

**WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**15 FEBRUARY 2016**

1. **AN ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS OF QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AGAINST 'THE PLAN' – QUARTER THREE 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 third 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 third Quarterly Performance Review Meeting of 2015/2016 took place on 2 February 2016. 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 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 third quarter of 2015/2016.

#### 4.3 Service Delivery Indicators

##### 4.3.1 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 performance is within the tolerance levels.
- Average attendance times to Category 1 incidents (the most critical and important of the four categories) have increased by 5 seconds to 4 minutes 47 seconds in Quarter 3, remaining below the target of 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 26 seconds (an increase of 2 seconds) – the target is under 7 minutes
  - Category 3 Incident Type: 5 minutes 41 seconds (remaining the same as per Quarter 2) – the target is under 10 minutes
  - Category 4 Incident Type: 6 minutes 25 seconds (a reduction of 1 second) – the target is under 20 minutes
- It should be noted that performance has stabilised to some extent, with minor increases and decreases in the attendance times across all four categories of incident type. Analysis has demonstrated that reaction times (the time from initial mobilisation by Fire Control to the appliance being mobilised) have remained stable. The small increase in attendance times mirrors a seasonal trend observed in previous years where the travel times appear to be affected in the winter months.

#### 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

With regard to PI 6 'The number of Home Safety Check points achieved by the Brigade', it should be noted that in addition to the introduction of the Safe and Well visit, the risk point scoring system was revised during quarter 3 to better reflect the level and range of fire risk and to better align with the priority target groups identified in the Command Level 3 Plans. The electronic workbook has been revised and was implemented in early November. The new scoring system has been applied retrospectively back to 1 April 2015.

The overall target for the year of 135,000 points has been achieved during quarter 3 (163,711.3), a direct result of the change to the scoring system.

Although the performance indicator target will remain, as agreed under the target setting process, it will be reset internally for quarter 4 to enable WMFS to baseline performance, and to enable informed target setting for the year 2016/17.

With regard to the quantity of Safe and Well visits undertaken, whilst recognising the quantity versus quality perspective, currently the Service achieves an average of 0.8 Safe and Well visits per watch per day and output performance is variable across the West Midlands. Additionally, there is a backlog of 2500 Safe and Well referrals within the Contact Centre which the Service is seeking to address, therefore, there is an intention to increase output across the Service.

- The performance indicator for the following area demonstrates performance is within the tolerance levels (green):
  - PI 2 The number of accidental dwelling fires
- There are four areas where under performance has been

demonstrated against the tolerance levels (red):

- PI 3 Injuries from accidental fires in dwellings, taken to hospital for treatment (47 in total, 5 above the target and 2 above the upper tolerance level)
- PI 5 The percentage of Home Safety Checks referred by our partners (27.9% against a forecast/target of 40%)
- PI 10 The number of arson vehicle fires (540 incidents recorded compared to a forecast/target of 470, 47 incidents above the upper tolerance level, reflecting that arson vehicle fires remain on the high side)
- PI 12 The number of arson fires in derelict buildings

The approach within all Commands areas focussing on hotspots of arson and using local level 3 leads to tackle local issues appears to be working on the majority of arson related performance indicators. However, PI 10 'The number of arson vehicle fires', and PI 12 'The number of arson fires in derelict buildings', remain in exception, above target, albeit showing improvement.

The Service will refocus its efforts in these areas and identify approaches that will support improvement in PI10 and PI12 performance including placing an emphasis on improving referrals to Local Authorities of abandoned vehicles, fly tipped rubbish and derelict / void buildings, and working more closely with the Police.

All arson related performance indicators, particularly PI10 and PI12, will continue to be proactively monitored and will be reviewed at the end of quarter 4 2015/16.

- 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 over performance against the tolerance levels (blue), having previously been rated as green in quarter 2.

- PI 14 – The number of false alarm calls due to fire alarm equipment continues to demonstrate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).

#### 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 PI 21 – The total number of injuries demonstrates over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).

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

- PI 24 – To reduce the gas use of Fire Authority premises
- PI 25 – To reduce the electricity use of Fire Authority premises demonstrates performance within the tolerance levels.

4.5.3 PI 22 – The total number of RIDDOR injuries demonstrate under performance against the tolerance levels (red). Performance I has

improved in quarter 3 with one incident above the upper tolerance level. The gap between actual performance and the annual target has narrowed.

4.5.4 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 Plans for Response and Protection currently indicate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).

4.6.2 The Corporate Action Plan for Prevention currently indicates performance within the tolerance levels (green).

### 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 Dashboards for Command Areas continue to be developed with stakeholders and rolled out across the Service:

- Following the initial trial of the draft Command Area dashboard at the Black Country South Performance Indicator Meeting in October 2015, Aspireview was successfully utilised at the Command's performance meeting for quarter 3.
- 'Show and Tell' visits have been scheduled with the other Command Areas during quarter 4 to demonstrate Aspireview.
- Additionally, Aspireview was used effectively at the Operations Commander Performance Indicator Meeting.

5.3 Station dashboards will now be progressed and trialled later in the year 2015/16.

5.4 The project management function has been tested and the Aspireview workstream is now live and managed using the system. The project element will continue to be scoped and developed to incorporate strategic projects.

5.5 The data feed to allow the automatic update of information continues to be progressed by ICT and Callcredit, the supplier of Aspireview.

- 5.6 The potential use of Aspireview by other departments including Fire Control and Fire Safety 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 December 2015 actual expenditure was £71.547 million compared to a profiled budget of £71.683 million resulting in a £0.136 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 revised full year budget for smoke alarms and other supporting materials in 2015/2016 is £237,100. Actual expenditure as at the end of December 2015 was £151,900. Expenditure for the third quarter is in line with the profiled budget. The majority of expenditure will be incurred in the final quarter of the financial year due to smoke and carbon monoxide alarms being received at the start of the financial year following the allocation of DCLG grant in March 2015.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

Corporate Risk Quarter 3 Position Statement January 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