

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

06 JUNE 2016

1. **AN ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS OF QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AGAINST 'THE PLAN' – QUARTER FOUR 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 fourth 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 fourth Quarterly Performance Review Meeting of 2015/2016 took place on 24 May 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 fourth 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 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 47 seconds in Quarter 4, the same time as quarter 3 and 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 25 seconds (a decrease of 1 second) – the target is under 7 minutes
 - Category 3 Incident Type: 5 minutes 35 seconds (a decrease of 6 seconds) – the target is under 10 minutes
 - Category 4 Incident Type: 6 minutes 27 seconds (an increase of 2 seconds) – the target is under 20 minutes
- The overall performance of PI 1 and the performance of the response times for all four categories of incident type have been rated as blue consecutively for each quarter of the year 2015/16.

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 11 The number of arson rubbish fires

With regard to PI 6 'The number of Home Safety Checks / Safe and Well visit points achieved by the Brigade' it was reported to the Committee in the quarter 3 update that the risk point scoring system had been revised during that quarter 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. Additionally, the electronic workbook had been revised and implemented in November 2015, and the new scoring system applied retrospectively back to 1 April 2015.

The revision to the scoring system has had a positive effect on the overall points for the year resulting in a year-end figure of 204,445 (the year-end target of 130,000 was achieved during quarter 3). However, it does make comparison with previous years' inappropriate.

The number of Safe and Well visits completed during quarter 4 is 5300. This is a lower number than previous quarters (7940 in quarter 1, 8267 in quarter 2, 6350 in quarter 3). This is a result of the fact that the content of a Safe and Well visit is far wider than the previous Home Safety Checks and the visits can take up to one hour to complete. The following provides a breakdown of the average points achieved per visit:

- Q1 – 7.01 points per visit
- Q2 – 7.26 points per visit
- Q3 (October only) – 6.99 points per visit (3029 visits)
- Safe and Well visits commenced on 1 November 2015:
- Q3 (November & December) – 7.80 points per visit (3321 visits)
- Q4 – 7.59 points per visit

This demonstrates that whilst there has been a reduced number of visits, the risk points score has increased since the introduction of the Safe and Well visits.

- The performance indicator for the following three areas demonstrates 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 9 The number of arson fires in non-domestic premises
- There are three areas where under performance has been demonstrated against the tolerance levels (red):
 - PI 5 The percentage of Home Safety Checks referred by our partners (28.8% against a forecast/target of 40%)
 - PI 10 The number of arson vehicle fires (725 incidents recorded, 84 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 (144 incidents, just 4 above the upper tolerance level)

The approach within all Command 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.

The Service will continue its approach within command areas of targeting these PI's where hot spots occur. The continued approach of referring abandoned vehicles and void buildings to Local Authorities will be closely monitored to ensure action is being taken when referrals are made.

In relation to arson derelict, efforts are being made to request that where possible, Local Authorities enact the Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1982 (section 29) and the Buildings Act 1984 (section 76-83) where structures are dangerous and a risk to firefighter safety (this approach will be trialled during quarter 1 2016/17).

All arson related performance indicators, particularly PI10 and PI12, are being reviewed as part of the year end and a thematic

review of arson vehicle fires is currently in progress, and will continue to be proactively monitored during 2016/17.

The following two PI's do not have a performance rating assigned:

- PI 4 – The number of deaths from accidental fires in dwellings: the 9 fatalities is the lowest number since 2012/13
- 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 (figures are only accurate up to November 2015), therefore no performance rating has been assigned.

4.3.3 Protection:

- PI 14 – The number of false alarm calls due to fire alarm equipment continues to demonstrate over performance against the tolerance levels (blue).
- PI 13 – The number of accidental fires in non-domestic premises demonstrates performance is within the tolerance levels (green).

4.4 People Support Services Performance Indicators

4.4.1 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
- PI 19 – the average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness (non-uniformed and Fire Control staff)
- PI 20 – The average number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness – all staff.

4.4.2 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

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 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

4.5.2 PI 22 – The total number of RIDDOR injuries demonstrate under performance against the tolerance levels (red). The number of injuries reportable to the Health and Safety Executive under RIDDOR has been stable for the past three years (with figures of 22, 22, and 21 respectively). The performance rating is a result of a three year average being used to set the target, and the figures for year 2012/13 being low with fifteen occurrences.

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 The Aspireview performance management system continues to be used for performance reporting. However, it should be noted that the performance management system InPhase has been purchased by the Service (in February 2016) which will supersede the Aspireview system. Initial training was provided to members of the implementation team (members of ICT and Strategic Hub) during March 2016 and implementation commenced in April.

5.2 The InPhase system not only provides all the performance management elements of the Aspireview system including planning, projects and risk, but also enhanced data retrieval and analysis functionality, and financial reporting, amongst other extra functionality.

5.3 All learning from the development of the Aspireview system will be incorporated into the implementation of InPhase, with the aim of ensuring a seamless transition to the new system.

- 5.4 The Aspireview system will continue to be used in the short term interim, having been used to facilitate the Quarterly Performance Review for quarter 4 2015/16.
- 5.5 The data feed to allow the automatic transfer of data continues to be progressed by ICT and forms part of the work involved in the development of a data warehouse.
- 5.6 Full engagement with staff and departments across the organisation continues, ensuring the involvement of all key stakeholders, and to allow end users input into the development and implementation of the system.

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

£98.538million. 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. 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.

- 9.2 Expenditure on smoke alarms and other supporting materials in 2015/16 is £256k

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

Corporate Risk Quarter 4 Position Statement May 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