptly to support a joint understanding of risk, decision-making, and co-ordinated response activity. By embedding Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles, these arrangements deliver a consistent Common Operating Picture and facilitate communication and interoperability with wider local, regional, and national partners.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

Infrastructure

A. Collectively maintain access to Strategic and Tactical Co-ordination Centres equipped with resilient facilities, IT systems, and communication arrangements that support effective multi-agency co-ordination. These arrangements should feature scalable capacity and include the capability to integrate and support Government Liaison Officers and Government Liaison Teams.

B. Identify, document, and communicate suitable fallback capabilities with comparable functionality for Strategic and Tactical Co-ordination Centres. These arrangements should include the resilience to distribute strategic and tactical co-ordination functions across more than one physical location or secure virtual environment.

C. Collectively maintain tested IT, communications, and security procedures that support interoperability by enabling the timely, accurate, and consistent exchange of operational information between partner organisations. This includes maintaining the capability to operate at the SECRET classification level where required and proportionate to the local risk profile.

D. Establish, test and evaluate communications, procedural and technical links between multi-agency strategic and tactical facilities and other command, control and co-ordination levels that facilitate interoperability with wider local, regional, and national partners.

Governance and activation

E. Define in multi-agency plans the purpose and functions of strategic and tactical co-ordination, and detail the locations and modes through which they will operate (for example, physical, virtual, or hybrid).

F. Maintain an agreed multi-agency protocol for the notification, activation, escalation, handover, and stand-down of Strategic and Tactical Co-ordinating Groups. This protocol should detail clearly defined thresholds for partner organisations to request activation, notification procedures, lead-agency arrangements, and procedures for the concurrent operation of and handover to Recovery Co-ordinating Group.

G. Establish multi-agency arrangements and escalation triggers for rising-tide emergencies to enable early information sharing, joint risk monitoring, and precautionary strategic co-ordination before formal response structures are activated.

H. Agree expectations for partner organisation representation at Strategic and Tactical Co-ordinating Group meetings, requiring that participating partner organisations provide consistent attendance of representatives with sufficient authority, delegated authority, and/or clear internal escalation routes to make decisions, influence priorities, and allocate resources on behalf of their organisations.

I. Define clear arrangements for identifying and transferring Strategic and Tactical Co-ordinating Group chairing roles, lead agency responsibilities, and co-ordination structures during an emergency. These protocols should explicitly detail how leadership and co-ordination transition across different emergency types and establish a process for the timely transfer of co-ordination authority from the response phase to a Recovery Co-ordinating Group.

Multi-agency response arrangements

J. Embed Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles as the foundation of multi-agency response and co-ordination arrangements. This includes facilitating arrangements to:

    i. Encourage relevant partner organisation control rooms to align their procedures, operating practices, technologies with Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles and agreed multi-agency information-sharing arrangements;

    ii. Use M/ETHANE as the standard incident reporting framework when sharing initial or significant updated information about an existing or potential multi-agency emergency, particularly during initial notification, control-room-to-control-room communication and the early stages of a multi-agency response;

    iii. Maintain situational awareness through a Common Operating Picture which partner organisations can access; and

    iv. Embed the use of the Joint Decision Model as central to joint decision-making and to underpin the structure of multi-agency Strategic, Tactical and Operational Groups, including assessment, decisions and review.

K. Detail a process to collectively set and keep under review a multi-agency strategic framework that defines the strategic aim and objectives of the response. This strategic

direction should be directly interpreted and executed at the tactical level through the development of an aligned multi-agency tactical plan.

L. Establish procedures to activate specific multi-agency teams, cells and Specialist Advisory Groups. These arrangements should define clear, cross-partner handover protocols and support arrangements to enable sustained operation.

M. Maintain comprehensive, auditable arrangements to record and log multi-agency discussions, decisions and their rationales in an accessible manner and retained in line with local policies.

N. Define arrangements within Strategic and Tactical Co-ordinating Groups to collectively consider and co-ordinate requests for external support (for example, mutual aid, Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations, spontaneous volunteers, Military Aid to Civil Authorities, and UK government via Government Liaison Officer/Team).

O. Facilitate and promote a shared understanding and agreement between partner organisations regarding arrangements for sustaining proportionate multi-agency response structures during complex, cascading and concurrent emergencies (for example, on-call arrangements, shift patterns, surge staffing arrangements).

P. Understand and be able to engage with UK government in line with the expectations set out in the Amber Book - Managing Crises in Central Government.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

Q. Adopt and consistently use agreed multi-agency terminology, definitions, and map and graphic symbols across all joint arrangements, emergency plans, briefings, and situation reporting to support interoperability.

R. Assign and maintain Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles Lead roles, for example Strategic and Tactical Commanders, to suitably qualified and experienced people across relevant partner organisations to support interoperability.

S. Establish agreed arrangements for notifying neighbouring LRFs who may be impacted by an emergency, including clear escalation pathways to convene a Response Co-ordinating Group where cross-boundary coordination is required.

T. Define arrangements for sharing information and co-operating in response and recovery with other Strategic or Response Co-ordinating Groups, both neighbouring and non-neighbouring, who may be impacted by an emergency.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Cabinet Office
- Amber Book - Managing Crisis in Central Government (2025), Cabinet Office
- Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (2024), JESIP

Thematic Guidance:

- Multi-Agency Information Cell (MAIC) Guidance (2022), JESIP
- Provision of scientific and technical advice in the strategic co-ordination centre: guidance to local responders (2007), Cabinet Office

Good Practice Guidance:

- ISO 22320:2018 - Security and resilience - Emergency management - Guidelines for Incident Management

Standard 10 Human aspects

Desired Outcome

LRFs have adaptable, scalable, and co-ordinated multi-agency arrangements to address the welfare and psychosocial support needs of people impacted by emergencies, often referred to as human aspects. There is a people-centred and trauma-informed approach to considering the needs of people, partner organisation personnel, and communities across the resilience cycle. Arrangements are regularly reviewed, inclusive, and consider those who may become vulnerable during certain emergencies, as well as the disproportionate impact of emergencies on people and communities with pre-existing vulnerabilities.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Ensure there is appropriate multi-agency oversight of human aspects activity, including within relevant plans, procedures, working groups, and cell structures, to support shared situational awareness across partner organisations. This should involve:

   i. Support for the consideration of people's needs across the resilience cycle, including:

      a. An agreed approach for the provision of welfare and psychological support to people and communities impacted by an emergency, including survivors, partner organisation personnel and Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector responders;

      b. Arrangements to recognise the cultural, faith, linguistic and social needs of affected people and communities;

   ii. The integration of perspectives from Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations and other people with expertise (for example, social workers, academics);

   iii. The consideration of community demographics, noting that people's needs may vary based on their personal circumstances and the specific nature of the emergency;

   iv. The consideration of people who may be disproportionately impacted by an emergency;

   v. The contribution and enhancement of local human aspects capabilities and support mechanisms; and

vi. The establishment of monitoring and feedback mechanisms for the continual improvement of human aspects activity, including learnings from reviews, exercises and emergencies.

B. Have a process for identifying, engaging and agreeing the roles and responsibilities of organisations that may lead or support the provision of human aspects, in advance of an emergency. This may include existing local service providers (for example, GPs, hospitals, social care organisations) or Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector organisations.

C. Embed human aspects considerations within risk assessments, including the impacts and needs of those with pre-existing vulnerabilities and those who may become vulnerable during certain emergencies, including these considerations within the Community Risk Register where appropriate.

D. Have plans and procedures for establishing a range of emergency assistance centres, including plans to support people affected by an emergency outside of their home area, and the consideration of support animals and/or pets.

E. Support the pre-identification of physical locations and virtual support mechanisms for short and longer-term assistance needs, including a non-exhaustive list of local networks and organisations who may be able to provide logistical and/or practical support.

F. Incorporate human aspects objectives within LRF training and exercising.

G. Ensure the plans for public communication in an emergency are accessible, include engagement with trusted voices to support those who are harder to reach, consider survivors' needs, and signpost to practical advice and psychosocial support.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

H. Have flexible response and recovery plans, based on a comprehensive understanding of people's needs in emergencies. Interventions should consider the concurrency of multiple human aspects activities, as well as the diverse and evolving needs of people in the short, medium, and longer term.

I. Maintain proportionate arrangements to evaluate the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of human aspect interventions to support continual improvement.

J. Strengthen partner organisation capabilities through specific training on human aspects.

K. Gather data to support the development of partner organisation or multi-agency equality impact analyses. LRFs could facilitate seeking input from groups with pre-existing vulnerabilities during the development and testing of emergency plans, to ensure arrangements are suitable.

L. Consider strengthening the voice of survivors and involving those with lived experience throughout the resilience cycle, to ensure people are at the heart of resilience.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Equality Act 2010, Chapter 1: The Public Sector Equality Duty
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Cabinet Office
- National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies: SFJCCAF1: Work with communities to raise risk awareness, increase preparedness and resilience (2025), The Workforce Development Trust
- National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies: SFJCCAG4: Provide care and assistance to meet the immediate and longer term needs of individuals impacted by emergencies (2025), The Workforce Development Trust
- National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies: SFJCCAF2: Communicate with individuals and communities to enable early action and response (2025), The Workforce Development Trust

Thematic Guidance:

- Human aspects in emergency management (2016), Cabinet Office
- Identifying and supporting persons who are vulnerable in an emergency (2025), Cabinet Office
- Community Resilience Development Framework (2019), Cabinet Office
- National Recovery Guidance: Humanitarian Issues (2013), Cabinet Office
- Chronic Risk Analysis (2025), Cabinet Office and Government Office for Science

Good Practice Guidance:

- NHS Core Standards for Emergency Preparedness, Resilience and Response (2013), NHS England
- Emergency planning and response for education, childcare, and children's social care settings (2023), Department for Education

- Learning & Resources, The Emergency Planning Society
- ISO 22319:2017 Guidelines for planning the involvement of spontaneous volunteers
- ISO 22395:2018 Guidelines for supporting vulnerable persons in an emergency
- ISO 45003:2021 Guidelines for managing psychosocial risks

Standard 11 Recovery management

Desired Outcome

The LRF co-ordinates comprehensive, embedded, and flexible recovery management arrangements, establishing recovery as a co-equal component of the resilience cycle. To ensure a smooth, co-ordinated transition, multi-agency recovery should align with response planning and commence at the earliest stage of an emergency. Acknowledging that recovery is often led by local authorities, these recovery management arrangements support collective decision-making to initiate, resource, monitor, sustain and conclude recovery activities. By establishing a shared understanding of the local risks and impacts, multi-agency recovery drives evidence-based, community-informed, and equitable outcomes.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

Governance and recovery management framework

A. Establish a flexible multi-agency mechanism (for example, Recovery Working Group) responsible for collectively maintaining recovery arrangements and ensuring they are linked to other relevant LRF activities.

B. Maintain a flexible recovery management framework applicable to any emergency using a common consequences approach. The framework should recognise that response and recovery activities frequently operate concurrently, be refreshed on an agreed cycle and provide the flexibility to transition from response to recovery and back again if the local circumstances change.

C. Define and agree clear roles and responsibilities for organisations that may lead or support recovery work, recognising that recovery is often led by local authorities but with contributions from partner organisations, wider partners and stakeholders. This should include clear co-ordination protocols between multiple local authorities within and across the LRF area.

D. Agree multi-agency arrangements for setting clear strategic objectives, milestones, success measures, and closedown criteria as part of a recovery framework. These arrangements should enable recovery activities to be monitored, support transparent reporting to partner organisations and affected communities, and guide the eventual transition of recovery activity into business-as-usual.

Multi-agency co-ordination

E. Define and agree protocols to establish recovery arrangements during the earliest response phase of an emergency. This should include details of the transition of leadership from

response to recovery (facilitating a timely and documented handover) and identify which response arrangements should be retained and adapted to ensure continuous multi-agency situational awareness, information sharing, and decision-making.

F. Define arrangements for establishing and operating a Recovery Co-ordinating Group, applying Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles. This should include agreement on the chairing arrangements, membership, hosting arrangements, secretariat/administrative support, and information-sharing protocols, explicitly planning for the sustained multi-agency operations required to run concurrently with response.

G. Define arrangements for establishing and operating Recovery Co-ordinating sub-groups to manage specific elements of the recovery programme (for example, human aspects, environmental protection, infrastructure and site clearance, economic recovery).

Resourcing, financial and legal control

H. Establish scalable, multi-agency resourcing arrangements that enable recovery operations to be sustained over an extended period. These arrangements should support partner organisations to collectively manage the cumulative impacts of prolonged recovery.

I. Define comprehensive arrangements for financial and legal oversight and control during recovery. This should include arrangements to track expenditure, formalise local funding agreements, and establish clear, auditable processes for cost recovery and expenditure record-keeping, especially where recovery activity may be sustained over an extended period.

Community support and wider partner integration

J. Agree multi-agency recovery arrangements, which are adaptable to the evolving needs of people and communities from response to recovery, to ensure continuity of support. This may include appropriate impact assessments where support is being reduced.

K. Maintain arrangements to communicate with and facilitate the involvement of necessary and appropriate wider partners in recovery management.

L. Establish arrangements with wider partners to co-ordinate and manage financial or other support (for example, financial and physical donations, unaffiliated spontaneous volunteers, and in-kind resource or expertise) following an emergency.

M. Establish arrangements to sensitively manage tributes, memorials and vigils in the short-term, and for larger-scale emergencies, considering the longer-term need to publicly acknowledge anniversaries.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

N. Ensure multi-agency recovery management arrangements are flexible for complex, cascading and concurrent emergencies, which may require sustained recovery operations over an extended period.

O. Incorporate tailored, risk-specific annexes into the generic, common-consequences recovery framework to address distinct recovery considerations for priority risks identified in the Community Risk Register.

P. Work with neighbouring LRF areas, where risks or local planning assumptions indicate, to develop and agree cross-border recovery management arrangements. This may include pre-planned arrangements for joint partnership-working, shared resourcing, mutual aid, and the establishment of a Multi-Recovery Co-ordinating Group.

Q. Develop a generic framework, agreed with relevant local authority Responsible Financial Officers (Section 151) across the LRF areas, for the rapid distribution of emergency payments to affected individuals and organisations. This framework should identify appropriate payment channels, reporting and monitoring arrangements, and related communications.

R. Co-design multi-agency recovery management arrangements directly with wider partners and stakeholders, ensuring that response and recovery plans are actively designed with affected communities rather than simply adapted for them.

S. Ensure multi-agency recovery arrangements identify those who might be disproportionately impacted by an emergency, and what additional support they require in recovery. This may include an explicit focus on facilitating community-led recovery, promoting long-term recovery, and building community cohesion and trust.

T. Incorporate long-term opportunities for community development, education, environmental sustainability, climate adaptation, economic regeneration, and future risk mitigation directly into multi-agency recovery management arrangements.

U. Collect data from affected people and communities to measure recovery outcomes with regard to people and communities, health and wellbeing, the environment, the economy, infrastructure, public confidence and community cohesion, using these insights to drive continual improvement in recovery management.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 5: Publication of plans and assessments
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Regulations 2005), Part 6: Arrangements for warning and

provision of information and advice to the public

- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 5: Emergency Planning, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 7: Communicating with the Public, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Cabinet Office

Thematic Guidance:

- Human aspects in emergency management (2011), Cabinet Office
- Identifying and supporting persons who are vulnerable in an emergency (2025), Cabinet Office
- Community resilience development framework (2019), Cabinet Office
- The Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019

Good Practice Guidance:

- National Occupational Standards for Resilience and Emergencies, The Workforce Development Trust
- ISO 22393:2023 Guidelines for planning recovery and renewal

Standard 12 Continual improvement

Desired Outcome

The LRF encourages a culture of learning and continual improvement. The LRF proactively captures, tracks, and shares local, regional, national, and international lessons identified and notable practice. Lessons identified and notable practice are effectively translated into practice, changing behaviours, reducing the recurrence of known issues and driving tangible improvements in multi-agency capabilities.

At a minimum, Local Resilience Forums should:

A. Promote a culture of learning and continual improvement that actively encourages open reflection and constructive challenge. Training, exercising, debriefs, assurance and wider evaluations should be recognised as opportunities for continual improvement.

B. Establish and maintain a senior governance mechanism to oversee a multi-agency lessons management framework that supports the identification, prioritisation, ownership, implementation, and embedding of multi-agency lessons across LRF activities.

C. Use and/or develop systems to support lessons management, ensuring that local learning arrangements are inclusive of necessary and appropriate wider partners, whilst utilising Joint Organisational Learning Online to submit nationally relevant lessons.

D. Detail multi-agency debriefing procedures within emergency plans to identify lessons and notable practice from exercises and emergencies.

E. Establish arrangements to review nationally relevant lessons and notable practice published (for example, through Joint Organisational Learning Online, independent reviews, and public inquiries), assessing their relevance to the LRF area and implementing any required changes within LRF activities.

F. Apply proportionate arrangements for classification, anonymisation, legal privilege, data protection, commercial sensitivity, and operational security before sharing lessons beyond the originating partner organisation.

G. Develop a process to prioritise lessons identified based on clear criteria (for example, risk, likelihood of recurrence, impact of recurrence) to determine priority action areas for continual improvement.

H. Establish a clear, auditable process to implement lessons which defines explicit lesson ownership (for example, a partner organisation, wider partners, or held collectively by the LRF), outputs, milestones and outcomes.

I. Establish arrangements to monitor, evaluate and report progress against agreed actions arising from lessons identified and/or notable practice, ensuring these insights are embedded and translated into measurable improvements in multi-agency capability.

J. Establish clear closure criteria within the lessons management framework to ensure that actions arising from lessons identified and/or notable practice are only closed when the intended change has been implemented, tested or otherwise evidenced, and the residual risk and impact on multi-agency capability has been reviewed.

K. Implement and maintain a local approach to the LRF Partnership Assurance Framework, tailored to local circumstances, risks and priorities. This approach should enable partner organisations to collectively understand strengths, risks and areas for development, providing assurance and driving continual improvement.

L. Participate in sector-led and nationally-led assurance and improvement activities (for example, using the LRF Partnership Assurance Framework, and the LRF Peer Review Assessment Framework) to evaluate multi-agency activities, share notable practice, and help set strategic priorities for improvement.

For good practice, Local Resilience Forums could:

M. Record and categorise lessons in a consistent, structured manner to identify and analyse recurring trends, themes and insights across reviews, exercises and emergencies.

N. Use external peers in the lessons management process to provide objective challenge and fresh perspectives.

O. Create opportunities for wider partners and stakeholders (including members of the public) to give feedback on LRF activity and share community insights to inform continual improvement activities.

P. Designate a Joint Organisational Learning Single Point of Contact and identify a Lead for implementing and managing multi-agency learning within the LRF. This role could support the co-ordination of local learning, the submission of nationally relevant lessons to Joint Organisational Learning Online, and the assessment and local implementation of lessons published through Joint Organisational Learning Online.

Q. Establish arrangements to proactively and promptly share relevant multi-agency lessons and notable practice with neighbouring LRF areas and the wider resilience community.

R. Engage with academic institutions, professional bodies, and cross-sector forums beyond the LRF to review and share lessons and notable practice.

S. Review international lessons identified and notable practice where they are relevant to LRF activities.

T. Contribute local insights to national products (for example, the UK Resilience Academy's Resilience Lessons Digests, Joint Organisational Learning Working Group) to help strengthen the resilience system.

Guidance and supporting knowledge

Core Guidance:

- Emergency Preparedness (2012), Chapter 5: Emergency Planning, Cabinet Office
- Emergency Response and Recovery (2013), Chapter 4.6: Identifying and learning lessons and Chapter 5.6: Debriefing and identifying lessons to be learned, Cabinet Office
- Joint Doctrine: The Interoperability Framework (2024), JESIP

Thematic Guidance:

- Joint Organisational Learning Guidance (2021), JESIP

Good Practice Guidance:

- Lessons Management Best Practice Guidance (2025), UK Resilience Academy
- UK Resilience Lessons Digest, UK Resilience Academy
- Multi-Agency Debrief Template, JESIP
- Umpire Evaluation Template, JESIP
- BS ISO 22392:2020 Guidelines for conducting peer reviews

Glossary

Acute Risk	Time-bound, discrete events, for example a major fire or a terrorist attack. Contrast with Chronic risks.
Capabilities	The organisations, tools, data, legislation or resources required to respond to risks. There are both specific capabilities, which are needed to manage specific risks, as well as generic response ones which can be used to respond flexibly to multiple risks.
Cascading Impact	The knock-on impacts of a risk that cause further physical, social or economic disruption. For example, severe weather could cause flooding, which then causes damage to electricity infrastructure, resulting in a power outage which then disrupts communications service providers (and so on).
Chronic Risk	Continuous challenges which gradually erode our economy, community, way of life and/or national security (e.g. money laundering; antimicrobial resistance). Contrast with Acute risks.
Civil contingencies	Planning and preparation for events or incidents with the potential to impact ordinary citizens and their interests.
Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) 2004	Act of 2004 which established a single framework for Civil Protection in the United Kingdom. Part 1 of the CCA establishes a clear set of roles and responsibilities for Local Responders; Part 2 of the CCA establishes emergency powers.
Emergency	An event or situation which causes or may cause serious damage to human welfare; the environment; or War, or terrorism, which threatens serious damage to security. This definition is set out in the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.
Exercise	1. A process to train for, assess, practice, and improve performance in an organisation. 2. A simulation designed to validate organisations' capability to manage incidents and emergencies. Specifically, exercises will seek to validate training undertaken and the procedures and systems within emergency or business continuity plans.
Hazard	Accidental or naturally occurring (i.e., non-malicious) event or situation with the potential to cause death or physical or psychological harm, damage or losses to property, and/or

	disruption to the environment and/or to economic, social and political structures. Contrast with Threat.
Human Aspects	The impacts on individuals during and after an emergency. This also includes humanitarian assistance, which refers to the activities carried out during and after an emergency to meet the needs of those affected.
Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP)	Models and principles have become the standard for interoperability in the UK. The JESIP Joint Doctrine: the interoperability framework sets out a standard approach to multi-agency working, along with training and awareness products for responding organisations to train their staff.
Joint Organisational Learning Online (JOL Online)	A process and platform used to capture lessons identified that may impact on multi-agency working and that allow for continual improvement. Lessons identified or notable practice may come from training, testing and exercising or incidents. The JOL platform is hosted on ResilienceDirect.
National Risk Register	The external version of the National Security Risk Assessment (NSRA), which is the UK government's assessment of the most serious risks facing the UK.
National Security Risk Assessment (NSRA)	The NSRA assesses, compares and prioritises the top national level risks facing the UK, focusing on both likelihood of the risk occurring and the impact it would have, were it to happen. It is the main tool for assessing the most serious civil contingencies risks facing the UK.
Post Exercise Review / Report (PXR)	A review or report identifying any potential 'lessons identified' by an exercise, ensuring they are captured and forwarded to the authority responsible for lessons management.
Response Co-ordinating Group (ResCG)	A Multi-SCG Co-ordinating Group which may be convened where the local response has been, or may be, overwhelmed and wider support is required, or where an emergency affects a number of neighbouring Strategic Co-ordinating Groups and would benefit from co-ordination (e.g. to obtain a consistent, structured approach) or enhanced support.
Resilience	The ability to anticipate, assess, prevent, mitigate, validate, respond to, and recover and learn from natural hazards, deliberate attacks, geopolitical instability, disease outbreaks, and other disruptive events, civil emergencies or threats to our way of life.

Resilience Cycle	A conceptual model that breaks the management of a risk down into stages at which different preparatory actions can be taken. The UK government is using eight stages: anticipation, assessment, prevention, validation, preparation, response, recovery and learning. The resilience cycle is also known as the risk life cycle.
Risk	An event, person or object which could cause loss of life or injury, damage to infrastructure, social and economic disruption or environment degradation. The severity of a risk is assessed as a combination of its potential impact and its likelihood. The UK government subdivides risks into: hazards and threats.
Recovery Co-ordinating Group (RecCG)	A group generally chaired by an executive member of the local authority, established during the response process, with its chair expected to sit on the strategic co-ordinating group (SCG).
Strategic Co-ordination Centre (SCC)	A location and infrastructure enabling the SCG to co-ordinate their response, with flexible plans by LRFs to open elements as needed for specific incidents.
Strategic Co-ordinating Group (SCG)	A multi-agency group responsible for co-ordinating the joint response to an emergency at the local strategic level.
Subsidiarity	The principle whereby decisions are taken at the lowest appropriate level, with co-ordination at the highest necessary level. In practice this means that most incidents are handled within the capabilities of local agencies and responders, without central involvement.
Tactical Co-ordination Centre (TCC)	A location and infrastructure enabling the TCG to co-ordinate their response, with flexible plans by LRFs to open elements as needed for specific incidents.
Tactical Co-ordinating Group (TCG)	A multi-agency group of tactical commanders that meets to determine, co-ordinate and deliver the tactical response to an emergency.
Threat	Malicious risks such as acts of terrorism, hostile state activity and cyber crime. Contrast with Hazard.
Training Needs Analysis (TNA)	A process used by local responder organisations and businesses to identify key areas in which staff require training, which is also delivered within a specific amount of time. The purpose being to improve employee job performance, including professional growth and progress. A training analysis reviews current methods within an organisation and can pinpoint any knowledge or skills gaps amongst staff. This allows a business to create fit-for-purpose

	learning and development rather than investing excess time and money in areas where this isn't needed.
Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS)	The phrase ‘Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector’ is not formally defined. It is often used to refer to a wide range of organisations including those which aim to fulfil a specific social purpose (such as charities) or support specific communities (such as community groups or faith-based organisations).
Vulnerability	The quality or state of being more prone or susceptible to the impacts of hazards or threats. Vulnerability could affect individuals, communities, assets or a whole system and may be caused by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes.