

Service	Recovery Coordinating Group (RCG)
Completed by & title	June Graves – Chairman of Recovery Coordinating Group
Date completed	8 August 2014
	<p>A Recovery Coordinating Group (RCG) was put in place formally when the SCG handed over from response to recovery across the Thames Valley – 21 February 2014. However plans were already being put in place in advance of that.</p> <p>In order to manage the various issues for recovery the RCG put in place a number of subgroups reporting into it including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance – focusing on recovery of costs, making bids for centralised funding and managing the grants to for property level protection and business support. • Health & Well Being – focusing on public health issues such as gastroenteritis and the psychosocial elements of peoples well being, • Infrastructure – focusing on the repairs necessary ranging from gulley cleaning, potholes, renewal of roads and public rights of way. • Resources- focusing on the recovery of pumps, sandbags and other equipment • HR- Staff Welfare/Support – focusing on staff welfare, staff payments and support. • Communications- providing the communications for recovery <p>The arrangements for working within the Berkshire Recovery Group were put in place; the full group met once in Bracknell and had a number of conference calls. This group was used for information sharing and focused on sandbag dispersal and understanding the issues of financial support.</p> <p>It should be noted that some recovery actions are still ongoing and will continue until at least next Mar15 due to financial elements, welfare checks and infrastructure actions.</p>
What plans did your service have in place beforehand to help manage the recovery process	The recovery was coordinated using the Thames Valley LRF Recovery Plan.
Of the actions that you had planned, what worked well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially the RCG met weekly in order to monitored the progress of the various subgroups • The RCG maintained a work plan in order to track actions, assign new actions and provide an audit trail of issues. • The group coordinated the response to the Berkshire Recovery Group and the Strategic Recovery Group/ Government departments. • The Recovery Group Chair issued weekly updates to stakeholders, communicating the work of the Council to internal services and external agencies and communities – illustrating actions completed, those underway and future considerations of

	<p>the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The working group sought resources from outside of the Council (Community pay back team) in order to recover resources, an effective use of wider support. • In order to facilitate the RCG WBC utilized the Berkshire EPO MOU in terms of staff support as a Tactical Advisor • A tactical advisor was put in place for all the recovery groups to support the chairs. • The sub groups of the RCG were really effective and manage their allocated work well, the respective reps attended the group meetings and reported back on progress
<p>What worked less well or would you change for future events and why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The handover to recovery took place on the 21 February, at which point WBC was still responding to cases of flooding and loss of facilities (delivering portaloos and sandbags) – timing was not appropriate for West Berkshire where a more phased approach was needed. • Some advice from Public Health and EA contradicted each other, therefore caused delays in the response required to remove sandbags • Restricted resources post handover from the Strategic Coordinating Group (and ultimately the loss of Military Aid) resulted in delays to recover resources such as sandbags. • WBC was left to recover the Chieveley Depot despite the activity being set up there being a Thames Valley wide asset. • Some rural communities noticeably worked together to support their Community and the Council in the recovery process. Whereas in the Newbury communities this was not the case – the Recovery worked initiatively to manage the varied demands and needs of communities • A number of financial grants/ support schemes were introduced by Central Government in response to the needs of community and to aid recovery. The processes were undefined at the point of handover to LA's and the demand for information from impacted residents was significant • Challenges were faced in respect of the administrative support required to facilitate grants, defining the process and communicating the available support to communities. • Understanding the position of the wider council in terms of business continuity was a challenge and could not effectively establish, using the BCP model, where the recovery work was having an impact outside of dealing with normal business. Suggest that further work is needed to clarify under what circumstances BCP would be put into place
<p>What changes, if any, were made to your plan in response to events and what effect did they have?</p>	<p>The recovery plan will be reviewed as a result of the before process.</p>

Appendix G - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission 1st September 2014

Please outline any other comments that you may have for the Commission.	NA
--	----