

**WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**16 NOVEMBER 2015**

1. **AN ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS OF QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AGAINST 'THE PLAN' – QUARTER TWO 2015/2016**

Report of the Chief Fire Officer.

RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 THAT the Committee note the status of the Service's key Performance Indicators in the second quarter of 2015/2016 (Appendix 1).
- 1.2 THAT the Committee note the progress made in delivering the three strategic objectives contained in 'The Plan' 2015-18 (Appendix 1).
- 1.3 THAT the Committee note the Aspireview performance information system update 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 2015/2016.

3. **BACKGROUND**

The second Quarterly Performance Review Meeting of 2015/2016 took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2015. This quarterly meeting is 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 West Midlands safer and manage the resources allocated to this work. The Service is improving and meeting targets across a range of indicators.

#### 4.2 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 second quarter of 2015/2016.

#### 4.3 Service Delivery Indicators

##### 4.3.1 Response:

- PI 1 – the risk based attendance standard; performance continues to improve, 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, representing positive/exceptional performance.
- Average attendance times to Category 1 incidents (the most critical and important of the four categories) have reduced by 1 second to 4 minutes 42 seconds in Quarter 1, which is the best performance for more than four years. The target is under 5 minutes.
- Average attendance times for Category 2, 3 and 4 Incident Types remain well within their respective targets:
  - Category 2 Incident Type: 5 minutes 24 seconds (a reduction of 3 seconds) – the target is under 7 minutes
  - Category 3 Incident Type: 5 minutes 41 seconds (a reduction of 3 seconds) – the target is under 10 minutes
  - Category 4 Incident Type: 6 minutes 26 seconds (a reduction of 5 seconds) – the target is under 20 minutes
- It should be noted that the ongoing improvement in performance during Quarter 2 is much more gradual than that of Quarter 1 which saw significant improvements as a result of a focussed strategy to improve attendance times. It is only to be expected that further significant gains in this area may be limited due to the high levels of performance that are being achieved by the Service.

#### 4.3.2 Prevention:

- The performance indicators for the following areas demonstrate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue):
  - PI 6 The number of Home Safety Check points achieved by the Brigade
  - PI 8 The number of arson fires in dwellings
  - PI 9 The number of arson fires in non-domestic premises
  - PI 11 The number of arson rubbish fires
- 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 12 The number of arson fires in derelict buildings
- There are two areas where under performance has been demonstrated against the tolerance levels (red):
  - PI 5 The percentage of Home Safety Checks referred by our partners (27.8% against a forecast/target of 40% which represents a 1% increased compared to quarter 1 2015/16)
  - PI 10 The number of arson vehicle fires (349 recorded compared to a forecast/target of 295 - 345 reflecting that arson vehicle fires remain on the high side, although it is predicted that this PI will be within the tolerance levels and green by year end)
- PI 4 – The number of deaths from accidental fires in dwellings: there is no target for this performance indicator.
- PI 7 – The number of people killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Collisions: only limited figures for this performance indicator have been released at the time of writing, therefore no performance rating has been assigned.

#### 4.3.3 Protection:

- PI 13 – the number of accidental fires in non-domestic premises demonstrates performance within the tolerance levels (green).
- PI 14 – The number of false alarm calls due to fire alarm equipment demonstrates over performance against the tolerance levels (blue). This performance indicator was reported as performing within the tolerance levels (green) in Quarter 1, and therefore performance has improved (for example, the number of incidents is approximately 400 lower than for the same period during 2014/15).

#### 4.4 People Support Services Performance Indicators

4.4.1 PI 19 – the average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness (non-uniformed and Fire Control staff) demonstrates over performance against the tolerance levels (blue). However, it should be noted that the two associated performance indicators regarding sickness, PI's 18 and 20, are both red (please see 4.4.3).

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

- PI 16 – the number of female uniformed staff.
- PI 17 – the percentage of all staff from ethnic minority communities

4.4.3 The performance indicators for the following areas demonstrate under performance against the tolerance levels (red):

- PI 15 – The percentage of employees that have disclosed their disabled status
- PI 18 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – uniformed employees
- PI 20 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – all staff

#### 4.5 Safety, Health and Environment Performance Indicators

4.5.1 The performance indicators for the following areas demonstrate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue):

- PI 21 – The total number of injuries

- PI 24 – To reduce the gas use of Fire Authority premises
- 4.5.2 PI 25 – to reduce the electricity use of Fire Authority premises demonstrates performance within the tolerance levels (green).
- 4.5.3 PI 22 – the total number of RIDDOR injuries demonstrate under performance against the tolerance levels (red).
- 4.5.3 The performance for PI 23 – to reduce the Fire Authority's carbon emissions, is reported annually.

#### 4.6 Strategic Objectives

- 4.6.1 The Corporate Action Plan for Response currently indicates over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).
- 4.6.2 The Corporate Action Plans for Prevention and Protection currently indicate performance within the tolerance levels (green). Full details can be found within Appendix 1.

### 5. **ASPIREVIEW PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

- 5.1 Good progress continues to be made on the Aspireview performance management system with corporate planning and performance reporting, operations planning and performance reporting, corporate risk and project management continuing to be established with a view to wider implementation across the organisation.
- 5.2 The system has been integrated into the Quarterly Performance Review, having been used to collate and display performance indicator and corporate risk information for the last three meetings.
- 5.3 An initial dashboard has been designed and built for Commands and this was successfully trialled at the Black Country South Performance Indicator Meeting during October 2015. It is intended that this dashboard will be developed further with stakeholders and rolled out to the other Commands for use at their respective performance indicator meetings. These dashboards will also be utilised at the quarterly Operations Commanders Performance Indicator Meeting. Consequently, Station dashboards will now be progressed and trialled later in the year 2015/16.
- 5.3 The project management function continues to be scoped and developed to incorporate strategic projects.
- 5.4 The data feed to allow the automatic update of information continues to be progressed by ICT and Callcredit, the supplier of Aspireview.

- 5.5 The potential use of Aspireview by other departments within Service Support continues to be explored.

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 2015/2016 budget setting process which established a total budget requirement of £98.538 million. As at the end of June 2015 actual expenditure was £28.130 million compared to a profiled budget of £28.272 million resulting in a £0.142 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 2015/2016 is £13.1 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 2015/2016 is £359,100. Actual expenditure as at the end of June 2015 was £24,300. Expenditure for the first quarter is in line with the profiled budget.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

'The Plan 2015-18' Strategic Objectives – Level 2 Action Plans.  
Corporate Action Plan updates.

Corporate Risk Quarter 2 Position Statement October 2015/16 (exception report).

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

PHIL LOACH  
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER