# Working Paper, No 8

## Proposed fire and rescue services inspection programme and framework 2020/21

## Draft Response to HMICFRS consultation

**Professor Pete Murphy**

**Katarzyna Lakoma,**

NOTTINGHAM
BUSINESS SCHOOL
Nottingham Trent University

# Contents

# Working Paper 8

## 1. Introduction and Purpose of Working Paper

This is a draft response to the HMICFRS consultation on the proposed fire and rescue service inspection programme and framework 2020/21, which was published on 22nd of October 2019. The consultation ends on 29 November February 2019.

The consultation document provides details of HMICFRS's proposed inspection programme and framework for fire and rescue services for 2020/21. It concerns the second full cycle of inspection of all the fire and rescue services in England.

The working paper has been produced with the intention of publishing a draft of our anticipated final response and making this draft available to Fire Sector Federation members via the FSF Intranet, in sufficient time for Federation members to comment and/or to use the draft to inform their own response(s) prior to the consultation closing on 29th November 2019.

The publication of this working paper follows the publication of previous working papers published by Nottingham Business School, which address the issues of service delivery, policy development and public assurance of Fire and Rescue Services. These include draft responses to previous consultations from both HMICFRS and from the Home Office. The full list of working papers is attached as Appendix B at the end of this working paper.

**The consultation document**

The consultation document provides details of the proposed fire and rescue services inspection programme and framework for 2020/21 and asks for views on whether "the right areas of fire and rescue services' activities are covered".

In particular, the inspectorate wishes to receive responses to "six questions, which are repeated in the body of the document". These questions are grouped together under three areas or headings with two questions per heading. The headings are

- An overview of HMICFRS's proposed inspection programme for fire and rescue services 2020/21.
- HMICFRS's inspection framework
- Methodology, monitoring, assurance and analysis

**The working paper**

This working paper therefore addresses the three heading and six questions in the next section before addressing some further comments in section 3 of the working paper. For ease of reference the proposed detailed questions for 2020/21 together with the detailed questions for 2018/19 can be found in Appendix A with the differences highlighted on the proposed 2020/21 questions.

## 2. An overview of HMICFRS's proposed inspection programme for fire and rescue services 2020/21.

The proposed approach outlined on pages 8 and 9 is almost identical to the approach undertaken in the 2018 and 2019 cycle of inspections. There are just three proposed changes listed in these sections (and identified and highlighted in Appendix A) as follows

- The addition of the words "including major and multiagency incidents" in the inspection focus for the effectiveness question – with the explanation that the inspection would "provide the public with more clarity on how well fire and rescue services are prepared to respond to major incidents with other fire services and agencies". This is operationalised by the replacement of questions 1.5.1 to 1.5.5 (inclusive) as amended and supplemented in new questions 1.5.1 to 1.5.9 (inclusive)

- In the explanation of the assessment of efficiency - "new questions have been added which focus on whether a service can demonstrate what savings it has made, the effect of these on its operational performance, and whether its use of reserves is sustainable". This is operationalised by the replacement of questions 2.1.3 to 2.1.8 (inclusively) as amended and supplemented in new questions 2.1.3 to 2.1.9 (with the exception of 2.1.7 which repeats the former 2.1.8)

- In the explanation of the assessment of people - "the question sets have been altered slightly to reflect an additional focus on the behaviours within the workforce, and to also consider individuals' career pathways". This is operationalised by amalgamating former questions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 including an additional question about values and behaviours (3.1.2) amending questions 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.3.3 and 3.4.2.

### a) Response to the proposed amendments

The **first proposed amendment** responds to a significant omission in the first cycle of inspections. This was highlighted, in particular, by the tranche 2 finding that identified a serious gap in one service's ability to respond to a terror attack in one of our largest cities, Manchester.

**We support the proposed change, but believe it should go further.** The proposed questions still relate to planning and preparations for a major and/or multi agency incident or emergency. There is no proposal to inspect the actual response to such incidents where they have occurred in the inspection period. These incidents are unfortunately a regular feature of the Fire and Rescue Services work. National and international research suggest they are increasing and they are (not surprisingly) the aspect of the service in which the public have the most interest. There are clear definitions, protocols and arrangements in place to assist an assessment.

Secondly, we note that in the remainder of the methodology the assessment of collaborations is generally restricted to collaborations with the other 'blue light' emergency services. Major incidents and emergencies include Category One and Category Two responders. Category One responders include Local authorities, HM Coastguard, NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups, the Health Protection Agency, Port health authorities and the Environment Agency as well as Ambulance Trusts and the Police. Category Two responders are key co-operating responders that act in support of the Category One responders mostly transport organisations and utilities. The appropriate representatives from these groups will need to be included in the inspection if the inspection is to produce a 'rounded assessment of fire and rescue services'.

The **second proposed amendment** *inter alia* responds to the finding that the Tranche 2 inspections which found most fire and rescue services operating with reducing budgets and fewer staff. However, they found two services (Northamptonshire FRS and Northumberland FRS) that are operating in a much more difficult financial environment. The inspectorate were concerned that those two services may not be able to absorb further budget reductions without this having a negative effect on the service they provide to the public i.e. "It will be difficult for these services to absorb any further budget reductions without adverse implications for public safety". They therefore have included new questions on values and behaviours "at all levels of the organisation" and the management of career pathways.

**We would support the proposed change, but believe they should go further.** We believe it highlights an inadequacy in the overall structure, scope and purpose of the proposed inspections in that they do not currently inspect the corporate body that establishes the overall financial envelope for the service; or the short and long term financial strategies within which the service is obliged to operate. We return to this issue later in this response.

The **third proposed amendment** inter alia responds to the very disappointing findings in relation to organisational leadership and culture in both tranche 1 and 2 reports. In both tranches, the 'people' scores were significantly lower than both the effectiveness and the efficiency scores and the inspectorate continue to have concerns about how some services look after their staff.

**We would support the proposed change, and agree that this should refer to all levels of the organisation.** However, as currently scoped we consider the intention is to exclude assessment of the services' governance arrangements and their scrutiny arrangements. In our view the organisational culture of any organisation is significantly influenced by the leadership and most senior responsible actors. Any comprehensive or rounded judgement on a fire and rescue service organisational culture must include the influence of the strategic leadership of the governance of the organisation, and how that governance is scrutinised. These are currently both absent from the proposed methodology.

**b) Response to overview questions 1 and 2.**

Question 1. What do you think of the proposed approach to FRS inspection that HMICFRS proposes to conduct in the next cycle? How could this be improved?

Question 2. Does the draft inspection methodology (annex A) include the right questions to gather evidence for a rounded assessment of fire and rescue services? How could this be improved?

Whilst we commend the inspectorate's proposals for improving the overall approach to the inspection programme and support the detailed amendments above, we believe there are a number of improvements that could and should be made to the current approach.

We accept that, it may not be practical to introduce all of them within the next cycle of inspections, but we consider some can be implemented, and the inspectorate should begin preparatory work to develop the others.

As mentioned above, we consider the inspections to be 'partial' operational service inspections. For example, they do not review

- The adequacy of the IRMP process or plans; merely whether the configuration, deployment and management of services reflect the risks identified in the plans.
- The full range of services as it does not, for example, include evaluation of outsourced or collaboratively provided services
- The full range of collaborations that FRS are engaged in – most notably collaborations other than those with other emergency services.

The proposed approach and questions will not deliver 'rounded' assessments of fire and rescue services because they also do not take into account

- The contribution of the governance arrangements and strategic decision-making functions that the service is dependent upon (including their internal scrutiny arrangements)
- The adequacy of the short, medium and long-term resource available to the service and the financial strategy that they have to operate within.
- The adequacy of the data and information that is available to the service to enable them to protect the public and manage service delivery at local and national levels.

The Inspectorate should move more decisively to make the inspections more comprehensive and more robust. It should acknowledge the inadequacies above and provide a detailed timetable (we would suggest a three-year timetable) for addressing all of these inadequacies. Over the same period, the inspectorate should be developing the detailed questions by which these changes can be operationalised. These should be added to the proposed question set for 2020/21 as and when available.

The proposed arrangement could be further improved by developing and bringing together the disparate elements of a potential Use of Resources Assessment that are currently distributed across the three sections of the methodology.

The most efficient and effective way to undertake corporate inspections would be to integrate them with the service inspections as has been done other inspection regimes. Whether this is done routinely or otherwise is a second issue. We note that HMICFRS is "still developing an approach to corporate governance inspections and will be consult on this shortly".

The programme of inspections should also include provision for the full range of types of inspection that are available to the Inspectorate including thematic inspections and joint inspections.

Equality and Diversity has been a challenging issue within services for many years. In February 2017 the former Minister (Brandon Lewis) announced that "the first (thematic) issues I want the inspectorate to focus on are diversity, collaboration and flexible deployment….. Once up and running, I also expect the new inspectorate to identify barriers to diversity across services and for each service to respond to the issues that it faces".

Two other areas where a thematic inspection (other than Use of Resources or Equality and Diversity) may be warranted are:

- IRMPS and their data, intelligence and methodology, and
- The incorporation of lessons from the Hackitt Report in regulation and enforcement


## 3. HMICFRS's inspection framework


### a) General response on the public reporting, availability and access to inspectorate reports.

The first cycle of published inspection reports (tranches 1and 2), have been commendably clear in their presentation both in terms of their narratives and the excellent summary graphics on the website. They have been published relatively quickly after judgements have been made, and we commend in particular the publication and accessibility of the two tranche summaries to-date.

We believe publication of the reports and the details behind them (methodology, data sources etc.) should be as open, transparent and expeditious as possible. The availability of the report and the tools and techniques to interrogate and analyse the content of the reports and the information upon which they are based, is clearly facilitated by their deposit in a single publically available web-based repository. We hope this will be continued.

However, the current chronological listing of reports and the current structure of the website (while perfectly adequate to-date) will soon be overwhelmed by the amount of reports, data and information that will shortly become available. The need to compare and analyse comparative information temporally, geographically and in terms of particular characteristics will therefore require more sophisticated recording, classification, and categorizing. The functionality and structure of the website will also need to be increased to facilitate greater

analytical capacity and capability. It would also be helpful if users could have 'notification of updates' for additions to the website (or parts thereof).

Although question 3 below refers to reporting 'service progress' we would like to see the inspectorate, its website and other activities, promoting and supporting the continuous improvement of the sector and its' services. In addition to the publication of reports summarising findings and the anticipated (first) 'State of Fire' report for the government, it would be useful to collect and publish a more detailed, systematic, comprehensive and practical report on innovations, good practice, and improvement initiatives from the first cycle of inspections.

**b) Response to overview questions 3 and 4.**

3. How best could HMICFRS report on the progress the service has made since the previous inspection?

4. What, if any, new or emerging problems for fire and rescue services should HMICFRS take into account in its inspections?

In order to report 'improvement' (both individual services and/or collectively as a sector) it will be necessary to be clear about changes/differences in the strategic and operational context that affect the services performance as a well as methodological differences in the inspections. Thus, these need to be clearly published in annexes or separate reports.

The judgements and scoring (both individual and collective) needs to be relatable back to the previous cycle of inspection reports but changes/improvements that are the result of FRS performance need to be differentiated from changes/improvements brought about by changes in context or methodology.

Maintaining open access to historical data and previous reports will be crucial for the public and key stakeholders.

In terms of question 4, the next round of inspections will need to take into account:-

- The changing financial context and resource envelope that FRS will be operating within following the 2019 Spending Review.
- The changing Leadership and Governance context that some service are operating within (such as the six Police Fire and Crime Commissioner-led services and any emerging proposals for future PFCCs).
- The Hackitt reports recommendations and the HMCLG proposed response in terms of the safety system in high-rise buildings.
- The unusually high number of major and multi-agency incidents being experienced around the country this year.
- Any fall out and consequences for the service that results from Brexit and the general election.

## 4. Methodology, monitoring, assurance and analysis

5. How else could HMICFRS adapt the way in which it acquires information to take full account of the circumstances of fire and rescue services and of risks to public safety?

6. What else should HMICFRS consider doing to make its fire and rescue service assessments as fair as they can be?


**a) Response to methodology questions**

To date the Inspectorate has been largely reactive and passive in the way it has acquired information at both national and local levels (with the notable excellent exception of the "Public perceptions of fire and rescue services in England" report commissioned in 2018). It needs to be more pro-active innovative and individually and collectively responsible for improving data and information available.

It needs to work much more pro-actively and collectively with other publically funded stakeholders to share and develop data and information that has been collected or developed with the assistance of public funds. This should preferably form a co-ordinated programme of initiatives agreed across the sector and supported accordingly.

It needs to provide a comprehensive set of links and hyperlinks to key stakeholder databases and repositories of data and information relating to the work of FRS and their key delivery partners, such as Category One and Two Responders under the Civil Contingencies Act and other statutory partnerships and collaborations.

The inspection reports have identified substantial inadequacies in data and information at both the national and local levels. The inspectorate have commended other stakeholders such as CIPFA and the NFCC for taking some initiatives in this field but has been far too reluctant to commit either its own resources to improving data and intelligence or lobbying the government or other stakeholders to commit resources to these areas.

In order to make the fire and rescue services assessments as fair as they can be, the inspectorate should consider *inter alia.* the following:-

- To give greater consideration to the context and strategic and operational environment that individual services and the sector are operating within.
- How the inspectorate can contribute proactively to improving the data and intelligence that the sector and individual FRS have available on which to base decisions.
- How the inspectorate can help encourage and facilitate complementary improvements in internal audit, scrutiny and reporting arrangements.
- Improving the scope of the inspections to embrace the need to assess all aspects of leadership, governance, delivery and the range of collaborations FRS are involved in.
- How it can improve the nature and sophistication of its current program of inspections, to include alternative types of inspection deployed to achieve a more economic, efficient and effective programme while being fair to all stakeholders.

**Appendix A: The 2020/21 questions from annex 'A' compared to the 2018/19 questions**

**Questions included in proposed 2020/21 methodology (<mark>with additions and amendments highlighted</mark>)**

## 1. How effective is the FRS at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?

**1.1 How well does the FRS understand the risk of fire and other emergencies?**

1.1.1 How well does the FRS engage with the local community to build up a comprehensive risk profile?
1.1.2 To what extent does the FRS use information from other sources to build the risk profile?
1.1.3 How well does the FRS identify and assess current, emerging or future changes in the risk of fire and other risks?
1.1.4 How well does the FRS define the level of community risk, including those communities most at risk or seldom heard, and risks affecting the most vulnerable people?
1.1.5 To what extent is risk information systematically and accurately gathered by staff?
1.1.6 How well is information on risk communicated throughout the FRS?
1.1.7 To what extent are the results of operational activity used to make sure there is a common understanding of risk?

**1.2 How effective is the FRS at preventing fires and other risks?**

1.2.1 To what extent is preventative activity, such as the home fire safety check programme, focused on the people most at risk?
1.2.2 How well does the FRS raise awareness, and campaign to prevent fires and promote community safety?
1.2.3 What progress has the FRS, with partner organisations, made in preventing fires and keeping people safe?
1.2.4 To what extent does the FRS identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people?
1.2.5 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to promote road safety and reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on the roads?
1.2.6 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to tackle fire setting behaviour and support the prosecution of arsonists?

**1.3 How effective is the FRS at protecting the public through the regulation of fire safety?**

1.3.1 To what extent is enforcement and inspection based on risk?

1.3.2 To what extent is a systematic, consistent and robust fire safety audit undertaken by staff?

1.3.3 How well does the FRS take enforcement action against those who fail to comply with fire safety regulations?

1.3.4 How well does the FRS work with other enforcement agencies to share information on risk and take joint enforcement action?

1.3.5 To what extent is the FRS working in partnership to reduce the burden of unwanted fire signals?

1.3.6 To what extent does the FRS engage with local businesses or large organisations to share information and expectations on compliance with fire safety regulations?

**1.4 How effective is the FRS at responding to fires and other emergencies?**

1.4.1 To what extent does FRS operational policy reflect national operational guidance?

1.4.2 To what extent does the FRS respond proportionately to incidents based on risk?

1.4.3 How well does the FRS use and communicate information about incident risk?

1.4.4 How well does the FRS command fire service assets at incidents?

1.4.5 How well does the FRS respond to cross-border incidents with other FRSs?

1.4.6 How well does the FRS communicate information about incidents and risks to the public?

1.4.7 To what extent are consistent, rigorous and open systems in place to evaluate operational performance and make operational improvements?

**1.5 How well prepared is the FRS to respond to major and multi-agency incidents?**

1.5.1 To what extent has the FRS anticipated and assessed community risks likely to require a multi-agency response?

1.5.2 How well has the FRS established response plans for dealing with major and multi-agency incidents?

1.5.3 How well has the FRS trained, exercised and tested arrangements for dealing with major and multi-agency incidents?

1.5.4 How well prepared is the FRS to form part of a multi-agency response in line with JESIP?

1.5.5 How well prepared is the FRS to respond to major incidents with other FRSs?

1.5.6 How well does the FRS exchange learning and notable practice with other FRSs, including learning from local, regional and national incidents?

## 2. How efficient is the FRS at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?

### 2.1 How well does the FRS use resources to manage risk?

2.1.1 To what extent do FRS plans address the risks identified in the integrated risk management plan?

2.1.2 To what extent are the FRS plans built on sound planning assumptions, subject to informed challenge and meet financial requirements?

2.1.3 To what extent does the FRS have the capacity and capability it needs to achieve operational performance, including the allocation of resources to prevention, protection and response activity?

2.1.4 How well does the FRS make sure its workforce's time is productive?

2.1.5 How well is the service making use of new ways of working, including having a flexible workforce and flexible working pattern?

2.1.6 To what extent is the FRS actively exploring all opportunities for collaboration within and beyond the fire and rescue sector, and are the anticipated benefits from collaboration being realised?

2.1.7 To what extent are business continuity arrangements in place and how often are they tested?

2.1.8 To what extent does the FRS show sound financial management of non-pay costs, including estates, fleet and equipment through benchmarking, contract renegotiation and procurement?

2.1.9 To what extent can the FRS show that the efficiencies it has made have sustained or improved its operational performance?

**2.2 How well is the FRS securing an affordable way of managing the risk of fire and other risks now and in the future?**

2.2.1 To what extent does the FRS understand and take action to mitigate its main or significant financial risks?

2.2.2 To what extent does the FRS have a track record for achieving savings and avoiding any residual future budget gaps?

2.2.3 To what extent is the FRS's use of reserves sustainable and promoting new ways of working?

2.2.4 To what extent does the FRS estate and fleet strategy, and changes to estate and fleet, support future service provision?

2.2.5 How is the FRS planning to invest in future innovation and use technology and new ways of working?

2.2.6 To what extent does the service have the capacity and capability it needs to achieve future change?

2.2.7 To what extent does the FRS influence how it works with others in the future in order to improve efficiency?

2.2.8 To what extent has the FRS considered and exploited external funding opportunities, or options for generating income?

### 3. How well does the FRS look after its people?

**3.1 How well does the FRS promote its values and culture?**

3.1.1 How well does the FRS understand the <mark>wellbeing needs of its workforce and act to improve workforce wellbeing?</mark>
3.1.2 <mark>To what extent are service values and behaviours demonstrated at all levels of the organisation?</mark>
3.1.3 How well do leaders [the words '<mark>demonstrate they</mark> have been omitted]' model and maintain the values that the FRS expects of them?
3.1.4 To what extent is a culture of promoting health and safety [reference to <mark>'wellbeing'</mark> has been omitted]evident at all levels of the FRS?

**3.2 How well trained and skilled are FRS staff?**

3.2.1 How well does the FRS understand the skills and capabilities of its workforce, including the use of technology?
3.2.2 How well does the FRS ensure it has the right workforce mix of skills and capabilities?
3.2.3 To what extent has the FRS established a culture of learning and improvement?

**3.3 How well does the FRS ensure fairness and diversity?**

3.3.1 How well do leaders seek feedback and challenge from all parts of the workforce?
3.3.2 How well does the FRS identify and resolve workforce concerns?
3.3.3 How well does the FRS identify and address potential disproportionality in recruitment, retention and progression ['<mark>for staff with protected characteristics</mark>' has been omitted]?

**3.4 How well does the FRS develop leadership and capability?**

3.4.1 How well does the FRS manage and develop the individual performance of its staff?
3.4.2 <mark>To what extent are the career pathways of all staff effectively managed?</mark>
3.4.3 How fairly does the FRS identify high potential members of the workforce to become senior leaders?
3.4.4 How fairly does the FRS select for leadership roles at all levels?


## Questions included in 2018/19 methodology

### 1. Effectiveness: How effective is the FRS at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?

**1.1 How well does the FRS understand the risk of fire and other emergencies?**

1.1.1 How well does the FRS engage with the local community to build up a comprehensive risk profile?

1.1.2 To what extent does the FRS use information from other sources (e.g. health and social care data, population and demographic data) to build the risk profile?

1.1.3 How well does the FRS define the level of community risk, including those communities most at risk, harder-to-reach, hidden (e.g. unscrupulous landlords, overcrowded dwellings) or affecting the most vulnerable people?

1.1.4 To what extent does the FRS undertake regular liaison with relevant bodies to ensure a common understanding of risk, including fire standards and requirements?

1.1.5 To what extent is risk information systematically and accurately gathered by staff?

1.1.6 How well is information on risk communicated throughout the FRS?

1.1.7 To what extent are the results of operational activity used to ensure a common understanding of risk?

1.1.8 How well does the FRS identify and assess current, emerging or future changes in the risk of fire and other risks?

## 1.2 How effective is the FRS at preventing fires and other risks?

1.2.1 To what extent is preventative activity, such as the home fire safety check programme, focused on those most at risk?

1.2.2 How well does the FRS raise awareness and campaign to prevent fires and promote community safety?

1.2.3 What progress has the FRS, with partner organisations, achieved in preventing fires and keeping people safe?

1.2.4 To what extent does FRS identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people during preventative activity?

1.2.5 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to promote road safety and reduce the numbers killed and seriously injured on the roads?

1.2.6 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to tackle fire setting behaviour and support the prosecution of arsonists?

## 1.3 How effective is the FRS at protecting the public through the regulation of fire safety

1.3.1 To what extent is enforcement and inspection based on risk?

1.3.2 To what extent is a systematic, consistent and robust fire safety audit undertaken by staff?

1.3.3 How well does the FRS take enforcement action against those who fail to comply with fire safety regulations?

1.3.4 How well does the FRS work with other enforcement agencies to share information on risk and take joint enforcement action (e.g. local authority licensing, building control and trading standards officers)?

1.3.5 To what extent is the FRS working in partnership to reduce the burden of unwanted fire signals?

1.3.6 To what extent does the FRS engage with local businesses or large organisations to share information and expectations on compliance with fire safety regulations?

**1.4 How effective is the FRS at responding to fires and other emergencies?**

1.4.1 To what extent does FRS operational policy reflect national operational guidance?

1.4.2 To what extent does the FRS provide a proportionate response to incidents on the basis of risk?

1.4.3 How well does the FRS use and communicate information about incident risk?

1.4.4 How well does the FRS command fire service assets at incidents?

1.4.5 How well does the FRS identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people at incidents?

1.4.6 How well does the FRS communicate information about incidents to the public?

1.4.7 To what extent are consistent, rigorous and open systems in place to evaluate operational performance and make operational improvements?

1.4.8 How well does the FRS exchange learning with other FRSs, including learning from national incidents?

**1.5 How effective is the FRS at responding to national risks?**

1.5.1 To what extent has the FRS established arrangements to be able to supplement resources in the event of extraordinary need, such as a flood, or a major incident?

1.5.2 How well has the FRS established site-specific response plans for high-risk premises?

1.5.3 To what extent has the FRS demonstrated it is intraoperable with other FRSs to ensure an effective and efficient cross-border response?

1.5.4 To what extent does joint training and joint exercising help the FRS to plan for and test arrangements for dealing with major multi-agency incidents?

1.5.5 How well prepared is the FRS to form part of a multi-agency response to a community risk identified by the local resilience forum, including a marauding terrorist attack?

## 2. Efficiency: 2. How efficient is the FRS at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?

**2.1 How well does the FRS use resources to manage risk?**

2.1.1 To what extent do FRS plans address the risks identified in the integrated risk management plan?

2.1.2 To what extent are the FRS plans built on sound planning assumptions, subject to informed challenge and meet financial requirements?

2.1.3 How well does the FRS allocate resources to preventative, protective and response activity?

2.1.4 To what extent does the FRS have the capacity and capability it needs to achieve both change and operational performance?

2.1.5 How well does the FRS ensure that the workforce's time is productive, making use of a flexible workforce and flexible working patterns?

2.1.6 To what extent is the FRS actively exploring all opportunities for collaboration within and beyond the fire and rescue sector?

2.1.7 How well does the FRS ensure there are mechanisms in place for the monitoring, evaluation and review of collaborations (including benefits realisation and outcomes)?

2.1.8 To what extent are business continuity arrangements in place and how often are these tested?

## 2.2 How well is the FRS securing an affordable way of managing the risk of fire and other risks now and in the future?

2.2.1 To what extent does the FRS understand and is taking action to mitigate the main/ significant financial risks?

2.2.2 To what extent does the FRS have a track record for achieving savings and avoiding any residual future budget gaps?

2.2.3 To what extent can the FRS demonstrate sound financial management of principal non-pay costs (including fleet and equipment) through benchmarking, contract renegotiation, and joint procurement?

2.2.4 How well do FRS plans make the best use of the opportunities, and respond to the risks, presented by changes in technology?

2.2.5 To what extent does the FRS estate/fleet strategy, and changes to estate/fleet, support current and future service provision?

2.2.6 To what extent is the FRS continuing to make savings to invest for future innovation?

2.2.7 How well does the FRS use reserves to improve efficiency, to allow innovation and to promote new ways of working?

2.2.8 To what extent is the FRS influencing how it can work with others in the future in order to improve efficiency?

2.2.9 To what extent has the FRS considered and exploited external funding opportunities, or options for generating income?

## 3. People: How well does the FRS look after its people?

### 3.1 How well does the FRS promote its values and culture?

3.1.1 How well does the FRS understand the wellbeing needs of its workforce?
3.1.2 How well does the FRS take early action to improve the wellbeing of the workforce?
3.1.3 How well do leaders demonstrate they model and maintain the values the FRS expects of them?
3.1.4 To what extent is a culture of promoting health, safety and wellbeing evident at all levels in the FRS?

### 3.2 How well trained and skilled are FRS staff?

3.2.1 How well does the FRS understand the skills and capabilities of its workforce (including the use of technology)?
3.2.2 How well does the FRS ensure it has the right workforce mix of skills and capabilities?
3.2.3 To what extent has the FRS established a culture of learning and improvement?

**3.3 How well does the FRS ensure fairness and diversity?**

3.3.1 How well do leaders seek feedback and challenge from all parts of the workforce?

3.3.2 How well does the FRS identify and resolve workforce concerns?

3.3.3 How well does the FRS identify and address potential disproportionality in recruitment, retention and progression for staff with protected characteristics?

**3.4 How well does the FRS develop leadership and capability?**

3.4.1 How well does the FRS manage and develop the individual performance of its staff?

3.4.2 How fairly does the FRS identify high potential members of the workforce to become senior leaders?

3.4.3 How fairly does the FRS select for leadership roles at all levels?

**Appendix B:**

**Emergency Services Working Papers**

This working paper is part of other working papers published by Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University, which address the issues of service delivery, policy development and public assurance of Fire and Rescue Services.

**Working papers to date comprise:**

**Working Paper no 1.** *The implications of the Crime and Policing Act 2017 for fire and rescue services*. Murphy, P., 2017. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

**Working paper no 2.** *Fire and Rescue National Framework for England: Government (Home Office) consultation*. Murphy, P., Glennon, R. and Lakoma, K., 2018. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

*Working paper no 3. Proposed fire and rescue service inspection programme and framework 2018/19: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services consultation response*. Murphy, P., Glennon, R., Lakoma, K. and Spencer, T., 2018. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

*Working paper no 4. Protocol on Central Government intervention action for fire and rescue authorities. Annex A: of the 'Fire and Rescue National Framework for England' Government (Home Office) consultation*. Murphy, P., Lakoma, K., Glennon, R. and Spencer, T., 2018. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

*Working paper no 5. A 'model' national framework for fire and rescue services in England*. Murphy, P., Lakoma, K. and Glennon, R., 2018. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

*Working paper no 6. A review of integrated risk management plans in fire and rescue services: stage 1*. Lakoma, K., Toothill, A. and Murphy, P., 2019. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

**Working paper no 7. Developing a model to facilitate evaluation of performance regimes and national frameworks.** Murphy, P. and Lakoma, K., 2019. Nottingham: Nottingham Trent University.

All working papers are available on the Fire Sector Federation's intranet and on the Nottingham Trent University's Institutional Repository (IRep) website under Pete Murphy's entry at https://irep.ntu.ac.uk/view/creators/Murphy=3AP=3A=3A.html