

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4 SEPTEMBER 2017

1. AN ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS OF QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AGAINST 'THE PLAN' – QUARTER ONE 2017/2018

Report of the Chief Fire Officer.

RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 THAT the Committee note the status of the Service's key performance indicators in the first quarter of 2017/2018 (Appendix 1).
- 1.2 THAT the Committee note the progress made in delivering the three strategic priorities contained in 'The Plan' 2017-20 (Appendix 1).
- 1.3 THAT the Committee note the update on the performance information system detailed in section 5 of this report.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report is submitted to provide the Committee with an analysis of the organisation's performance against 'The Plan' for 2017/2018.

3. BACKGROUND

The first Quarterly Performance Review meeting of 2017/2018 was held on 1 August 2017. This quarterly meeting, attended by the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, Principal Officers and Strategic Managers provides a joined up method of managing performance and provides assurance around the ongoing performance of 'The Plan'.

4. **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

- 4.1 The setting of targets against the operational and other performance indicators enables the Service to define in key areas the improvements which contribute to making the West Midlands safer, stronger and healthier, and to manage the resources allocated to this work. The Service continues to improve and meet targets across a range of indicators.
- 4.2 Graduated tolerances have been introduced for 2017/2018. This assists when the numbers are small at the beginning of the year. A larger tolerance is allowed in quarter one which gradually decreases as it gets to quarter four. This aids the interpretation of the performance indicators which could be misled due to the relatively low numbers at the beginning of the year (by being outside of the tolerance levels when the numbers are only marginally above or below the target).
- 4.3 The performance indicators remain the same as per year 2016/2017 with the exception of the People Support Services performance indicators where an additional indicator has been included. A new performance indicator has been added: PI17a 'The percentage of uniformed staff from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities'. This is in addition to the existing performance indicator, PI17 'The percentage of all staff from BME communities'.
- 4.4 Additionally, Fire Control sickness absence is no longer reported with Non-Uniformed sickness (PI 20), having been incorporated with Uniformed sickness (PI 19). It should also be noted that the performance indicators covering sickness absence have been renumbered (see appendix 1).
- 4.5 Appendix 1 details the performance against our:
- Service Delivery Performance Indicators (Response, Prevention and Protection)
 - People Support Services Performance Indicators
 - Safety, Health and Environment Performance Indicators
 - Strategic Objectives as outlined in 'The Plan' and milestones due for completion within the year 2017/2018.

4.6 Service Delivery Performance Indicators

4.6.1 Response:

- PI 1 – the risk based attendance standard; performance continues to be positive, with the targets having been met for all four categories of incident type. The overall performance is rated as over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).
- Average attendance times for Category 1 incidents (the most critical and important of the four categories) is 4 minutes 46 seconds in Quarter 1, a decrease of five seconds compared to the previous quarter.
- Average attendance times for Category 2, 3 and 4 Incident Types remain well within their respective targets:
 - Category 2 Incident Type: 5 minutes 36 seconds (an increase of two seconds) – the target is under 7 minutes.
 - Category 3 Incident Type: 4 minutes 55 seconds (a decrease of four seconds) – the target is under 10 minutes.
 - Category 4 Incident Type: 6 minutes 35 seconds (a decrease of eleven seconds) – the target is under 20 minutes.

4.6.2 Prevention:

- The overall performance is rated as performance is within the tolerance levels (green).
- The performance indicators for the following areas demonstrate performance is within the tolerance levels (green):
 - PI 2 The number of accidental dwelling fires.
 - PI 3 Injuries from accidental fires in dwellings, taken to hospital for treatment.
 - PI 8 The number of arson fires in dwellings.
 - PI 9 The number of arson fires in non-domestic premises.
 - PI 10 The number of arson vehicle fires.
 - PI 12 The number of arson fires in derelict buildings.

- There are three areas where under performance has been demonstrated against the tolerance levels (red):
 - PI 5 The percentage of Safe and Well visits referred by our partners.
 - PI 6 The number of Safe and Well points achieved by the Brigade.
 - PI 11 The number of arson rubbish fires.
- The following two performance indicators do not have a performance rating assigned:
 - PI 4 The number of deaths from accidental fires in dwellings.
 - PI 7 The number of people killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Collisions.

4.6.3 Protection:

- The overall performance is rated as performance is within the tolerance levels (green).
- PI 13 – The number of accidental fires in non-domestic premises demonstrates performance is within the tolerance levels (green).
- PI 14 – The number of false alarm calls due to fire alarm equipment in dwellings and non-domestic premises demonstrates performance is within the tolerance levels (green).

4.7 People Support Services Performance Indicators

4.7.1 The performance indicators for the following areas demonstrate performance is within the tolerance levels (green):

- PI 15 – The percentage of employees that have disclosed their disabled status.
- PI 16 – The number of female uniformed staff.
- PI 17 – The percentage of all staff from black and ethnic minority (BME) communities.
- PI 17a – The percentage of uniformed staff from BME communities
- PI 18 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to

sickness (all staff).

- PI 19 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness (uniformed and Fire Control staff).
- PI 20 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness (non-uniformed employees).

4.8 Safety, Health and Environment Performance Indicators

4.8.1 The performance indicators for the following areas indicate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue):

- PI 22 – The total number of RIDDOR injuries.
- PI 23 – To reduce the Fire Authority's carbon emissions.
- PI 24 – To reduce the gas use of Fire Authority premises.
- PI 25 – To reduce the electricity use of Fire Authority premises.

4.8.2 The performance indicator for the following area indicates performance within the tolerance levels (green):

- PI 21 – The total number of injuries

4.8.3 PI 23 – To reduce the Fire Authority's carbon emissions, is reported on an annual basis.

4.9 Strategic Objectives

4.9.1 The Corporate Action Plan for Response currently indicates over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).

4.9.2 The Corporate Action Plans for Prevention and Protection currently indicate performance within the tolerance levels (green).

5. **PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

5.1 The implementation of the InPhase performance management system continues with work progressing on the structure of the system for performance and planning, and the design of the relevant dashboards to display performance information in an intuitive and user friendly style, as the system is rolled out across the organisation. To this end, performance dashboards for the command areas and stations have been developed and launched during quarter one. Additionally, Safe and Well information has been added to the

system. Fire Safety have also begun to use the system which has included the addition of information on commercial hot strikes.

- 5.2 Implementation of the 3PT (Portfolio, Programme, Project, Tasks) approach is now underway and is currently being utilised by the Strategic Enabling Team in managing strategic programmes and projects. It is the intention that this approach will replace the organisations current planning framework by April 2019. All projects will be planned and monitored to deliver against organisational value statements aligned to the plan and key performance indicators. This will be managed through the use of Microsoft Project web application, Office 365 including SharePoint and Power BI. The next steps include identifying and releasing the organisational value through each project that is identified. Currently an approach to measuring the value delivered through a project or programme through metrics is being developed and will form as essential component to the developing digital strategy.
- 5.3 Full engagement with staff and departments across the organisation continues with InPhase, ensuring the involvement of all key stakeholders and to allow end users input into the development and implementation of the system.
- 5.4 As the 3PT approach develops this will begin to inform the future approach to Corporate performance and the systems used.

6. **CORPORATE RISK**

- 6.1 Corporate Risks are those risks that, if realised, would seriously affect the Service's ability to carry out its core functions or deliver key objectives.
- 6.2 In accordance with the Corporate Risk Management Strategy, all risks maintained within the Corporate Risk Register have been reviewed by Senior Risk Owners in order to update the relevant triggers, impacts and control measures and determine a relevant risk score, if appropriate, based on assessment of likelihood and impact.
- 6.3 A report of progress against our Corporate Risks is submitted separately to the Audit Committee.

7. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

In preparing this report, an initial Equality Impact Assessment is not required and has not been carried out. The matters contained within this report will not lead to a policy change.

8. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The course of action recommended in this report does not raise issues which should be drawn to the attention of the Authority's Monitoring Officer.

9. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The level of response, protection and prevention resources required to achieve the targets for the operational indicators shown in Appendix 1 were considered as part of the Authority's 2017/2018 budget setting process which established a total budget requirement of £94.848 million. As at the end of June 2017 actual expenditure was £27.642 million compared to a profiled budget of £27.730 million resulting in a £0.088 million underspend. Based on Best Value Accounting Code of Practice the estimated cost of staff engaged in prevention work, including an element for watch based firefighters for 2017/2018 is £13.2 million.
- 9.2 The cost of delivering services which contribute to the performance achievements comprise goods such as smoke alarms and staff time. The staff time includes those who are solely engaged in prevention work and watch based staff that provide emergency response as well as prevention services.
- 9.3 The full year budget for smoke alarms and other supporting materials in 2017/2018 is £359,500. Actual expenditure as at the end of June 2017 was £73,500. Expenditure for the first quarter is in line with the profiled budget.

10. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

'The Plan 2017-20' Strategic Objectives – Level 2 Action Plans.
Corporate Action Plan updates.

Corporate Risk Position Statement Quarter 1 2017 (exception report).

Executive Committee 27 March 2017 – Corporate Performance Indicators
2017/18.

The contact name for this report is Gary Taylor (Assistant Chief Fire Officer),
telephone number 0121 380 6006.

PHIL LOACH
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER