GMFRS Programme for Change

Monday, 11 March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMFRS Programme for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frontline first emergency service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refocus on frontline delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Laying the foundations for an organisation that is sustainable, affordable, and delivers greater public value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A stronger organisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeping more firefighters in communities than previously proposed in the IRMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated with place-based teams, targeting resources and meeting the needs of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence-based proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximising fire cover across Greater Manchester with available resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firefighters at the heart of the Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More devolved power to the frontline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported by an organisation, which has a culture of trust, respect and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved working conditions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modern facilities, better training and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family-friendly working arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

May 17
- Mayor elected, taking over responsibility for fire and rescue services from the Greater Manchester Fire Authority
- Concerns raised by staff and FBU both prior to and post the Mayors appointment
- Manchester Arena Terrorist attack, leading to firefighters expressing their anger about decisions which delayed their attendance

Dec 17
- Mayor and Deputy Mayor concerned about the financial position of the Service and high vacancy rate amongst firefighters
- IRMP and associated efficiency plans suspended due to lack of evidence
- Fire Cover Review subsequently initiated to determine evidence-based fire cover requirements across Greater Manchester

Mar 18
- Kerslake Review into Manchester Arena Attack published featuring a number of recommendations for GMFRS
- Mayor announced root and branch review of GMFRS

Apr 18
- Programme for Change (PfC) commissioned with the aim to develop a coherent case for change, addressing the challenges faced by the Service
- Work commenced to develop Outline Business Case, informed by the Fire Cover Review, together with options for a new Operating model for GMFRS
Review Approach

• **Listen** - Enabling staff to raise their concerns and ensuring feedback is fed into proposals

• **Learn** – Incorporating learnings from major incidents

• **Change** – Ensuring improvements are made quickly where possible, together with a longer-term delivery plan
Programme for Change Headlines

• More devolved power to the frontline
• Focus on the role of the firefighter
• Place-based approach and improved partnership working
• Evidence-based Fire Cover proposals
• Building a culture of trust, respect and accountability
• Refreshed Vision and Purpose
• New delivery model for Prevention and person centred risk assessments
• Increased focus on Protection
• Sustainable & affordable delivery model
Changes Already Implemented

• Engaging with staff and adopting a frontline first focus
• Firefighter recruitment recommenced
• Changes to shift system and removal of roster reserves
• Changes to annual leave selection process creating greater flexibility
• Investment in the estate and improved facilities
• Changes to the Safe and Well approach
Vision and Mission

• **Vision** – A modern, flexible, resilient fire and rescue service

• **Mission** – Saving lives, protecting communities, working together
Re-investing in the future Service

Short-Term
• Introduction of a new shift system
• New annual leave arrangements implemented

Long-Term
• Re-investing in local stations and improved facilities
• Investment in operational appliances and equipment
• Improved training and development
• Investment in supporting technology and systems
GMFRS Approach to Operational Risk

- IRMP 2016-2020 in place
- Fire Cover Review (FCR)
- FCR Scope
- FCR External Validation
FCR Process

Data used in the analysis process to inform the options include:

• Number of life risk incidents
• Number of mobilisations
• Individual impact of change
• Geographical coverage and spread from other stations
• Mosaic data denoting likelihood of people having fires
• Risk Based Inspection Profile data
• Professional judgement
Response Planning Standard
The Proposed Package

- The removal of six 2\textsuperscript{nd} fire engines at: Manchester Central, Blackley, Heywood, Moss Side, Oldham and Eccles;
- Crewing levels of 4 on all fire engines;
- Alter shift start and finish times and staffing numbers at the six day crewed stations;
- Remove a further two 2\textsuperscript{nd} fire engines from Salford and Gorton;
- Undertake three station mergers at Bolton (Bolton Central & Bolton North), Manchester (Manchester Central & Philips Park) & Stockport (Stockport & Whitehill);
- Impact on performance at GM level for the 1\textsuperscript{st} fire engine is just 10 seconds. The least impact of any option explored;
- New delivery model for Prevention, Protection, Youth Engagement & Administration;
- Realise savings of £6.7m (year 1), £11.6m (year 2), and £12.8m (year 3).
Bolton Stations Merger

Bolton Central – G50

Bolton North – G51
Bolton Stations Merger

Key Information

• Existing interest in G50 site from College
• Would see 2 stations & 3 pumps merge into a single 2 pump station
• Small impact on attendance times in the North but still within 10 minute planning standard
Stockport Stations Merger

King Street – G21

Whitehill – G20
Stockport Stations Merger

Key Information:

• Would see 2 stations & 2 pumps merge into a single 2 pump station
• Attendance times improved as a result of the move
• Potential land close to M60 to be considered / identified
Manchester Stations Merger

Manchester Central – G16

Philips Park – G18
Manchester Stations Merger

Key Information:
• Would see 2 stations & 3 pumps merge into a single 2 pump station
• 10 min response standard met
• Potential land to be identified by MCC
Crewing Levels of 4

• NWFC assesses the number of fire engines needed at an incident and send the nearest fire engines regardless of whether 4 or 5 firefighters are on board

• If all fire engines have a crew of 4, we will review the pre-determined attendance to ensure sufficient fire engines and crew are sent

• Task analysis review has determined that 4 firefighters per fire engine represents a safe system of work for initial phase of an incident
Impact Upon Performance - Option ‘Packages’

- The graph shows impact upon performance all the options
- Overall first pump performance reduces by 1.0% to 2.6% as detailed in the options below
- The related average response time increases between 11 and 23 seconds.
- Impact upon the borough, station area, and ward, should also be considered for all options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1st Pump</th>
<th>2nd Pump</th>
<th>3rd Pump</th>
<th>1st Pump</th>
<th>2nd Pump</th>
<th>3rd Pump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019 (50 pumps)</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1st Pump</th>
<th>2nd Pump</th>
<th>3rd Pump</th>
<th>1st Pump</th>
<th>2nd Pump</th>
<th>3rd Pump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ave resp. time</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
<td>Ave resp. time</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
<td>Ave resp. time</td>
<td>Diff vs historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>07:19</td>
<td>09:28</td>
<td>11:49</td>
<td>07:19</td>
<td>09:28</td>
<td>11:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019 (50 pumps)</td>
<td>07:24</td>
<td>10:02</td>
<td>12:16</td>
<td>07:24</td>
<td>10:02</td>
<td>12:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>07:29</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>07:29</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>12:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>07:33</td>
<td>10:06</td>
<td>12:34</td>
<td>07:33</td>
<td>10:06</td>
<td>12:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevention, Protection & Youth Engagement

• Prevention, Protection and Youth Engagement to be an integral part of place-based delivery

• New delivery model for Prevention which will place ownership on firefighters, station managers and borough managers

• Additional resources within Protection, together with an increase in firefighter involvement across protection activity

• Refocus youth engagement activity on fire-related interventions

• If proposals are adopted, there would be staff reductions, but the aim is for no compulsory redundancies
Person Centered Fire Risk Assessment

Youth Engagement

Fire Protection

Place Based Team

People / Family / Place

Data / Intelligence

Responding to the Challenge
Administration Proposals

• New delivery model proposed for administration
• Central coordination with local ownership and accountability, streamlined processes and supporting technology
• If proposals are adopted, there would be staff reductions, but the aim is for no compulsory redundancies
• Need the help of GMCA, Local Authorities and other public sector partners to achieve this ambition
### Proposed Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Engines</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewing Levels</td>
<td>5:4,4</td>
<td>5:4,4</td>
<td>4:4,4</td>
<td>4:4,4</td>
<td>4:4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform numbers</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff numbers</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What next?

• Launch of Union and Public Consultations
• GMCA Scrutiny Committee – 19th March
• GMCA Meeting – 29th March
• Consideration of feedback
• Implementation
Approach to Consultation on Changes

We will consult with staff in the following ways:

• Collective Consultation with recognised trade unions
• Service Consultations with affected groups of staff
• Individual Consultation on a one to one basis

Areas for Discussion

• Key Proposals and Rationale
• Which groups of staff will be affected and how
• Where staff reductions are proposed, how we will go about this
• How we propose to mitigate for any adverse impact
• Support in place for affected staff
• Ideas and suggestions
# Proposed Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Timeline</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective Consultation</td>
<td>Week commencing 4 March 2019</td>
<td>Commencement of ongoing meetings with trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval &amp; Formal Notification of proposals</td>
<td>11 March 2019</td>
<td>Committee Reports, notices, letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Consultations</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Service leads to meet with staff in group sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consultations</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Line Managers meeting individually with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Implementation date</td>
<td>1 September 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?