

## OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES

### SUMMARY

1. At a Special Meeting of the Fire Authority held on 10 May 2013 Members approved options to go out to engagement as part of the Operational Efficiency Programme. Formal consultation on an Operational Efficiency Programme would follow in the autumn, once CMT and the Authority had an opportunity to consider the outcome of the engagement process.
2. This paper is concerned only with the outcomes of the engagement. Separately, Members will receive a report, taking into account that engagement, the options that could go out to formal public consultation. As such, this report should be read in conjunction with that report.
3. A more detailed engagement pack is available for Members and will be circulated which provides a more detailed data analysis behind this report. In addition, a room has been set aside in Headquarters for Elected Members (and any other interested person) to view the actual returns and be guided through the engagement process undertaken by a member of the Communication Team (part of the People Directorate).
4. An overview of the outcomes from the engagement process is attached at Appendix 1.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

5. Members are asked to consider this report.

### ENGAGEMENT

6. The objective of engagement was to stimulate discussion and debate around the options, and to gain local insights into them to help further shape and inform the options that may go to formal consultation. As such, the initial engagement was designed to help shape options before the Authority decides to formally go out to consultation.
7. The presentation delivered during the engagement process provided information on how implementation of the options would impact on both risk and cost taking into consideration other factors such as response standard performance and workload. The vast majority of the engagement sessions were led by either the Deputy Chief Officer/Director of Operations or the Assistant Chief Officer/Director of Safety, supported by Communications.
8. Participants were asked to complete a feedback form showing their most preferred and least preferred options for each geographical area. The form also featured areas for respondents to suggest alternative options (the further report before Members captures these proposals) as well as make general comments about the options and the programme overall. Participants were offered the choice to complete and hand in

the form at the end of the session or return by the beginning of August using a Freepost address.

#### STAFF ENGAGEMENT

9. All staff were invited to participate in any one of the 12 engagement sessions which were held across the Service area. The location of the sessions was arranged with those staff in mind whose areas would be most affected by implementation of the options. Additional sessions were available to meet demand.
10. In total, 236 members of staff attended the sessions. The location, dates and attendance at each session are set out in Appendix 2.

#### EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

11. Representatives from a variety of stakeholder groups were invited to take part in the engagement sessions, this included other local blue light services, hospital trusts, town and parish councils, local Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites and community groups who had previously engaged with the Service and who had expressed an interest in being part of future planning. Information about the programme was also published on the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service website. In total, approximately 400 separate groups/organisations were invited to attend.
12. A total of 10 external stakeholder engagement sessions were held across the Service area which saw 78 representatives from stakeholder groups attend. A list of those bodies invited to attend has previously been circulated to Members for their information.
13. The Chief Fire Officer/Chief Executive also met with the Humberside Police Crime Commissioner separately.

#### PREFERED OPTIONS – THE RESULTS

14. In total, 136 preference feedback forms were returned. Respondents were asked to indicate if they were a member of staff or a member of the public as well as which station/area they were from. Of the 136 forms received, 70 indicated they were from members of staff, 65 from members of the public and one form did not indicate whether the respondent was a member of staff or a member of the public.
15. A preferential voting system was used, with all participants who completed a form to choose their first, second and third preferred options. Not all forms were completed in this way however, with some respondents only indicating their most or least preferred option, with others not choosing their preferred options for each area but only the area where they indicated they live/work.
16. Appendix 1 sets out the overall analysis of the feedback. This provides Members with an insight into the views of both staff and external stakeholders, which may assist the Authority in deciding which options should go out to formal consultation.

#### NEXT STEPS: FORMAL CONSULTATION

17. The engagement stage was developed to help both Officers and Members shape their views as to the operational efficiency options which should go out to a formal three month public consultation.
18. Members should refer to the next report on the Fire Authority agenda which sets out how the engagement process has influenced options and which options could go out to consultation. Feedback will be given to all those who participated in the engagement process.

19. Formal consultation will be far more extensive than the engagement stage in terms of staff, public and other stakeholders. A communication strategy and consultation plan will be developed, which will be shared with Members at the next Authority meeting (as was done in respect to engagement).

#### STRATEGIC PLAN COMPATIBILITY

20. The operational efficiency options support strategic objective 4 – making the best use of the resources we have.

#### FINANCIAL/RESOURCES/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

21. None arising.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

22. The Authority has a duty to consult upon the options which will emerge from the operational efficiency programme.

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT/HR IMPLICATIONS

23. An EIA will be carried out ahead of any consultation taking place.

#### CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

24. Effective engagement, followed by formal consultation will help to manage and mitigate risk, in particular in respect to Strategic Risks 249 and 250.

#### HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

25. None arising directly.

#### COMMUNICATION ACTIONS ARISING

26. To ensure consistency of message to the media regarding the operational efficiency options being engaged on, a media strategy is being drawn up to deal with media enquiries arising during this period. This will be circulated to all relevant parties ahead of the consultation commencing.

27. HFRS staff, local community groups and key stakeholders that have been involved in the engagement process will be informed of outcomes resulting from this process and will be specifically invited to participate in the three-month formal consultation.

#### DETAILS OF CONSULTATION

28. Formal consultation will be far more extensive than the engagement stage in terms of staff, public and other stakeholders. A communication strategy and consultation plan will be developed in due course, which will go before the Fire Authority for endorsement (prior to consultation).

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS AVAILABLE FOR ACCESS

29. Operational efficiency option papers.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS RESTATED

30. Members are asked to consider this report.

**R GRAHAM**

Officer Contact: Laura Andrew ☎ 01482 567466  
Corporate Communication Manager

Humberside Fire & Rescue Service  
Summergroves Way  
Kingston upon Hull

RG/LA/SJ  
30 August 2013