



Community Integrated Risk Management Plan (CIRMP) 2018-2022

Protecting local
communities

Equality Impact Assessment

Manager's Name	Karen Winter, Director of Corporate Services
Directorate	On behalf of the Authority
Date	October 2017 – March 2018

Is this a proposed or existing service/policy/strategy/guidance/project proposal
<p>This is Cleveland Fire Authority's (CFA) new CIRMP 2018-2022.</p> <p>The protected characteristics covered by this EIA are age, disability, gender, assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation</p>

What are the aims, objectives and projected outcomes?
<p>The CIRMP builds on the Authority's strategic direction; the vision has not changed and places emphasis on making a positive difference to the safety and quality of life of every local citizen; and the places where they live and work.</p> <p>A stated mission has been introduced that again places emphasis on the Authority's commitment to inclusivity: 'Our Mission is to deliver an Inclusive Fire and Rescue Service that ensures the Safety and Wellbeing of its Communities'</p> <p>The Goals take cognisance of this commitment these being aimed at the Authority's communities and workforce as well as efficiency.</p> <p>The CIRMP sets out the Authority's proposals for the four years to 2022; these proposals are aimed at delivering its vision, mission and strategic goals.</p>

Involving and Consulting Stakeholders

A full consultation programme has been followed to ensure that all relevant internal and external stakeholders were sufficiently consulted on the draft CIRMP.

A comprehensive consultation exercise ran from 11th December 2017 to 2nd February 2018. The consultation followed the Government's Consultation Principles 2016, in that it aimed to be proportionate, targeted and placed emphasis on ensuring that consultees understood the effects of the proposals. The purpose of the consultation was to:

- ensure stakeholders were aware of the proposals set out in the draft CIRMP
- seek views on the proposals set out within the CIRMP
- seek alternative proposals that would achieve the same level of financial savings whilst mitigating risk to the public and staff

The objectives of the consultation were to:

- explain the Fire Authority's risk assessment process
- outline the outcomes of the Authority's risk assessment process
- provide details of the proposals set out in the draft CIRMP
- state the anticipated timescales for decision/implementation
- state how to contact the Brigade to voice opinion
- state how the Brigade will respond to opinions received

The consultation programme included the following stakeholders

- Employees of CFB
- Members of the Public
- Community Groups
- Industrial and Commercial Businesses
- Representative Bodies: Fire Brigades' Union and Unison
- North East MEPs
- Members of Parliament in Teesside
- Chief Executives and Leaders of Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Councils
- Tees Valley Combined Authority
- Tees Valley Mayor
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
- Cleveland Police: Chief Constable
- Professional Associations
- Third Sector Organisations
- Other Partners: Health, Safeguarding Boards, Ambulance
- Media
- All Fire and Rescue Authorities in the United Kingdom
- Other Emergency Services

A wide variety of communication methods and tools were used to encourage staff members of the public and other stakeholders to engage in the consultation process.

These included:

- development and agreement of the proposals through the Authority's governance arrangements

- early engagement with representative bodies prior to launch
- copies of the draft plan were widely circulated to stakeholders via links to the Brigade's website
- road shows for all staff to explain the proposed changes
- social media messaging to encourage participation
- consultation materials published on the intranet and the external website, informing all stakeholders and communities of the methodology of feeding back to the Authority through the Communications and Engagement Team
- Meetings with key stakeholders including Local Authority Council meetings
- Media Interviews (Evening Gazette and BBC Tees)

The resulting feedback was collated into a feedback report that was considered by the Authority prior to making decisions on the final CIRMP. This is available from the Communications team at Brigade HQ.

Relevant quantitative and qualitative data relating to data collection and consultation

The Authority follows the recommended process for integrated risk management planning as set out in the Government's Fire and Rescue Service National Framework document, published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in 2012.

Stage 1 of the IRMP process is risk identification and prioritisation and this has included a comprehensive analysis of the Authority's community risk profile. Our operating environments and the historical type of our incidents informs us of the risks in our communities. Each identified is prioritised using the Brigade's risk matrix that considers:

- the consequences/impacts of the risk on: people; firefighter safety; the environment; heritage; property; value for money
- the severity of that consequence/impact that being one of the following: insignificant; minor; moderate; significant and catastrophic
- the likelihood of that risk occurring that being one of the following: probable; possible; unlikely, very unlikely and negligible.

Having identified and prioritised our high level risks we undertake a detailed assessment in order to fully understand the nature and extent of the risk. Our general approach is to assess the risk to establish who it affects; and where and when it impacts. The assessments are based on an analysis of information and data relating our communities and households; deprivation, health and employment levels, building types, transport networks; and the environment including adverse weather conditions. In addition we include future forecasts of anticipated changes to the risk facing the communities according to available information such as building new housing estates and development of new transport links.

We get the data and information we use in our assessment from a range of sources:

- CFB historical incident data, Community Safety Prevention data, Industrial and commercial Inspection Outcomes
- partner organisations such as Local Development Plans of the 4 Borough Councils, Tees Valley Unlimited Transport Plans, education, health, crime and social care

- the Community Risk Register, which is maintained for the Tees Valley area
- the national risk assessment produced by the government
- National datasets published by the Home Office
- National datasets such as Indices of Multiple Deprivation, Housing Stock and population profile.
- Internal evaluation and analysis reports including Prevention Services Evaluation, Protection Services evaluation, Emergency response Evaluation and Equality and Diversity Analysis 2017.

We have a range of tools, systems, and processes that we use to assess, and understand the nature and scale of the risks faced by our communities:

- ◆ **Fire Service Emergency Cover (FSEC) toolkit:** a geographical information system that estimates the potential losses in terms of lives lost and property costs based on a particular fire service response to emergencies
- ◆ **Cadcorp:** a commercially developed modelling and deployment system for response services and measures the impact of potential changes in service deployment
- ◆ **Mosaic:** profiling software that uses information on vulnerable groups and maps it to incident data and performance information to enable the intelligent targeting of our prevention and education activities
- ◆ **SEED:** is our command and control mobilisation system for emergency response calls. SEED integrates with our IRS system
- ◆ **Incident Recording System:** records detailed incident information
- ◆ **Community Safety System:** records details of our Prevention activities and vulnerable clients
- ◆ **Exeter Data:** Health data set detailing all individual's aged over 65 registered with GP practice within our area.
- ◆ **Performance Management System:** facilitates the monitoring and management of our performance
- ◆ **Community Fire Risk Management Information System:** records risk in commercial and industrial premises
- ◆ **National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies:** is a reference document produced by the Home Office for organisations wishing to be better prepared for a civil emergency
- ◆ **Community Risk Register:** is a requirement of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004. Cleveland's CRR is produced by its Local Resilience Forum and is a reference document outlining the considered risks to the communities within Cleveland.

- ◆ **Corporate Risk Register:** which captures and evaluates risks to our organisation that may impact on our ability to deliver services safely and effectively.
- ◆ **Site Specific Risk Information:** details of buildings and installations that present or are vulnerable to particular types of risk.
- ◆ **IResponse:** Modelling software system to support incident command activities in industrial incidents and used in supporting the development of the Brigades worst case planning scenarios for high hazard sites
- ◆ **Horizon Scanning:** by our Executive Leadership and Senior Teams
- ◆ **Professional Judgement:** to assess other factors that may affect our risks.

Our information and analysis work resulted in the production of a Community Risk profile report which considered all the protected characteristics of our communities. This is published on our website.

Who are the main stakeholders in relation to this policy?

- the Authority with regard to setting direction and reputation
- ELT with regard to the management and delivery of the service
- employees
- Representative Bodies who we recognise and who support our staff
- the community who receive our services including businesses, partners and the general public

Consultation Feedback

The key findings from the consultation are taken from the various elements of feedback received from the stakeholders and attempt to correlate similar comments from multiple stakeholders and single strong comments from individual stakeholders. The key findings can be used to inform decision making on the finalised proposals.

Key Finding 1 – Questionnaires

The number of questionnaires returned was disappointing considering the amount of questionnaires that were made available to staff, stakeholders and members of the public. The Brigade's questionnaire was completed by only six people and we also received four emails in response.

Key Finding 2 – Use of Social Media

Six questions were put out on the Brigade's social media sites, all of which gave us a wider reach and better response than the questionnaires. On each question the majority of people agreed with the proposals although it is worth noting of the negative comments under each question in the table in Appendix W of the Consultation Feedback Report.

Question	Reach	Engaged	Agree	Disagree
We want to reach house fires as quickly as possible. Do you think that a house fire should receive the same standard of response no matter where it occurs in Teesside?	6680	602	48	6
Do you think that response standards for attending house fires should be aimed at improving our ability to save lives in these situations?	5712	305	74	0
Our current response standards to house fires for 99.99% of the Teesside population is a first fire engine in 8 minutes with a second fire engine in 11 minutes, or in some areas, a first fire engine in 10 minutes and a second fire engine in 13 minutes. We want to improve this to be a first fire engine in 7 minutes with a second fire engine in 10 minutes everywhere in Teesside.	6369	90	91	0
We have visited every high hazard industrial site in Teesside and looked at the reasonable worst case incident for each site and calculated what resources we would need in terms of fire engines and crews to deal effectively with that incident. Do you agree with that approach in determining our response to incidents at high hazard industrial sites?	3245	44	34	2
We want to reach high hazard industrial incidents as quickly as possible. Our current response standards to incidents at all high hazard industrial sites in Teesside is a first fire engine in 8 minutes with a second fire engine in 11 minutes or, in some areas a first fire engine in 10 minutes and a second fire engine in 13 minutes. We want to improve this to be a first fire engine in 7 minutes with all of the remaining engines needed within a further 13 minutes to every high hazard site in Teesside.	7949	89	70	4
In order to improve our response standards to 7 minutes for the first fire engine to a house fire, and to reach industrial incidents as quickly as possible with the appropriate amount of resources, even in times of high demand elsewhere, we believe the number of fire engines required in Teesside is 18. Do you support maintaining 18 fire engines available 24/7, 365 days a year?	7672	800	159	22

Key Finding 3 – Staff Engagement

Staff engagement through the staff roadshow remains an important tool for engaging with staff on proposed changes. Nine events were held to ensure that all staff had an opportunity to hear proposals directly from the CFO with two way engagement encouraged, as demonstrated by the questions asked set out in Appendix T of the Consultation Feedback Report.

Key finding 4 - Opposition to Job Cuts

The Fire Brigades' Union submitted a detailed response and some of the comments made were echoed by one of the local MP's and by a response received from the Senior Organiser of the GMB union. The FBU's position in their report challenges the content of the CIRMP, the length of the consultation process and the ability of the public to understand the content of the document. The FBU make a number of claims in their report that challenge the content of the CIRMP however the evidence to support the claims is not included or referenced. The FBU make a number of recommendations as alternatives to the CIRMP, however these suggestions are not costed nor are they aligned to the Brigade's risk profile. Some of the suggestions may not lead to a sustainable future for the service i.e. utilisation of reserves to maintain frontline fire cover or be acceptable to the Authority i.e. calling a referendum to increase council tax.

Key Finding 5 – Opinion of Other Fire Services and Professional Bodies

Six other Fire and Rescue Services have contributed to the consultation; Merseyside FRS, Gloucestershire FRS, Tyne and Wear FRS; North Yorkshire FRS, Staffordshire FRS and Northumberland FRS. These services recognised the methodology adopted was robust, that the risk assessment approach covered foreseeable risk and that the arrangements proposed were logical.

Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit recognised that the review of industrial response demonstrated the ability of the Brigade to meet response standards for sites allowing early implementation of Joint Emergency Service Interoperability Programme' principles.

The Health and Safety Executive, as the Competent Authority, cannot 'approve' plans or proposals, however they can state whether or not there are any regulatory gaps identified in the planning arrangements. The CA stated that no such gaps had been identified, that the plans were in line with good practice used by site operators and that the work was aligned to recommendations emanating from the incident occurring in Buncefield.

Cleveland Strategic Road Safety Partnership concluded that the CIRMP met the expectations of that partnership and recorded its support for the plan. Both North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Trust and Stockton Borough Council provided positive responses to the consultation document recognising the work of the Brigade did in partnership with them to reduce local risk. Supportive comments were also made relating to matching resource to risk across Cleveland.

Key Finding 8 –Traditional Methods of Engaging with Communities

The Chief Fire Officer gave interviews to the Evening Gazette and BBC Tees that gained extensive coverage and explained the rationale behind the proposals set out in the CIRMP. The interviews focused on the key issues in the consultation that affected local people and there was no significant negative comments received on the proposals put forward, although some comments were made around governance of the service and governmental cuts in general.

The FBU raised a number of concerns re the proposals in a comprehensive feedback report. Their concerns were heard in person and considered by the FA prior to making a final decision on the CIRMP.

Changes as a result of Consultation

Reflecting on the current risk assessment outcomes and the outcomes from the consultation exercise the Fire Authority made no changes to the nature of the draft CIRMP proposals 2018-22.

However, given the updated slightly more favourable position of the medium term finances, the Fire Authority amended the timelines for implementation

Action Required:

Implementation of the CIRMP will be done proposal by proposal with each proposal being equality impact assessed as appropriate.

Any adverse impacts to individuals that emerge will be addressed either via the Director of Corporate Services or to ELT if they significantly affect policy.

Statement of Completion

I am satisfied that this policy* has been successfully equality impact analysed.

Signed: 

This document alongside a copy of the relevant policy* should now be sent to the HR department at Cleveland Fire Brigade Headquarters for information, advice and counter signature.

To be completed by the HR Officer

Received Date 29 March 2018

Advice to Head of Department

Returned Date 29 March 2018

Countersigned & Date  29 March 2018