

Critical incidence planning and response: 2005 london train bombing



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

From the unfortunate event which took place in 7 July 2005, it can be concluded that more stringent measures could have been put in place in support of all the people who were affected by the attack. The main lesson learned from this event is that the quality of help received within the initial few minutes of the tragedy influences for years, the reaction of the people towards events like these.

Speed, flexibility and openness are very critical in offering humanitarian support. What this implies is that a faster response in putting in place centres of help and assistance as well as obtaining basic information to the people quickly is more important (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 1).

An analysis of the critical incident planning of the event reveals that the emergency services of the capital and the transport workers displayed the biggest response in the history of the capital in response to a terrorist attack unlike the 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing.

A lot of tribute is paid to the professionalism of the emergency services of London, the transport for London staff among other organizations along with the courage displayed by the members of the public who equally contributed their effort (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 1).

Incidence planning and response to the 2005 London bombing entailed the provision of better support to the families who were bereaved along with more resilient networks of telecommunication (Strom & Eyerman 2008).

The event also revealed the importance of having in place emergency service networks of communication coupled with underground communications. Still the issue of timely information to the public arose as

well as attempts to keep London safe. Finally, there was the need for crisis co-ordination arrangements (Strom & Eyerman 2008).

As a result of the 2005 London bombings and in response to related occurrences in future, police custody bureau arrangements were reviewed thoroughly with the motive of developing new procedures, systems as well as training.

The newly established National Mutual Aid Telephony System as well as the mutual aid telephony protocols amongst the police forces is expected to permit the Casualty Bureau to manage more calls than as the case during the event (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 4).

The other issue which arose during the 2005 London Bombing concerned non-confidential information concerning the injured undergoing treatment being availed to those looking for their loved ones contrary to the 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing.

What has been done in this regard is that the police in partnership with the relevant government departments are working on modalities by which this kind of information can be more effectively shared during the response to a crisis (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 4). One of the ways which has been identified is by way of enhanced bureau arrangements.

From the time the 7 July attack occurred, the Metropolitan Police has upped its capacity of collating efficient casualty information from hospitals receiving the injured as well as from the affected people looking for their survivors at identified survivor reception areas.

With regards to the provision of emotional and practical support, attempts are being made to ensure that victims are given constant and updated information concerning criminal investigations going on (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 8).

Unlike the 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing, plans are equally underway to introduce new practicing codes with the intent of achieving long-term communication with victims of all kinds of offences with at least one contact per month. The other issue concerns that financial support and compensation.

During the response period, some survivors experienced difficulties in applying for compensation from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA) just like in the case of 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing. In this regard, a number of efforts have been instituted to not only simplify but also to speed up the process.

This alongside the establishment of the London Bombing Relief Charitable Fund by the Mayor of London on July 8th and became operational immediately, the first donation of £ 1 million coming from the government and a further £ 2. 5 million. Eventually the fund reached close to £ 11. 5 million (Reid, & Jowell, 2006 p. 8).

Like in the case of 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing, other areas where improvements have been made include the provision of health services, in which case the Health Protection Agency are carrying out research aimed at establishing any effects from being exposed to the fumes of the explosion.

The other area is according the dead dignity and respect care is being taken to have absolute certainty before a family can be informed about the loss of their beloved along with the London Plan, an attempt being made for incidences leading to mass loss of lives.

Along with that have been international responses where the Foreign and Commonwealth Office is establishing a critical incident plan as a future response mechanism to such events among others (Reid & Jowell, 2006 p. 8).

Critical Incidence Planning and Response: 1995 Oklahoma City Bombing
Just like the case of 2005 London Bombing, after September 11 201 attack, almost al law enforcement agencies in the United States are keen prepared for signals which could act as pointers to terrorist attacks.

The United States having experienced terrorist incidents has realized the need to evaluate the hazard and vulnerability preparedness. The United States in preparing for any such future occurrence has included mutual aid partners, plan for interoperable communications as well as equipments. At the same time the country has made attempts aimed at protecting vital response infrastructure (Fagel, 2005, p. 2).

In responding to the above, just like the case of 2005 London Bombing, the United States have realized that the response phase is likely to proceed in a smooth way if planning, exercising as well as training has well been carried out.

In this regard, as response preparedness, the United Stats have realized the need to have a single incident command system (ICS) by employing the

newly established National Incident Management System (NIMS) (Fagel, 2005, p. 4). The expectation is that all the response agencies will establish a single ICS structure in which case incident command could be organized as a command area.

The other response measure is to enforce safety requirements introduced by way of trainings and exercises. In this regard, in similarity the case of 2005 London Bombing, the remedy is to carry out documentation as much as possible more so given the fact that law suits cannot be avoided in the case of a terrorist occurrence.

The implication here is that there is a likelihood of documentation being overlooked as response agencies are likely to focus their attention on immediate incident needs. In similarity with the case of 2005 London Bombing, the other measure is to plan for contingencies.

This arises from the fact that responding to a terrorist attack is typical hence irrespective of best efforts to plan; situations are likely to emerge requiring the need to have contingency plans (Fagel, 2005, p. 5).

Like in the case of 2005 London Bombing and 1996 Olympic Bombing, the United States has realized to manage the expectations of the public. This is in terms of explaining to the public that the process of recovery is time consuming Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA).

Still there is the need to put in place a Family Assistance Center (FAC) which is could be synonymous to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA) or even the Health Protection Agency. The other measure and in contrast with the case of 2005 London Bombing, the United States

recognizes the potential for disagreements. This arises from the emotions which are likely to be high as a result of a terrorist attack (Fagel, 2005, p. 7).

Critical Incidence Planning and Response: 1996 Olympic Bombing

In July 127, 1996, when the Olympic Games were going on in Atlanta, a pipe bomb burst in the city's Centennial Park. Just like case of 2005 London Bombing, this left two people dead while 111 ere injured. Prior to the 911 warning reaching the area having sound-and light tower, a man named Richard Jewell 33 by then and a security guard at the place discovered a small backpack left unattended to and raised an alarm.

Investigations by the Secret Service and the Georgia Bureau of Investigations however pointed to then fact that Jewell could have been involved in setting up the bomb (Committee of Concerned Journalists, 2009).

That notwithstanding, training appears to be a fundamental issue in disaster planning, preparedness and management. For instance, like in the U. S or the Olympic Bombing, the anti-terrorism branch of the London Metropolitan Police Service caries out joint activities called the Hanover Series in practicing what should be done in the event of an incident (Strom & Eyerman 2008).

It is however important to note that irrespective of the best planning efforts, terrorist can still attack. Thus emphasis should be laid on establishing responder safety by putting in place Incident Command System which could set the pace for not only a safe but also an effective response.