For Publication

Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority
Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group
23 March 2017
Item No. 5

REPORT AUTHOR:	**DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**
SUBJECT:	**SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAMME AND PERFORMANCE 2016/17 - QUARTER 3 (APRIL TO DECEMBER 2016)**

For further information on this Report contact:	Alison Ashwood 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 2016/17 Quarter 3, 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 3 2016/17 (1 April 2016 to 31 December 2016).

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. <u>Programmes and Projects 2017/18</u>

1.1 Projects contained in this report have been reviewed and endorsed in February 2017 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 2017/18 to 2020/21 has been taken within the proposed 2017/18 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan, as presented to the Authority for agreement in February 2017.

1.4   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 on 14 April 2017.

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.

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 3 2016/17 which covers the period 1 April 2016 to 31 December 2016. Performance is shown in Appendix B. The indicators and targets included within the report are those established as part of the Authority's 2016/17 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 Q3 – 2016/17

      Project Exceptions:

3.1   The Replacement Mobilising System, with a revised 'go live' date of end November 2016 with the 4i mobilising system, has been further delayed due to technical difficulties beyond Service control, and will now be delivered in the summer of 2017.

3.2   The delays in the Replacement Mobilising System project have had a knock on effect on the implementation of Retained Duty System Improvement Project (RDSIP). The estimated project completion is now 31 March 2018 (originally set at 30 June 2017).

3.3   The Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP) is still rated Amber due to on-going national delays. BFRS continues to work with other Fire and Rescue Services within the region.

      Performance Indicators:

3.4   **Pi 20 - Number of calls to FAGI – Mobilized to**
      The categorisation False Alarm Good Intent (FAGI) is applied to incidents where a call is made in good faith in the belief that FRS intervention is needed, but on attending it is found that FRS is not required (e.g. steam from a heating system is mistaken for smoke and the FRS is called). The purpose of this performance indicator is to measure the performance of Control Operators in minimising the number of mobilisations to this type of false alarm through effective call handling. For Q1 and Q2 Performance Report performance against target for this indicator was categorised as 'RED' and members were advised that the Service Control Commander was investigating performance. This investigation has identified that a significant proportion of Incident Reports were incorrectly categorised as FAGI by operational managers. In particular, where a call triggered by a fire alarm operation turns out to be a false alarm (e.g. dust triggers fire alarm resulting in call to FRS and mobilisation) this should be categorised as 'False Alarm due to Apparatus'. However on a significant proportion of incidents this type of false alarm has incorrectly been categorised as FAGI. These IRS are being corrected and quality assurance process has been put in place to check all future IRS to ensure the correct category has been applied. With the removal of those incidents that were not actually FAGI performance is better than target.

All performance indicators are on target, except for:

3.5   **PI 02 - Primary Fire Fatalities**
      We have experienced three fire fatalities already this year.

3.6   **PI 04 - Deliberate (Arson) Fires per 10,000 Population**
      We remain above the target due to the high spike in Quarter 2. The number of these incidents in Quarter 3 (164) is in line with the average for this period on its own over the last 5 years. The Community Safety Arson Adviser continues to monitor the trends and identify Community Safety initiatives.

3.7   **PI 11 - The % of Occasions when our Response Time for Critical Fire Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards**
      The target attendance time was not achieved on response to 24 (out of 82) critical fire incidents. Just over half of these were in urban areas such as Bedford, Luton and Dunstable. On 14 occasions the appliance not meeting the response time target

was RDS crewed. There were a variety of reasons that the response time target was not met including:

- Distance/travel time to the incident;
- Non-availability (due to insufficient crew) of closest RDS appliance;
- Non-availability (committed to another incident) of closest WDS
- Appliance; and
- Impact of RDS 'turn-in' time on overall response time.

Work is ongoing through the RDS improvement project to improve the crewing and availability of RDS appliances.

3.8   PI 19 - Percentage of FAM & HOAX Calls - Not Attended
The actual percentage for the quarter alone dipped from an average of 51% over the past two years to 38% we have asked the Service Control Commander to investigate.

3.9   PI 24 - The percentage of Building Regulation consultations completed within the prescribed timescale
The problems previously reported to members continue to present themselves and despite more efforts being made to turn around consultations more quickly we have missed the target by 1%.

3.10   PI 26 - Total number of Fire Safety audits carried out on very high & high risk premises
The reported performance figure appears to be lower than targeted; the following reasons explain the differential:

The annual target for 2016/17 is 224 and this was set by members of the SD P&C Group at their meeting 10/03/2016.

Of the annual target of 224;

- 31   Premises, during Q4 2015/16, had their risk rating reduced from high to medium (post 2016/17 annual target setting approval by SD P&C Group meeting   10/03/2016), so these will no longer form part of the 224 targets set;

- 9   High risk premises were found to be un-occupied so no audit was conducted;

- 3   High risk premises have been demolished - so no audit was conducted;

- 4   High risk premises have converted back into private dwellings - so no audit was conducted;

- 40   High risk premises (HMO's) were visited with the aim of completing a full audit, however a full audit is not always possible (an example would be absent landlords who may live elsewhere, even overseas).

    This can mean that documentation / records are not available to conduct the audit according to Home Office benchmark standards. When this happens Fire Inspectors conduct a physical check of the common areas - including the condition of the fire alarm, emergency

lighting, fire doors and escape routes. In short it is confirmed that the building is safe from fire;

- 100   Full fire safety audits have been completed up to Q3 2016/17; and

- 37   High risk premises requiring audit during the fourth and final quarter.

Due to these reasons the current number of high and very high risk premises has been reduced by approximately 40. A proposal to reduce the associated target will be made during the annual review process.

3.11   PI 28 – AFD FA's in Non – Domestic properties
As per last quarter, the draft target set was challenging and reaching this was always going to be subject to the implementation of revised AFA mobilisation procedure. Once implemented, significant reductions in AFA in non-domestic premises are predicted. Consultation on the revised policy is well underway and it is envisaged that changes to the current AFA mobilising procedures will be affective from March 2017.

GLEN RANGER
DEPUTY CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAMME REPORT

Project Description	Aim	Performance Status	Comments
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. 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**	**06 March 2017** The project is still rated amber due to the ongoing national delays, which are outside local control. The Service continues to work regionally to represent and work with other FRSs within the region; the most recent Regional Fire Group meeting attended was on 25 January 2017. The latest update from the Home Office is as follows: • Hand-held devices will not now be available until mid-2018. Procurement for these will now be via a mini-competition process; • The DNSP pricing options are about to be released; • East of England Fire Group has indicated to the Home Office that we expect to begin transition to ESN in 2019 (complete transition to ESN in December 2020). An EE Coverage workshop was attended at Police HQ in Hertfordshire on 20th January, and there are plans to attend BAPCO in March where EE are hosting Q&A workshops. Background transition work on feeding into device specifications and populating the central Huddle database with relevant Service information is ongoing. Service-wide communication bulletins remain on hold until there is more detailed information to share.

Project Description	Aim	Performance Status	Comments
Replacement Mobilising System (RMS)	Replace mobilising system to provide resilient, dynamic mobilisation of Fire Service assets.	**Amber**	**20 February 2017:** Since "Go Live" in November 2016 the Service has mobilised to 1500 incidents. During this time the system has been stable with only minor issues occurring. The mobilising Officers are very positive about the new system and are now looking to build on the training and consolidation that they have completed. Progress on the MDT's is ongoing and connectivity issues have now been resolved allowing for penetration testing, prior to the application for the CoCo to take place. Penetration testing was delayed by 2 weeks following some technical difficulties experienced, which required a collaborative effort between Essex, BFRS, Remsdaq and Airbus to resolve. Unfortunately, during the test itself, further connection issues arose which meant the full test could not be completed in the time remaining on the temporary licence issued by the Home Office. A re-test has been proposed for late March, subject to the Accreditor agreeing a temporary licence extension. This means that, despite best efforts, the expected go live with 4i will now extend into the summer.

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**	**20 February 2017** Following go live of the replacement mobilising system in November 2016 work will commence to integrate the Gartan availability module with the mobilising system so that appliance availability is automatically updated on the mobilising system as crewing changes. Configuration of the replacement mobilising system to enable phased alert at all RDS stations is underway. A model for phased alert at each RDS station is being developed. Phased alert has been successfully trialled for co-responding at Biggleswade and Leighton Buzzard. Work is underway to include RDS within the Strategic Reserve providing more flexible deployment of staff to improve appliance availability. A range of work is underway in the recruitment workstream including: - a review of turn-in requirements; - introduction of station Facebook pages to help in recruitment; - update of BFRS website recruitment area; - introduction of on-line application process and evening and weekend selection events. Work continues to configure the Gartan Payroll module to facilitate improved performance management. Implementation is contingent upon the iTrent HR system project.

SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE 2016/17 Quarter 3

No.	Description	Aim	2016-17 Full Year Target	Average over last 5 years	2015-16 Q3	Q3 Actual	Q3 Target	Performance against Target	Comments
Measure				**2016-17 Quarter 3**					
PI 01	**CPI 01 - Primary Fires per 100,000 Population**	Smaller is Better	156.28	128.90	122.52	115.84	117.21	Green	1% better than target
	FPI 01 - Primary Fires		1010	816	789	746	757.50		
PI 02	**CPI 02 - Primary Fires Fatalities per 100,000 Population**	Smaller is Better	0.5	0.22	0.47	0.47	0.38	Red	Aim to achieve fewer than 3 annual fatalities
	FPI 02 - Primary Fire Fatalities		3	1	3	3	2.25		
PI 03	**CPI 03 - Primary Fires Injuries per 100,000 Population**	Smaller is Better	3.41	2.69	2.64	2.17	2.56	Green	Aim to achieve fewer than 22 annual injuries
	FPI 03 - Primary Fire Injuries		22	17	17	14	16.50		
PI 04	**CPI 04 - Deliberate (Arson) Fires per 10,000 Population**	Smaller is Better	11.31	11.23	8.93	9.07	8.48	Amber	Missed target by 7%
	FPI 04 - Deliberate (Arson) Fires		731	709	575	584	548.25		

Measure			2016-17 Quarter 3					
No.	Description	Aim	2016-17 Full Year Target	Average over last 5 years	2015-16 Q3	Q3 Actual	Q3 Target	Performance against Target	Comments
PI 05	CPI 05 - Accidental Dwelling Fires per 10,000 dwellings	Smaller is Better	15.52	11.32	9.75	10.61	11.64	Green	9% better than target
	FPI 05 - Accidental Dwelling Fires		391	283	249	271	293.25		
PI 06	FPI 07 - Number of Deliberate Building Fires	Smaller is Better	112	98	51	42	84	Green	50% better than target
PI 10	FPI 14i - The % of Occasions Global Crewing Enabled 5 and 4 (Whole-time)	Higher is Better	90%	97%	95%	90%	90%	Green	On target
PI 11	FPI 14ii - The % of Occasions when our Response Time for Critical Fire Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards	Higher is Better	80%	76%	74%	74%	80%	Amber	Missed target by 6%
PI 12	FPI 12 - The % of Occasions when our Response Time for RTC Incidents were Met against Agreed Response Standards	Higher is Better	80%	90%	84%	82%	80%	Green	3% 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%	99%	96%	99%	96%	Green	3% better than target

Measure				2016-17 Quarter 3					
No.	Description	Aim	2016-17 Full Year Target	Average over last 5 years	2015-16 Q3	Q3 Actual	Q3 Target	Performance against Target	Comments
PI 16	CH 1 - % Calls Answered in 7 seconds	Higher is Better	90%	96%	97%	96%	90%	Green	7% better than target
PI 17	CH 2 - % of Calls Mobilized in 60 Seconds or Less	Higher is Better	60%	62%	59%	61%	60%	Green	2% better than target
PI 18	CH 3 - Number of Calls to FAM (Hoax) - Mobilized To	Lower is Better	140	104	114	112	140	Green	20% better than target
PI 19	CH 4 - Percentage of FAM & HOAX Calls - Not Attended	Higher is Better	55%	57%	52%	50%	55%	Amber	Missed target by 9%
PI 20	CH 5 - Number of calls to FAGI – Mobilized to	Lower is Better	721	563	529	364	540.75	Green	33% better than target

	Measure			2016-17 Quarter 3					
No.	Description	Aim	2016-17 Full Year Target	Average over last 5 years	2015-16 Q3	Q3 Actual	Q3 Target	Performance against Target	Comments
PI 24	**FS01 - The percentage of Building Regulation consultations completed within the prescribed timescale**	Higher is Better	95%	99%	96%	94%	95%	Amber	Missed target by 1%
PI 25	**FS02 - Fire Safety Audits/Inspections Completed**	Higher is Better	1900	1135	1153	1506	1425	Green	6% better than target
PI 26	**FS04 - Total number of Fire Safety audits carried out on very high & high risk premises**	Higher is Better	224	196	97	100	168	Red	Missed target by 40%
PI 27	**FS05a - Non Domestic Fires per 1,000 non – domestic properties**	Smaller is Better	8.63	6.43	5.62	5.11	6.47	Green	21% better than target
	FS05b - Total No of Fires in Non-domestic Buildings	Smaller is Better	152	112	99	90	114		
PI 28	**FS06a – AFD FA's / Non Domestic properties per 1,000 non – domestic properties**	Smaller is Better	44.41	44	39	37	33.31	Red	Missed target by 11%
	FS06b – AFD FA's in Non – Domestic properties	Smaller is Better	782	763	693	652	586.50		

Measure				2016-17 Quarter 3					
No.	Description	Aim	2016-17 Full Year Target	Average over last 5 years	2015-16 Q3	Q3 Actual	Q3 Target	Performance against Target	Comments
Inf01	RTC01 - Number of RTC's Attended	Smaller is Better	n/a	285	289	299	n/a	n/a	n/a
Inf02	RTC02 - KSi - No. of People Killed or Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Collisions (Partnership Indicator)	Smaller is Better	n/a	167	170	68*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Inf03	SSI 01 - Number of water related deaths	Smaller is Better	n/a	2	2	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Inf04	SSI 02 - Number of water related injuries	Smaller is Better	n/a	2	2	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

IRS Status - At the time the data was downloaded there were 292 IRS incomplete and 763 unpublished.

*Awaiting up to date data from Casualty Reduction Partnership

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.

Document Last Saved 23/08/2017 16:56:00

Item 5.13