Public Document Pack



## BEDFORDSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

Councillor C Atkins
Councillor T Brown
Councillor J Chatterley
Councillor P Downing
Councillor D Franks
Councillor J Mingay (Chair)
Councillor M Riaz

A meeting of **Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group** will be held at **Conference Room, Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters, Kempston, Bedford MK41 7NR** on **Thursday, 16 June 2016** starting at **10.00 am.**

Karen Daniels
Service Assurance Manager

# A G E N D A

| Item | Subject | Lead | Purpose of Discussion |
|------|---------|------|------------------------|
| 1. | Apologies | | |
| 2. | Election of Vice Chair 2016/17 | Chair | |
| 3. | Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests | Chair | Members are requested to disclose the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interest and any other interests as required by the Fire Authority's Code of Conduct. (see note below). |
| 4. | Communications | | |
| 5. | Minutes | Chair | *To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2016 (Pages 1 - 6) |
| 6. | Review Terms of Reference | Chair | * To consider Terms of Reference (Pages 7 - 10) |

| Item | Subject | Lead | Purpose of Discussion |
|------|---------|------|------------------------|
| 7. | Service Delivery Performance Monitoring Report (Annual Review) and Programmes to Date | DCFO | * To consider a report (Pages 11 - 22) |
| 8. | Operational Decision Making Procedures - Exception Report | HOps | * To receive a verbal update |
| 9. | Corporate Risk Register | HSSP | * To consider a report (Pages 23 - 26) |
| 10. | Work Programme 2016/17 | Chair | * To consider a report (Pages 27 - 32) |
|  | Next Meeting |  | 10.00 am on 15 September 2016 at Conference Room, Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters, Kempston, Bedford MK41 7NR |

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

From 1 July 2012 new regulations were introduced on Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs). The interests are set out in the Schedule to the Code of Conduct adopted by the Fire Authority on 28 June 2012. Members are statutorily required to notify the Monitoring Officer (MO) of any such interest which they, or a spouse or civil partner or a person they live with as such, have where they know of the interest.

A Member must make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and any other interest as defined in paragraph 7 of the Fire Authority's Code of Conduct at any meeting of the Fire Authority, a Committee (or Sub-Committee) at which the Member is present and, in the case of a DPI, withdraw from participating in the meeting where an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.

**For Publication**          **Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority**
                             **Service Delivery Policy and Challenge**
                             **Group**
                             **16 June 2016**
                             **Item No. 5**

## MINUTES OF SERVICE DELIVERY POLICY AND CHALLENGE GROUP
## MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2016 AT 10.00am

Present:      Councillors C Atkins, J Chatterley and J Mingay (Chair)

              DCFO G Ranger, SOC I Evans, SOC G Jeffery and AC C Ball

15-16/SD/037 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brown, Downing and Franks.

15-16/SD/038 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

15-16/SD/039 Communications

DCFO Ranger reported that the Service's Fire Special Operations Team had recently been assessed through a peer review and the initial feedback had been extremely positive.  Positive comments had been made about the Service's organisational culture and its consistency throughout all levels of the organisation.

Councillor Atkins advised that, at a meeting of Bedford Borough Council's Executive the previous evening, thanks had been expressed for the assistance from the Service in response to the flooding incidents earlier that day.

SOC Jeffrey confirmed that 24 calls had been received by the Service to respond to incidents of flooding, mainly in the north of the County around Harrold.  A team of Officers had provided support to Control in order to co-ordinate the Service's assets and the Service's Press Officer was currently drafting a press release to inform the general public of the activity of the Service, including the rescue of individuals from vehicles stuck in flood water.

DCFO Ranger reminded Members that the Service had been delegated responsibility by the Local Resilience Forum to co-ordinate operational resources in the event of wide-area flooding in Bedfordshire.

15-16/SD/040 Minutes

**RESOLVED:**
That the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015 be confirmed and signed as a true record.

Item 5.1

<u>15-16/SD/041 Service Delivery Performance Monitoring Report and Programmes to Date</u>

DCFO Ranger presented his report on the performance against the Service Delivery Programme, projects and performance indicators and associated targets for Quarter 3 of 2015/16.

AC Ball provided an update on the RMS project.  He advised that following the provider being held to contract, as supported by Members at the previous meeting of the Policy and Challenge Group, progress had been made in rectifying the remaining issues and testing of the system was being undertaken.  The legal process was continuing to run alongside the progress made in the last two to three weeks by the provider.

Members were requested to support the commissioning of a review of the Service's involvement in the project.  It was recognised that this Service was a client of Essex Fire and Rescue Service and that it was that Service that held the contract with the provider.

DCFO Ranger reported that the Retained Duty System Improvement Project was on target.

In relation to the performance against the Service Delivery performance indicators, DCFO Ranger advised that performance against CPI02 (Primary Fire Fatalities) had missed the target for the quarter and it was unlikely that the year-end target would be met as there had been three fatalities in the first three quarters with one other fatality awaiting the post-mortem results.

Conversely, performance against the indicator measuring the number of accidental dwelling fires (PI05) was 4% above target for the reporting period.

Members were advised that the Service intervened to improve fire safety in the homes of vulnerable individuals where it was aware of the issues and where the occupant was willing to co-operate.

The target relating to FS04 (total number of fire safety audits carried out on high risk premises) had not been met as the number of high risk premises had reduced dramatically in the last few years from over 800 to 224 as the result of actions taken to drive down the risk of these premises. The target for this indicator was proposed for amendment and this would be considered under the next item.

**RESOLVED:**
1.    That progress made on the Service Delivery Programmes be acknowledged.
2.    That the commissioning of a review into the involvement of the Service in the RMS project be supported.

<u>15-16/SD/042 Proposed Service Delivery Indicators and Targets 2016/17</u>

DCFO Ranger presented the proposed Service Delivery indicators and targets for the 2016/17 performance year.  The targets had been set at a level that should be both challenging and achievable.  A number of changes to prefixes and numbering were also being proposed to improve consistency.

5% reductions were being proposed for PI01 (primary fires), PI03 (fire injuries), PI05 (accidental dwelling fires), PI06 (number of deliberate building fires) and PI18 (number of hoax calls mobilised to).

The baseline for PI05 included a projection taking into account the population growth in the County, with an increase in the number of individuals from vulnerable groups.

No change was proposed to the targets for PI02 (fire fatalities) and the indicators measuring call attendance.  The targets relating to call attendance may be revised following the implementation of the replacement mobilising system.  The new system would allow the Service to scrutinise in more detail the type of call received so emergency calls could be easily identified from the calls where an immediate response/mobilisation was not required.

A 3% reduction target was proposed for PI04 (deliberate (arson) fires) as it was felt that the Service may be approaching a 'ceiling' level of performance against the indicator.

5% improvements in performance in the percentage of False Alarm Malicious (FAM) and hoax calls not attended (PI19), number of calls to False Alarm Good Intent (FAGI) (PI20) and non-domestic fires (PI27) were also proposed.

The proposed target for PI24 which measured the percentage of Building Regulation consultations completed within the prescribed timescale had been set at 95%.

The proposed target for PI25 (total number of fire safety audits/inspections completed) had been set as 1900 and was a combination of annual inspections and visits undertaken by operational crews.

The baseline for PI26 (total number of fire safety audits carried out on very high and high risk premises) had been proposed as 224 as the Service currently had 222 high risk and 2 very high risk premises in the County.

In relation to PI28 (Automatic Fire Detection False Alarms/non domestic properties), a 20% reduction was being proposed.  It was recognised by Members that this target would not be achieved unless there was a change in the Automatic False Alarm (AFA) mobilising policy.  Any significant change in policy would have to be agreed by the Authority.

It was noted that if resources were committed to a hoax call or false alarm, they were not available for deployment to genuine incidents as well as causing disruption to training, fire safety and prevention activities.

Item 5.3

Four indicators were proposed to be presented to the Policy and Challenge Group for information only.  These would be numbered Inf01-Inf04 and measured the number of RTCs attended, water related deaths, water related injuries and people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.

It was hoped that the proposed changes to the targets would further drive forward performance.

**RESOLVED:**
That the proposed suite of Service Delivery performance indicators and targets for 2016/17 be endorsed.

15-16/SD/043 Customer Satisfaction Report Quarter 3 2015/16

SOC Jeffery submitted the results of the customer satisfaction surveys conducted between 1 October - 31 December 2015.  The surveys covered four areas: after the incident (domestic), after the incident (non-domestic), home fire safety check follow up surveys and fire safety audits.

There had been no complaints received via the customer satisfaction process and 100% of respondents across all four survey areas stated that they were fairly or very satisfied with the overall service received.

In response to a question, DCFO Ranger confirmed that there were individuals who left some of the survey questions blank and this accounted for the variations in the number of responses to some of the questions when compared to the number of surveys returned.

SOC Jeffery advised that he would be working with the Service's Press Officer to improve the layout of the report.  It was suggested that future reports should also include the number of people who did not respond to particular questions.

**RESOLVED:**
That the high levels of customer satisfaction achieved during Quarter 3 be acknowledged and that Members' satisfaction with these high levels be recorded.

15-16/SD/044 Community Risk Management Plan

SOC Jeffery advised that a leaflet was being produced which would provide partners and the general public with information on how the Service was progressing against the stated aims and objectives set out in the Community Risk Management Plan 2015-19.  The leaflet, when completed, would be available in hard copy and on the Service website.

A draft would be circulated to Members as soon as it was available.

**RESOLVED:**
That the current position in relation to the Community Risk Management Plan be acknowledged.

<u>15-16/SD/045 Operational Decision Making Procedures – Exception Report</u>

SOC Evans advised that there were no incidents to report.

<u>15-16/SD/046 Complaints – Driving and Parking of Service Vehicles</u>

SOC Evans submitted his report on the findings of investigations into external complaints received about the driving and parking of Service vehicles, arising from a resolution made by the Audit and Standards Committee at its meeting on 10 December 2015.

The Policy and Challenge Group was advised that when a complaint was received, this was brought to the attention of the relevant functional head who would allocate a manager to investigate the complaint and aim to respond within 10 working days. The majority of operational vehicles were fitted with CCTV cameras. Where this was available, the footage was viewed by Service Driving Instructors who would then issue a report setting out their professional opinion on the standard of driving. Where this footage was unavailable it was more difficult to determine whether an appeal should be upheld.

The complaints detailed in the report were received from 1 April 2014 – 31 October 2015.  Fifteen complaints on driving and parking of Service vehicles were received within this period.  Six had been upheld and one was inconclusive.  Of the upheld complaints, one related to the inappropriate non-operational parking of Service vehicles, two related to the driving causing member of the public driver to take evasive action to avoid a collision (the majority of these complaints related to vehicles on blue lights), one inappropriate normal road use whilst driving (eating and drinking whilst driving) and two related to unnecessary use of sirens disturbing local residents.  When complaints were upheld, drivers received written warnings or additional training as required.

It was noted that drivers of fire appliances were trained to avoid forcing other road users to take evasive action.  Drivers were also advised not to use sirens and horns when this was not necessary.

The report included guidance from the Highway Code on Emergency and Incident Support vehicles.  The behaviour of other road users when confronted with emergency vehicles on blue lights was discussed and it was suggested that the Service could consider issuing a press release to remind members of the public of the guidance for drivers in relation to emergency vehicles.

It was noted that the majority of complaints were not upheld and that the complaints received must be considered in the context of the Service responding to approximately 7000 incidents per year.

**RESOLVED:**
That the report be acknowledged.

Item 5.5

15-16/SD/047 Corporate Risk Register

DCFO Ranger introduced the review of the Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery. There were no changes to individual risks in the Register.

There were a number of updates relating to CRR01: If we do not plan properly for major operational incidents then we may not be able to resolve the incident appropriately and thus adversely effect our service delivery provision. These included the audit of the Service's fire special operations team, new mobilising arrangements for water incident management officers and continuing joint exercises organised through the Local Resilience Forum.

**RESOLVED:**
That the review by the Service of the Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery be approved.

15-16/SD/048 Work Programme

The Group received its updated Work Programme for 2015/16.It was noted that the annual review of performance would be conducted at the Policy and Challenge Group's next meeting.

**RESOLVED:**
That the work programme for 2015/16 and the 'cyclical' agenda items for each meeting in 2015/16 be acknowledged.

The meeting finished at 11.45am.

**For Publication**

**Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group**
**16 June 2016**
**Item No. 6**

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:**     **SECRETARY/MONITORING OFFICER**

**SUBJECT:**     **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

---

For further information
on this Report contact:

Mrs Karen Daniels
Service Assurance Manager
Tel No:  01234 845013

---

Background Papers:     None

---

Implications (tick ✓):

| LEGAL | | FINANCIAL | |
|---|---|---|---|
| HUMAN RESOURCES | | EQUALITY IMPACT | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | POLICY | |
| CORPORATE RISK | Known | OTHER (please specify) | |
| | New | CORE BRIEF | |

*Any implications affecting this report are noted at the end of the report.*

---

**PURPOSE:**

To review the Terms of Reference for the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That:

1.     Members consider the Terms of Reference for the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group and recommend any changes for 2016/17 to the Fire Authority.

2.     The Terms of Reference be updated to include a statement that the Group reports to the Fire and Rescue Authority.

---

Item 6.1

1.	Introduction

1.1	The Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group has been established to ensure that the following areas of the Fire and Rescue Service are functioning efficiently and effectively, challenging areas of under performance as required and approving any associated policy as necessary:

- Emergency Response
- Prevention
- Protection

2.	Terms of Reference

2.1	The Terms of Reference for the Policy and Challenge Group were last revised in June 2014 and are appended to this report.

2.2	An Internal Audit carried out by RSM in February 2016 made a recommendation that the Terms of References for the Policy and Challenge Groups and Audit and Standards Committee be updated to define to whom they report.

2.3	Members are asked to consider the current Terms of Reference and recommend any changes required for 2016/17 to the Fire and Rescue Authority.


**J ATKINSON**
**SECRETARY/MONITORING OFFICER**

# SERVICE DELIVERY POLICY AND CHALLENGE GROUP

The Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group has been established to ensure that the following areas of Service are functioning efficiently and effectively, challenging areas of under performance as required and approving any associated policy as necessary:

- Emergency Response
- Prevention
- Protection

## Membership

The Group is to consist of those Members appointed by the Fire and Rescue Authority for the ensuing year or as determined by the Fire and Rescue Authority.

One elected Member will be nominated as Chair of the Group by the Fire and Rescue Authority at its annual meeting and another elected Member will be nominated as Vice Chair at the first Group meeting held after the annual meeting. The Group may co-opt onto its membership any person, such as representatives or members of groups, who may provide specialist information or skills in assisting the Group to reach its aims and objectives set out below.

## Quorum

Business shall not be transacted at any meeting of the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group unless at least three Members are present and at least one Member from two constituent authorities.

## Support

The Group will be supported by the individual Principal Officer with responsibility for Service Delivery, the Service Delivery Team and members of the Strategic Support Team.

## Regularity of Meetings

The Group is to meet a minimum of four times a year.  Other meetings can be called when deemed necessary by any member of the Group and following agreement with the Group Chair.

## *Reporting*

*The Group has no delegated power to take decisions but its minutes are submitted to the FRA under a covering report from the Group's Chair with any recommendations.*

**Terms of Reference**

1. To consider and report as necessary on performance in respect of the Service Delivery Directorate functions and be involved in the setting and monitoring of Service targets.

2. To approve the Service Delivery Sections of the Fire and Rescue Authority's Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) and associated annual action plans.

3. To consider and approve the Service Delivery Strategy and associated annual action plans.

4. To monitor the progress of the Service Delivery projects identified in the Community Risk Management Plan.

5. To commission and oversee reviews into specified areas of work within the Service Delivery Directorate.

6. To oversee the Community Risk Management Plan consultation processes, consider any responses, and make changes where appropriate.

7. To consider any external reports relating to the Service Delivery functions.

8. To monitor and review matters arising from the former FiReControl project.

9. To monitor the effective identification and management of corporate risks relating to Service Delivery functions.

*Revised Terms of Reference agreed by the CFA on 7 September 2011*

*Updated for change of Authority name – December 2012*

*Quorum included – 25 June 2014*

*Reporting included for consideration at SD Policy and Challenge Group on 16 June 2016*

Item 6.4

**For Publication**

**Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group**
**16 June 2016**
**Item No. 7**

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:**     **DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

**SUBJECT:**     **SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAMME AND PERFORMANCE YEAR END 2015/16 - QUARTER FOUR (APRIL TO MARCH 2016)**

---

For further information      Alison Ashwood
on this Report contact:     Head of Strategic Support
                            Tel No:  01234 845015

---

**Background Papers:**

Previous Service Delivery Programme and Quarterly Performance Summary Reports

---

Implications (tick ✓):

| LEGAL | | FINANCIAL | ✓ |
|---|---|---|---|
| HUMAN RESOURCES | ✓ | EQUALITY IMPACT | ✓ |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | ✓ | POLICY | ✓ |
| CORPORATE RISK | Known ✓ | CORE BRIEF | |
| | New | OTHER (please specify) | |

*Any implications affecting this report are noted at the end of the report.*

---

**PURPOSE:**

To provide the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group with a report for 2015/16 Quarter 4, detailing:

1.     Progress and status of the Service Delivery Programme and Projects to date.

2.     A summary report of performance against Service Delivery performance indicators and associated targets for Quarter Four 2015/16 (1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Members acknowledge the progress made on the Service Delivery Programmes and Performance and consider any issues arising.

---

Item 7.1

1.   Programmes and Projects 2015/16

1.1  Projects contained in this report have been reviewed and endorsed in February 2016 by the Authority's Policy and Challenge Groups as part of their involvement in the annual process of reviewing the rolling four-year programme of projects for their respective areas in order to update the CRMP in line with the Authority's planning cycle.

1.2  The review of the current programme of strategic projects falling within the scope of the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group has confirmed that:

➢  All existing projects continue to meet the criteria for inclusion within the strategic improvement programme.

➢  All existing projects remain broadly on track to deliver their outcomes within target timescales and resourcing.

➢  Are within the medium-term strategic assessment for Service Delivery areas; and

➢  The current programme is capable of incorporating, under one or more existing projects, all anticipated additional strategic improvement initiatives relating to Service Delivery over the next three years.

1.3  Full account of the financial implications of the Service Delivery programme for 2016/17 to 2019/20 has been taken within the proposed 2016/17 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan, as presented to the Authority for agreement in February 2016.

1.4  The Retained Duty System Improvement Project (RDSIP) is underway, with a revised date of end May 2016 for implementation following some User Acceptance testing issues which are now being resolved; there will be a two to three week trial run prior to the termination of Rappel.

1.5  A solution has finally been agreed in principle for the Replacement Mobilising System, with a proposed 'go live' date of 27 September 2016 with the 4i mobilising system.

1.6  Other points of note and changes for the year include the following:

➢  The Corporate Management Team monitors progress of the Strategic Projects monthly.  The Strategic Programme Board reviews the Programme at least twice a year with the next Programme Board review scheduled for 22 September 2016.

The status of each project is noted using the following key:

| Colour Code | Status |
| --- | --- |
| GREEN | No issues.  On course to meet targets. |
| AMBER | Some issues. May not meet targets. |
| RED | Significant issues.  Will fall outside agreed targets. |

Item 7.2

2.      Performance

2.1     In line with its Terms of Reference, the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group is required to monitor performance against key performance indicators and associated targets for areas falling within the scope of the Group.  It has been previously agreed by the Group, that in order to facilitate this, it should receive quarterly summary performance reports at each of its meetings.

2.2     This report presents members with the performance summary outturn for Quarter Four 2015/16 which covers the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016.  Performance is shown in Appendix B.  The indicators and targets included within the report are those established as part of the Authority's 2015/16 planning cycle.

2.3     The status of each measure is noted using the following key:

| Colour Code | Exception Report | Status |
|---|---|---|
| GREEN | n/a | Met or surpassed target |
| AMBER | Required | Missed but within 10% of target |
| RED | Required | Missed target by greater than 10% |

3.      Summary and Exception Reports Q4 – Year End 2015/16

        All performance indicators are on target with the exception of:

3.1     **FPI 11 - The % of Occasions When Our Response Time for Critical Fire Incidents Were Met against Agreed Response Standards:**  We finished at 2% under our tight target of 80%, this measure is very dependent upon incident location and a relatively small number of critical incidents in remote locations can significantly affect the measure outcome.

3.2     **CH 1 - % Calls Answered in 7 Seconds:**  The failure of an IT data storage device has meant we are currently unable to provide the data for this measure.  The equipment is not critical to the operation of the mobilising system and corrective action is being taken to restore functionality.  At Q3 performance was 9% better than target and historically performance has consistently exceeded target.

3.3     **CH 2 - % of Calls Mobilized in 60 Seconds or Less:**  We missed our target on this measure by 1.25% which represents just under 40 calls, we will review and monitor call handling over the next quarter to ensure there are no ongoing issues.  It should be noted that we do regularly audit calls but there are occasions where callers do not have full details and make it difficult for the Control operator to dispatch appliances within the prescribed timescales.

3.4     **CH 3 - Number of Calls to FAM (Hoax) - Mobilized to and CH 4 - Number of Calls to HOAX - Not Attended:**  These two measures are used as comparators; the number in CH3 should lower as the number in CH4 rises.  We have noted that the figures are moving apart again and will conduct

further analysis to try to understand if there are any other issues that are affecting these. Both the measures have been revised for the next financial year and will stand on their own with their own target.

3.5 **FSO 3 - Total Number of Fire Safety Audits Completed on Very High Risk Premises:** Whilst we have missed the target this is due to the revision of the criteria which categorise very high risk, we currently now only have two very high risk premises in the service area of which just one is occupied and that one has been inspected.

3.6 **FSO 4 - Total Number of Fire Safety Audits Carried Out on High Risk Premises:** We have completed 124 high risk audits in quarter 4. Historically, there were over 800 high risk premises requiring audit in 2013. This was split over two years so that the original target was 400 per year as stated in the performance report. However, since 2013 a significant number of premises have been assisted through the audit process to manage down their risk by various methods. As of last month there were only 222 high risk premises to audit - down from 800 two years ago. This is a fantastic achievement. One upshot of this is that there are now gaps in our inspection calendar. The team are bringing forward planned audits to plug this gap but there is a limit to how far forward we can go before we start auditing premises every ten months (or even less). To audit more frequently would cause businesses much concern.

**GLEN RANGER**
**DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

Item 7.4

APPENDIX A

**SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAMME REPORT**

| Project Description | Aim | Performance Status | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Replacement Mobilising System** | Replace mobilising system to provide resilient, dynamic mobilisation of Fire Service assets. | Red | **19 May 2016**<br><br>Following the process to hold the supplier to contract positive progress has been made on aspects of the system.  Configuration has been slow due to the availability of the system.  Following meetings with the supplier and legal representatives a solution has been agreed in principle that will deliver a go live date of 27th September 2016 for BFRS to go live with the 4i mobilising system.<br><br>**Progress anticipated in the next period**<br><br>Configuration is expected to continue on the system.  Refresher training for control staff will be arranged.  Control staff will quality assure the configuration work already completed.  Training on the Frequentis Integrated Command and Control System will be arranged.  Once we have live system further User and Acceptance testing will be carried out to confirm that the system is functioning correctly, in accordance with the agreed specification. |

| Project Description | Aim | Performance Status | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Retained Duty System Improvement Project (RDSIP)** | To deliver improvements to the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the operation of the Retained Duty System within Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Service. | **Green** | **6 May 16**<br>User acceptance testing on the Gartan RDS availability module identified several issues with the software and as a result the implementation has been delayed slightly whilst waiting for Gartan to resolve them.  The majority of the retained stations have now had the training and have been using the software for a period of time and have reported no further issues.<br><br>A revised date of end May 2016 has been agreed with Gartan and it is envisaged that a 2-3 week pilot of the live server will run before the Rappel system is finally terminated. Final checks of skills of personnel and working patterns will be conducted during the trial.<br><br>A presentation has been delivered to members of the HR and Payroll teams to ensure that the new HR system is compatible with Gartan and the systems are able to interface with one and another.<br><br>Due to the complexity and bespoke nature of 'smart' alerting the Service has not been able to form a partnership with the Consortium to produce a framework.  The ability to commence procurement has also been impacted by the significant delay in the replacement of our mobilisation system (alerting technology must integrate with the mobilising system).  In view of the uncertainty over when the RMS will be in place and the length of time that it may take to develop a dynamic selective alerting system, the decision has been taken to implement interim phased alert arrangements based upon self-rostering utilising the existing mobilising/alert system.  This will involve procurement of new alerter units with enhanced capabilities.  The new Communication Manger is working in conjunction with RDSIPM to produce a blue light tender specification for replacement alerters. Phased alerting will be introduced at all RDS stations to initially allow for co-responding calls. |

| Project Description | Aim | Performance Status | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Retained Duty System Improvement Project (RDSIP), cont…….** | To deliver improvements to the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the operation of the Retained Duty System within Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Service. | **Green** | Stakeholder working groups will commence in May to progress the project work-streams, such as recruitment and retention, rostering and phased alert, banded retainers.<br><br>**Progress anticipated in the next period**<br><br>• Establishment of working groups for work streams such as recruitment and retention, rostering and phased alert, banded retainers, alternative training approaches, Gartan User Group.<br>• Complete administration training for BIT<br>• Gartan availability module to go live following a test phase.<br>• Phased alerting implemented at Stations for co-responding calls.<br>• RDS personnel being included on the overtime databases to provide cover at both wholetime and RDS stations when there is a shortfall of personnel. |
| **Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme ESMCP** | The Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP) has been established to meet the future requirements for mobile voice and data communications for the emergency services, to replace and upgrade the current Airwave System, which is reaching the end of its contracted lifespan.<br><br>This is a national project led by CFOA and the DCLG.  There is a National Programme Board, and Regional Project Boards have been set up across the country. | **Amber** | Regional project team is being established, GC Lisa Jackson from Hertfordshire is the Project Co-ordinator for the Eastern Region.  Still very little information coming down from the Home Office which allows BFRS to complete anything tangible.  Regular meetings of the project team are taking place which is ensuring that this project still has a focus, quarterly meetings for the Project board are in place.<br><br>A briefing meeting was held for all interested parties from across the Service.  The work streams are being defined from this meeting, which also identified risks and issues to be assessed. |

**SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2015/16 YEAR END**

| | Measure | | | 2015-16 Quarter 4 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Description | Aim | Full Year Target | Five Year Average | Q4 2014-15 | Q4 Actual | Q4 Target | Performance against Target | Comments |
| **PI 01** | CPI 01 - Primary Fires per 100,000 Population | Smaller is Better | 190.07 | 178.32 | 164.44 | 156.83 | 190.07 | Green | 17% Better than target |
| | FPI 01 - Primary Fires | | 1205 | 1118 | 1059 | 1010 | 1205 | | |
| **PI 02** | CPI 02 - Primary Fires Fatalities per 100,000 Population | Smaller is Better | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.47 | 0.47 | Green | Aim to achieve fewer than 3 fatalities |
| | FPI 02 - Primary Fire Fatalities | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | |
| **PI 03** | CPI 03 - Primary Fires Injuries per 100,000 Population | Smaller is Better | 5.31 | 3.70 | 2.95 | 3.57 | 5.31 | Green | 33% Better than target |
| | FPI 03 - Primary Fire Injuries | | 33 | 23 | 19 | 23 | 33 | | |
| **PI 04** | CPI 04 - Deliberate (Arson) Fires per 10,000 Population | Smaller is Better | 16.84 | 14.77 | 12.03 | 11.61 | 16.84 | Green | 31% Better than target |
| | FPI 04 - Deliberate (Arson) Fires | | 1068 | 924 | 775 | 748 | 1068 | | |
| **PI 05** | CPI 05 - Accidental Dwelling Fires per 10,000 dwellings | Smaller is Better | 13.71 | 15.60 | 16.25 | 13.08 | 13.71 | Green | 5% Better than target |
| | FPI 05 - Accidental Dwelling Fires | | 346 | 386 | 415 | 334 | 346 | | |

Item 7.8

**SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2015/16 YEAR END**

| Measure | | | | 2015-16 Quarter 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Description | Aim | Full Year Target | Five Year Average | Q4 2014-15 | Q4 Actual | Q4 Target | Performance against Target | Comments |
| PI 07 | FPI 07 - Number of Deliberate Building Fires | Smaller is Better | 155 | 139 | 107 | 64 | 155 | Green | 59% better than target |
| PI 08 | SSI 1 - Number of water related deaths | Smaller is Better | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | Green | Aim to achieve fewer than 2 fatalities |
| PI 09 | SSI 2 - Number of water related injuries | Smaller is Better | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Green | Aim to achieve fewer than 2 injuries |
| RTC | Number of RTC's Attended | Info Only | n/a | 379 | 439 | 274 | n/a | n/a | Info Only |
| KSI | Ksi - No. of People Killed or Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Collisions (Partnership Indicator) | Info Only | n/a | 221 | 205 | 214 | n/a | n/a | Info Only |

Item 7.9

**SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2015/16 YEAR END**

| Measure | | | | 2015-16 Quarter 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Description | Aim | Full Year Target | Five Year Average | Q4 2014-15 | Q4 Actual | Q4 Target | Performance against Target | Comments |
| PI 10 | **FPI 10 - The % of Occasions Global Crewing Enabled 5 and 4 (Whole-time)** | Higher is Better | 90% | 97% | 95% | 96% | 90% | Green | 6% better than target |
| PI 11 | **FPI 11 - The % of Occasions when our Response Time for Critical Fire Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards** | Higher is Better | 80% | 96% | 96% | 78% | 80% | Amber | Missed target by 2% |
| PI 12 | **FPI 12 - The % of Occasions when our Response Time for RTC Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards** | Higher is Better | 80% | 86% | 94% | 87% | 80% | Green | 8% better than target |
| PI 13 | **FPI 13 - The % of Occasions when our Response Times for Secondary Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards** | Higher is Better | 96% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 96% | Green | 2% better than target |

**SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2015/16 YEAR END**

| Measure | | | | 2015-16 Quarter 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Description | Aim | Full Year Target | Five Year Average | Q4 2014-15 | Q4 Actual | Q4 Target | Performance against Target | Comments |
| CH 1 | CH 1 - % Calls Answered in 7 seconds | Higher is Better | 90% | 96% | 95% | Data n/a | 90% | Data n/a | See exception report |
| CH 2 | CH 2 - % of Calls Mobilized in 60 Seconds or Less | Higher is Better | 60% | 62% | 65% | 59% | 60% | Amber | Missed target by 1% |
| CH 3 | CH 3 - Number of Calls to FAM (Hoax) - Mobilized To | Comparator Indicator | n/a | 130 | 123 | 171 | The number in CH3 should lower as the number in CH4 rises | | |
| CH 4 | CH 4 - Number of Calls to HOAX - Not Attended | Comparator Indicator | | 186 | 136 | 149 | | | |
| CH 5 | CH 5 - Number of calls to FAGI – Mobilized to | Smaller is Better | 942 | 757 | 722 | 688 | 942 | Green | 26% better than target |

Notes: ¹The target for CH2 % of Calls Mobilised in 60 Seconds or Less has been temporarily revised down to 60% by the SDP&C Group as it has proved unfeasible to collate end to end call data for all calls and satisfactorily exclude those that would normally be out of scope. The introduction of the new mobilising system will in future permit all calls to be measured from actual time of call to time of mobilisation and a commentary recorded to any call where due to circumstances beyond the service control the time is protracted.

Item 7.11

**SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2015/16 YEAR END**

| Measure | | | | 2015-16 Quarter 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Description | Aim | Full Year Target | Five Year Average | Q4 2014-15 | Q4 Actual | Q4 Target | Performance against Target | Comments |
| FS01 | FSO 1 - The percentage of Building Regulation consultations completed within the prescribed timescale | Higher is Better | 95% | 99% | 97% | 96% | 95% | Green | 1% better than target |
| FS02 | FSO 2 - Total number of Fire safety audits completed | Higher is Better | 850 | 1413 | 2203 | 1647 | 850 | Green | 94% better than target |
| FS03 | FSO 3 - Total number of Fire safety audits completed on very high risk premises | Higher is Better | 9 | 8 | 11 | 1 | 9 | Red | See exception report |
| FS04 | FSO 4 - Total number of Fire Safety audits carried out on high risk premises | Higher is Better | 400 | 265 | 332 | 220 | 400 | Red | Missed target by 45% |
| FS05 | FS0 5a - Non Domestic Fires per 1,000 non – domestic properties | Smaller is Better | 10.30 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10.30 | Green | 27% better than target |
| | FS0 5b - Total No of Fires in Non-domestic Buildings | Smaller is Better | 179 | 167 | 138 | 133 | 179 | | |
| FS06 | FSO 06a – AFD FA's / Non Domestic properties per 1,000 non – domestic properties | Smaller is Better | 58.45 | 59 | 58 | 50 | 58.45 | Green | 15% better than target |
| | FSO 06b – AFD FA's in Non – Domestic properties | Smaller is Better | 1029 | 1025 | 1025 | 872 | 1029 | | |

*Notes: The comments column on the right hand side shows a comparison of actual against target as a percentage, it should be noted that all targets are represented as 100% and the actual is a percentage of that target.*

**For Publication**                    **Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority**
                                        **Service Delivery Policy and Challenge**
                                        **Group**
                                        **16 June 2016**
                                        **Item No. 9**

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:**          **HEAD OF SAFETY AND STRATEGIC PROJECTS**

**SUBJECT:**                **CORPORATE RISK REGISTER**

---

For further information         Service Operational Commander Tony Rogers
on this Report contact:         Head of Safety and Strategic Projects
                                Tel No:  01234 845163

---

Background Papers:          None

---

Implications (tick ✓):

| LEGAL | | | FINANCIAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HUMAN RESOURCES | | | EQUALITY IMPACT | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | POLICY | |
| CORPORATE RISK | Known | ✓ | CORE BRIEF | |
| | New | | OTHER (please specify) | |

*Any implications affecting this report are noted at the end of the report.*

---

**PURPOSE:**

To consider the Service's Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Members note and approve the review by the Service of the Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery.

---

1.      Introduction

1.1     Members have requested a standing item to be placed on the Agenda of the Policy and Challenge Groups for the consideration of risks relating to the remit of each Group.  In addition, the Fire and Rescue Authority's (FRA) Audit and Standards Committee receives regular reports on the full Corporate Risk Register.

Item 9.1

1.2     An extract of the Corporate Risk Register showing the risks appropriate to the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group will be available at the meeting. Explanatory notes regarding the risk ratings applied is appended to this report.

2.      Current Revisions

2.1     The register is reviewed on a monthly basis during the Service's Corporate Management Team (CMT) meetings and by CMT members between these meetings if required.  A copy of the risks relevant to the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group are attached for your information and approval.

2.2     Changes to individual risk ratings in the Corporate Risk Register:  None.  All risks that are reported to the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group have been reviewed and there are no risk rating changes to report to Members.

2.3     Updates to individual risks in the Corporate Risk Register:

- **CRR01:  If we do not plan properly for major operational incidents then we may not be able to resolve the incident appropriately and thus adversely affect our service delivery provision:**  The Service continues to support on-going command and control training with partner agencies supporting multi-agency working and facilitating joint understanding of individual roles and responsibilities.  As part of these arrangements an exercise at Cranfield Airport was recently completed testing both Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue Service's mobilising arrangements of resources to specific areas within the county with further joint exercises scheduled throughout the year.

- **CRR 02:  If we cannot recruit or retain adequate numbers of part time fire fighters, particularly in relation to day cover, then we will not be able to fully crew our fire appliances and thus have a detrimental impact on our service delivery due to the unavailability of our fire appliances:**  Following on from previous reports to Members the new software system Gartan has been procured and implementation work has commenced.  Initial testing identified areas that require further analysis and the Service is working with Gartan to address these; however the existing mobilising arrangements are functioning effectively.  To date the majority of the retained stations have now received training in the use of Gartan and have been using the software with further training dates to be arranged.

3.      Business Continuity

3.1     As part of the Service's Business Continuity (BC) arrangements a programme of testing is now being developed that will cover all of the Service's BC plans on a cyclical process.  The thorough testing of these plans will ensure that in the event of functional or service wide business interruption the Service is still able to deliver vital services to the communities.


**SERVICE OPERATIONAL COMMANDER TONY ROGERS
HEAD OF SAFETY AND STRATEGIC PROJECTS**

Item 9.3

Explanatory tables in regard to the risk impact scores, the risk rating and the risk strategy.

Risk Rating

| Risk Rating/Colour | Risk Rating Considerations/Action |
|---|---|
| **Very High** | High risks which require urgent management attention and action. Where appropriate, practical and proportionate to do so, new risk controls must be implemented as soon as possible, to reduce the risk rating. New controls aim to:<br>• reduce the likelihood of a disruption<br>• shorten the period of a disruption if it occurs<br>• limit the impact of a disruption if it occurs<br>These risks are monitored by CMT risk owner on a regular basis and reviewed quarterly and annually by CMT. |
| **High** | These are high risks which require management attention and action. Where practical and proportionate to do so, new risk controls *should* be implemented to reduce the risk rating as the aim above.  These risks are monitored by CMT risk owner on a regular basis and reviewed quarterly and annually by CMT. |
| **Moderate** | These are moderate risks.  New risk controls should be considered and scoped.  Where practical and proportionate, selected controls should be prioritised for implementation.  These risks are monitored and reviewed by CMT. |
| **Low** | These risks are unlikely to occur and are not significant in their impact. They are managed within CMT management framework and reviewed by CMT. |

Risk Strategy

| Risk Strategy | Description |
|---|---|
| Treat | Implement and monitor the effectiveness of new controls to reduce the risk rating.  This may involve significant resource to achieve (IT infrastructure for data replication/storage, cross-training of specialist staff, providing standby-premises etc) or may comprise a number of low cost, or cost neutral, mitigating  measures which cumulatively reduce the risk rating (a validated Business Continuity plan, documented and regularly rehearsed building evacuation procedures etc) |
| Tolerate | A risk may be acceptable without any further action being taken depending on the risk appetite of the organisation.  Also, while there may clearly be additional new controls which could be implemented to 'treat' a risk, if the cost of treating the risk is greater than the anticipated impact and loss should the risk occur, then it may be decided to tolerate the risk maintaining existing risk controls only |
| Transfer | It may be possible to transfer the risk to a third party  (conventional insurance or service provision (outsourcing)), however it is not possible to transfer the responsibility for the risk which remains with BFRS |
| Terminate | In some circumstances it may be appropriate or possible to terminate or remove the risk altogether by changing policy, process, procedure or function |

**For Publication**

**Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority
Service Delivery Policy and Challenge
Group
16 June 2016
Item No. 10**

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:**     **DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

**SUBJECT:**     **WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

---

For further information
on this report contact:

Karen Daniels
Service Assurance Manager
Tel No: 01234 845013

---

Background Papers:     None

---

Implications (tick ✓):

| LEGAL | | | FINANCIAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HUMAN RESOURCES | | | EQUALITY IMPACT | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | POLICY | |
| CORPORATE RISK | Known | ✓ | OTHER (please specify) | |
| | New | | CORE BRIEF | |

*Any implications affecting this report are noted at the end of the report.*

---

**PURPOSE:**

To report on the work programme for 2016/17 and to provide Members with an opportunity to request additional reports for the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group meetings.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Members consider the work programme for 2016/17 and note the 'cyclical' Agenda Items for each meeting in 2016/17.

**GLEN RANGER
DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

**SERVICE DELIVERY POLICY AND CHALLENGE GROUP (SDPCG) PROGRAMME OF WORK 2016/17**

| Meeting Date | 'Cyclical' Agenda Items | | Additional / Commissioned Agenda Items | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Item** | **Notes** | **Item** | **Notes** |
| 16 June 2016 | • Appointment of Vice Chair<br>• Review Terms of Reference<br>• SD Performance Monitoring Report (Annual Review) and Programmes to date<br>• Audit and Governance Action Plans Monitoring Report<br>• New Internal Audits Completed to date<br>• Operational Decisions Made<br>• Corporate Risk Register<br>• Work Programme 2016/17 | None<br><br>None<br><br>Verbal Update | | |

Item 10.2

| Meeting Date | 'Cyclical' Agenda Items | | Additional / Commissioned Agenda Items | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Item** | **Notes** | **Item** | **Notes** |
| 15 September 2016 | • SD Performance Monitoring Report Q1 and Programmes to date<br><br>• Audit and Governance Action Plans Monitoring Report<br><br>• New Internal Audits Completed to date<br><br>• Corporate Risk Register<br><br>• Customer Satisfaction report (Q4 2015/16 and Q1 2016/17)<br><br>• Operational Decisions Made<br><br>• Work Programme 2016/17 | <br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Verbal Update | Review of Retained Duty System | Added SDPCG 10 March 2015 |

| Meeting Date | 'Cyclical' Agenda Items | | Additional/Commissioned Agenda Items | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Item | Notes | Item | Notes |
| 1 December 2016 | • SD Performance Monitoring Report Q2 and Programmes to date<br>• Audit and Governance Action Plans Monitoring Report<br>• New Internal Audits Completed to date<br>• Corporate Risk Register<br>• Customer Satisfaction Report (Q2)<br>• Operational Decisions Made<br>• Work Programme 2016/17<br>• Review of the Fire Authority's Effectiveness | Verbal Update | | |

Item 10.4

| Meeting Date | 'Cyclical' Agenda Items | | Additional / Commissioned Agenda Items | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Item | Notes | Item | Notes |
| 23 March 2017 | • SD Performance Monitoring Report Q3 and Programmes to date<br>• Proposed Service Delivery Indicators and Targets 2017/18<br>• Audit and Governance Action Plan Monitoring Report<br>• New Internal Audits Completed to date<br>• Corporate Risk Register<br>• Customer Satisfaction Report (Q3)<br>• Operational Decisions Made<br>• Review of the Work Programme 2016/17 | Verbal Update | | |

This page is intentionally left blank