

By: Chief Executive

To: Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority - 13 February  
2013

Subject: INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN - OUTCOMES OF  
CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS

Classification: Unrestricted

## **FOR DECISION**

### **SUMMARY**

Consultation on this year's Integrated Risk Management Plan closed on 14 January 2013. This report highlights the key issues arising from the consultation process for which the response rate has been lower than in previous years. It is pleasing to note that the comments made on the proposed five primary strategies have been largely positive.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members are requested to:

1. Note the outcomes of consultation (**Appendix 1** refers)].
2. Approve that the Integrated Risk Management Plan be renamed the Safety Plan (**para 5** refers).
3. Approve the revised names for the five primary strategies (**para 6** refers).

LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER: Head of Policy and Performance – James Finch  
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01622 692121 x8453  
EMAIL: james.finch@kent.fire-uk.org  
BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

## COMMENTS

### Background

1. Each year, the Authority produces an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP), and consults on how it should develop its services to meet future needs, and the context for this development, whether economic, social, or environmental. At its meeting on 17 October 2012, the Authority approved the draft IRMP to be published for consultation. Consultation ran from 29 October 2012 to 14 January 2013 and this report highlights the key issues which have arisen.
2. The content of this year's IRMP was far less controversial than last year's, and focused on the development of the five new primary strategies for the Authority, covering community safety, business safety, resilience, protecting the environment and developing the workforce. It also gave an update on the actions taken since the last IRMP was approved in February 2012.

### Consultation Responses

3. As in previous years information advertising the publication of the IRMP and the consultation period was sent to all staff, members of the public, businesses and key stakeholders/community groups. The range of methods used included an e-mail flyer to businesses in Kent and Medway, promotion on the Authority's website and via Twitter and Facebook, employee newsletters, e-mail circulation to Neighbourhood Watch members, and press releases. Several briefing sessions for Members were also held. For the first time, a video summarising the IRMP was made available on the Authority's website, and was watched, at least in part, by more than 2,000 people. However, this did not translate into significant numbers of questionnaires being completed, nor letters and emails to the Authority on the content of the IRMP, as **Tables 1** and **2** on the following page show.

**Table 1: Total Number of Consultation Responses received by the Authority**

	Questionnaires received via the website	Comments... received by letter or email	Total
Staff	228	0	228
Public	102	1	103
Business	2	0	2
Stakeholder/Community Group	15	4	19
Young people	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>352</b>

**Table 2: Total Number of Completed Questionnaires compared with Previous Years**

	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Staff	228	225	410	500	211	461	255	331	341	115
Public	102	291	1,217	643	74	390	147	97	123	138
Business	2	13	58	29	7	30	61	119	130	123
Stakeholder/ Community Group	15	45	12	26	45	39	55	39	20	32
Young people	-	223	325	560	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>2,022</b>	<b>1,778</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>408</b>

**Five Primary Strategies**

4. A detailed analysis of the comments made against each of the five proposed primary strategies for the Authority is attached at **Appendix 1**. In broad terms, the comments were positive, and there were no suggestions made of areas which had been omitted from the summary of the content of the proposed strategies. The detailed comments

have been passed to the strategy authors to consider. All five primary strategies are due to be considered by Members as initial drafts during the Spring cycle of Committee meetings.

### **Renaming the IRMP and Five Strategies**

5. One area which has been the subject of debate, both at Management Team level and as part of the meetings with Station and Watch Managers, is the names of the strategies themselves, and also of the IRMP as a document. It has been recognised for some time that the term “Integrated Risk Management Plan” is not readily understood by the public. In light of this, suggestions were made at the Station and Watch Managers’ seminars to change the name to the “Safety Plan”. This is felt to more accurately reflect what the IRMP is trying to convey. Members are asked to approve this change of name which will then be reflected in future iterations of the IRMP.
  
6. A number of suggestions were made for different names for the proposed strategies, which do have the effect of moving away from the common brand of “Focus on...” proposed in the IRMP. Having considered the suggestions made for the primary strategies, Members are asked to approve the following names, which are felt to better describe the content of the strategies:

<b>Original proposed name</b>	<b>New proposed name</b>
<b>Focus on You</b>	Focus on Your Safety
<b>Focus on Business</b>	Focus on Business
<b>Focus on Resilience</b>	Responding to Emergencies
<b>Focus on the Environment</b>	Caring for the Environment
<b>Focus on Staff</b>	Workforce Strategy

### **Accredited Representatives**

7. A formal response to consultation was received from the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) on 3 January 2013. Key themes in the FBU’s response have been incorporated into the detailed report where appropriate. A meeting with the FBU is being arranged to discuss the issues raised. No other responses from accredited representatives have been received.

## **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

8. The financial impacts of the IRMP are taken into account in the budget proposals included elsewhere on this agenda. The proposals have been discussed through the development process with staff and accredited representatives and their views are reflected in the report.
9. Data against protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 have been collected for questionnaire responses from members of the public. However, the low level of response has meant that analysis on the basis of differential response from groups has not been attempted on this occasion.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

10. Members are asked to:
  - 10.1 Note the outcomes of consultation (**Appendix 1** refers).
  - 10.2 Approve that the Integrated Risk Management Plan be renamed the Safety Plan (**para 5** refers).
  - 10.3 Approve the revised names for the five primary strategies (**para 6** refers).