Public Document Pack

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE JOINT COMMITTEE

Thames Valley Fire Control Service Joint Committee Meeting

Monday, 17th March, 2025 at 2.00 pm

RBFRS Headquarters, Newsham Court, Pincents Kiln, Calcot, Reading RG31 7SD

AGENDA

	Item	Page No.
9.	Date of Next Meetings (Hosted at BFRS HQ at 2pm) - To be agreed • Thursday 10 July 2025 – Annual meeting • Monday 22 September 2025 – Workshop (TEAMS) • Monday 15 December 2025 – Meeting • Monday 16 March 2026 – Meeting	

1. REMIT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

1.1. The Joint Committee is constituted to provide overall strategic direction and oversight for the TVFCS.

1.2. The Joint Committee shall have the following functions:

   1.2.1. champion the TVFCS;

   1.2.2. act as the link between the TVFCS and the Fire Authorities ;

   1.2.3. guide recommendations from the TVFCS, that may affect the operational functions of the Fire Authorities, through the governance processes of the Fire Authorities;

   1.2.4. assist with the management of the relationships between the Fire Authorities;

   1.2.5. monitor the steady state operational benefits and performance of the TVFCS, against the agreed measures and targets;

   1.2.6. monitor steady state risks relevant to the TVFCS;

   1.2.7. monitor the financial performance of the TVFCS against required and available budget, benefits and efficiencies, and to contribute to the financial processes of the Fire Authorities;

   1.2.8 discuss, and contribute to, proposals on future developments for the TVFCS;

   1.2.9. provide strategic direction on the future of the TVFCS;

   1.2.10 consider and recommend to the Fire Authorities proposals in relation to Fire Authority Decisions including but not limited to:

      (b) discuss and recommend proposals for additional full partners into the TVFCS;

      (c) discuss and recommend proposals for the supply of TVFCS services to other fire and rescue services or other clients;

   1.2.11. decide upon and determine all matters which are Joint Committee Decisions, any matters referred to the Joint Committee for decision pursuant to the TVFCS decision making process in clause 11 (Decision Making by TVFCS) and any matters reserved by law or otherwise to the Joint Committee.

D:\Moderngov\Data\Agendadocs\2\6\2\A00002262\$$Agenda.Doc

D:\Moderngov\Data\Agendadocs\2\6\2\A00002262\$$Agenda.Doc

This page is intentionally left blank

Thames Valley Fire Control Service
Joint Committee Meeting

Thursday, 12th December, 2024, 2.00 pm

Minutes

Present: (*)   Councillor Peter Frewer, Royal Berkshire Fire Authority
Councillor Gary Hall, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority
Councillor Nathan Ley, Oxfordshire County Council
Councillor Simon Werner, Royal Berkshire Fire Authority

In Attendance: Mark Arkwell, Deputy Chief Fire Officer – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Graham Britten, Monitoring Officer – TVFCS
Matt Chapman, Area Manager/Senior Responsible Officer - Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service
Simon Harris, Group Manager – TVFCS
Louise Harrison, Chief Fire Officer – Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Asif Hussain, Deputy Director of Finance and Assets – Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer – Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service
Jim Powell, Area Manager Collaboration and Response / Senior Responsible Officer – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Fayth Rowe, Democratic Support Lead – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Paul Scanes, Head of Response & Resilience / Senior Responsible Officer, Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Simon Tuffley, Deputy Chief Fire Officer – Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Lukasz Wrona, Head of Business Information Systems – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service

Conor Byrne, Head of Finance and Procurement – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service

Michaela Smith, Democratic Support Assistant – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service

Action

16.   APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Wayne Bowcock and Councillors Neil Fawcett, Simon Rouse and Matthew Walsh.

Councillor Gary Hall was in attendance as a substitute.

17.   INTRODUCTIONS (INCLUDING CHANGES OF MEMBERSHIP, IF ANY)

All Members and Officers present gave a brief introduction.

18.   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest from Members and Officers.

19.   MINUTES AND RECORDED ACTIONS OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 8 JULY 2024

Fayth Rowe, Democratic Support Lead – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, confirmed that the action on page eight (mandated training into the budget) was covered in the workshop which preceded the meeting.

Simon Harris, Group Manager – TVFCS, confirmed he had looked at contracts that have been awarded by other Fire and Resue Services in relation to Command-and-Control Systems and quoted the following: Humberside – £6m over a 6-year contract term, NFSP Partnership - C£24m over 7 years and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire - £10–12 million over 10 -12 years.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2024, be approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

20.   QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS (WRITTEN QUESTIONS)

No questions were received from Members.

21.   MATTERS ARISING

There were no Matters Arising.

**22.   QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 9.5
          (QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC)**

None received.

23.   TVFCS PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT Q1 & Q2 2024/25

Paul Scanes, Head of Response & Resilience, Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, stated the Performance Monitoring Report covered service performance for Quarters 1 and 2, between April – September 2024. Some measures for October 2024 were also included.

September was a busier period due to heavy rainfall and emergency calls answered by the service during this period averaged within 10% of the previous five years.

Call handling targets have been reviewed to better understand call handling times according to call challenge and incident type. Call handling to building fires have averaged above target whilst calls to vehicle fires were slightly off target. Calls to fires in the open and road traffic collisions take longer to pinpoint, being harder to locate, and therefore have not met the 90 second target.

The service continued to perform well in answering emergency calls within the 5 second target, with the monthly average number of calls handled per FTE having increased to 93 in October.

Fire survival guidance given to the public were on four occasions. Staff turnover has been zero with headcount above target. Completed learning statistics remain low due to the recent introduction of a new mandatory learning package, which staff are yet to complete.

Within the period there was one reportable data breach which was a potential data breach concerning restricted access to data. Safeguards were now in place to prevent this happening in the future.

In response to a question about the breach, Simon Harris, Group Manager – TVFCS, reported the Information Commission Office (ICO) changed their guidelines earlier in the year which meant that potential breaches were now reportable. He added even though data on the information sharing system was available to unauthorised staff, no staff accessed the data.

In answer to a question from Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer – Oxfordshire

Fire and Rescue Service, around call handling targets and whether data was specifically linked to particular stations, Simon Harris stated that data could be expanded, broken down further and made available if required.

RESOLVED that the Performance Monitoring Report be noted.

24.   TVFCS REPLACEMENT PROJECT MANDATE

Jim Powell, Area Manager - Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, reported TVFCS 10-year anniversary will be in April 2025. The original business case predicted services would collectively save £1 million per year compared to running individual control rooms. In the past 10 years, significant financial savings have been made and the three services have aligned several operational procedures including training.

TVFCS legal agreement was established for the period of 15 years and was due to expire in April 2030. The contracts which were put in place within TVFCS mirror the legal agreement and were due to expire in April 2028. Engaging with suppliers has shown that going out to tender for a new system would take at least one year, and then two years to deliver the solution to Control.

Jim Powell stated the report was seeking Members to approve funding from the renewals account to enable a dedicated resource to carry out the work. The legal agreement requires each service to confirm they are willing to continue beyond the current life of the agreement. He confirmed that in the workshop that preceded the meeting, Senior Responsible Officers (SRO) agreed to bring a draft proposal to this Committee.

The Chair thanked Jim Powell and agreed this was a complex situation and could be looked at in further detail at the March meeting.

Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer – Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service, stated it would be useful from a budget perspective to have an idea of the range of costs. Jim Powell agreed and said they hoped to bring this detail to the March meeting.

SRO

Answering a question about the 10th anniversary of TVFCS, Jim Powell answered activities were being planned to celebrate this.

On being put to the vote, it was **RESOLVED**:

1) To recommend to Authorities in principle, to continue participating in TVFCS beyond 2030 by approving this project mandate, which recommends the TVFCS replacement project commence in 2025/26 be agreed; and,

2) A final decision and full approval, or otherwise, on future participation in TVFCS and further investment in the replacement project will be taken on

presentation of the Full Business Case in December 2025 be noted; and,

3) The Capital expenditure profile for 2025/26, enabling investment in phase 1 project resourcing to deliver the Full Business Case be approved.

25.   TVFCS BUDGET REPORT 2025-26

Conor Byrne, Head of Finance and Procurement – Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, began with the Revenue Budget (Appendix A), which showed a total budget of just over £3 million, which was a 4.6% increase. The increase was a result of employment costs caused by a budgeted grey book pay award, overtime costs due to increased training and a pension scheme deficit payment. The reduced staff turnover has meant that a number of staff have achieved role competence, and the accompanying uplift salary has led to increased costs compared to previous years.

He stated any addition to the pay award above 2% would need to come out of the contingency budget. Recharges have been reviewed and updated to reflect the cost to provide 2025/26 corporate functions, such as:

- Finance and Procurement – Increase due to the rise in audit fees
- HR and L&D recharges increase due to the restructure of HR and Health and Safety team and increased occupational health costs
- Secondary control recharge from Oxfordshire FRS has increase due to PSTN replacement.

The current call handling contract ends in April 2025, and the new contract begins on 1st May, with an estimated annual cost of £20K.

Appendix B detailed the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and included budget pressures and future salary awards. In referring to paragraph 2.4 of the report, Conor Byrne stated it was proposed that each TVFCS partner continue to set aside £50K towards capital replacement costs, and the fund totalled £1.82m at 31st March 2024.

Appendix C covered the capital expenditure programme, totalling £217,800 for 2025/26 and Appendix D detailed the forecast of payments into and out of the Renewals Fund.

Jim Powell, Area Manager - Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, said that the information in Appendix D would change over the coming years as it was a forecast based on TVFCS' current position.

Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer – Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service, commented on the £20k increase in the 2025/26 Budget and queried whether the budget cycle could be brought forward to align with Oxfordshire County Council. Councillor Ley queried how much of the budget increase could have

been foreseen.

Simon Harris, Group Manager – TVFCS reported the budget cycle timescales were embedded within the legal agreement and that pay awards, staffing changes and other recharge increases were unknowns at the time of budgeting.

Graham Britten, Director of Legal and Governance - Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, confirmed any changes to the legal agreement would need to be approved by Buckinghamshire and Royal Berkshire Fire Authority's and Oxfordshire County Council.

Asif Hussain, Deputy Director of Finance and Assets – Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, stated it was challenging to forecast any budget early when there were unknowns and the £20k increase within a multimillion-pound budget was small.

In response to a question from Mark Arkwell, Deputy Chief Fire Officer - Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, Rob MacDougall reported Oxfordshire County Council 2025/26 budget report was brought into the public domain at the end of November 2024, therefore it would be helpful to have TVFCS 2025/26 budget six to eight weeks early.

Rob MacDougall asked a question about the Cost Apportionment Model and the ability to track incident changes to assist with forecasting costs. Simon Harris confirmed tracking data could be made available, and calculations could be run to show number changes for the previous year.

Conor Byrne added RBFRS try to accurately predict budget uplifts regarding staff moving into competence. He stated pay award assumptions were different to the actual pay award and advised TVFCS budget was presented to its meeting in December for Fire Authority and Oxfordshire County Council approval at respective meetings in February each year.

Jim Powell reported the legal agreement states two or more authorities can request that the cost apportionment model be reviewed and revised to reflect changes to the data (Population, Tax Base and Incidents Attended). However, amending the cost apportionment model principles is an Authority decision.

On being put to the vote, it was **RESOLVED**:

1) That the proposed TVFCS revenue budget for 2025/26 as detailed in Appendix A be agreed;
2) That a contingency budget allocation of £150,000 which would provide an upper limit of expenditure without further Authority approval be agreed;
3) That it be agreed to delegate authority to the three CFOs (unanimous decision required) for any unplanned expenditure between £10,000 and £150,000;
4) That it be agreed to pay £150,000 into the Renewals Fund (£50,000 from each partner) in 2025/26 towards capital replacement costs be agreed;
5) That the Capital Expenditure Programme for 2025/26 (Appendix C) be agreed;

6) That the Medium-Term Financial Plan (Appendix B) and Renewals Long Term Forecast (Appendix D) be noted; and,
7) To recommend to their respective Authorities the TVFCS revenue and capital budgets for the financial year 2025/26 and the individual Authority contributions to these budgets.

26.   THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL - CONTINGENCY CALL HANDLING TENDER

Jim Powell, Area Manager - Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, reported this paper was for note only as Authorities have approved for Contingency Call Handling Tender to commence. He explained the existing contract will expire on 30 April 2025 and were looking to tender for a new contract provision for Contingency Call Handling Service for TVFCS from April 2025.

It was estimated that the cost for providing this service will increase from £6K to £20K mainly due to inflation.

RESOLVED that it be noted Authorities have agreed to tender for Provision of a Contingency Call Handling Service and related services to Thames Valley Fire Control Service.

27.   FORWARD PLAN

Jim Powell, Area Manager - Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service, made the following amendments to the Forward Plan.

- March 2025 Joint Committee meeting change *'TVFCS Contingency Call Handling'* to ***'TVFCS Contingency Call Handling Contract Award'***.
- Scoping paper on TVFCS Replacement Project Mandate to be added to the Forward Plan
- December 2025 Joint Committee meeting change *'TVFCS Performance Report Q1'* lead officer to SRO.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan be noted.

28.   DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TVFCS Joint Committee meeting (Public meeting) – Monday 17 March 2024, 2pm at RBFRS Headquarters, Newsham Court, Pincents Kiln, Calcot, Reading RG31 7SD.

(The meeting closed at 2.45pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE

SUBJECT	TVFCS JOINT COMMITTEE
PRESENTED TO:	17 MARCH 2025
DATE OF MEETING	THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL - FUTURE REPLACEMENT PROJECT - SCOPING WORKSHOP UPDATE
LEAD OFFICER	SENIOR RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS
EXEMPT INFORMATION	NONE
ACTION	TO AGREE

1.   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1   Thames Valley Fire Control Service (TVFCS) went operationally live in 2015. The original business case predicted services would collectively save £1 million per year when compared to predicted costs of running their legacy, individual control rooms. TVFCS was one of the first of its kind, providing a joint operating model across the three Thames Valley FRS and providing an essential service to over two million people across the three counties.

1.2   The TVFCS Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) expires in April 2030. Clause 30 of the agreement requires each Fire Authority to discuss continued participation in a Joint Fire Control (TVFCS) by April 2027, reaching agreement on future provision by April 2028.

1.3   This timescale aligns to current contractual arrangements for TVFCS mobilising systems which, as previously agreed by Authorities, have been extended to April 2028 with options to extend for a further two years.

1.4   The scale and complexity of replacing core TVFCS systems and agreeing a new, refreshed Inter Authority Agreement is likely to take three to four years and will require dedicated and specialist resources to achieve.

1.5 To manage this complexity, minimise risk of business continuity impacts and provide sufficient contingency for business transition, it is recommended that Authorities commission a replacement project. This project will commence in 2025/26 in order to deliver new systems and a refreshed IAA by April 2028, with a contingency of April 2029.

1.6 On 12 December 2024 members of the Joint Committee approved the following recommendations in the TVFCS Replacement project mandate:

AGREE to recommend to Authorities in principle, to continue participating in TVFCS beyond 2030 by approving this project mandate, which recommends the TVFCS replacement project commence in 2025/26.

NOTE that a final decision and full approval, or otherwise, on future participation in TVFCS and further investment in the replacement project will be taken on presentation of the Full Business Case in December 2025.

APPROVE the Capital expenditure profile for 2025/26, enabling investment in phase 1 project resourcing to deliver the Full Business Case.

1.7 This report therefore serves to provide information regarding building a comprehensive project brief for the future replacement of the TVFCS Command and Control systems and associated technologies, ensuring an efficient, effective and robust service is provided into the next decade and beyond.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 To **AGREE** the progression of building a business case for the future replacement of the TVFCS Command and Control systems and associated technologies.

2.2 To **NOTE** this will support an intent to deliver an Outline Business Case to the Joint Committee in July 2025.

3 REPORT

3.1 Outline

3.1.1 This report provides the requirements and scope for a replacement command and control system and takes into account the TVFCS Concept of Operations.

3.1.2 Replacement of the systems in TVFCS will require significant stakeholder and sector engagement and market research. This is needed to ensure development of a robust, resilient and sustainable specification that translates into a meaningful business case, identifying the optimal solution for both public finances and public safety. Likely contract costs dictate a procurement process commensurate with a high value, long term, mission critical contract. Early engagement with suppliers indicates that implementation of a new solution could take around two years.

3.2   System scoping requirements – Base line

To achieve a minimum level of service;

3.2.1   Future systems should have no degradation of the current service levels being provided. Using the current performance measures and analytics, a future provision of TVFCS should not reduce the current call handling time, capability of mobilisation and command of the current service.

3.2.2   Future systems should adhere to the current principle of "quickest is quickest", providing allowances for borderless mobilising between FRS'.

3.2.3   Future services will allow for the utilisation of the current set of technical systems or a suitable, agreed and improved version which provides the same level of service or better (e.g. Automatic Vehicle Location System (AVLS), Advanced Mobile Location (AML)/ Enhanced Information Service for Emergency Calls (EISEC), Dynamic Group Number Assignment (DGNA), Talk Group (TG) per incident/multiple TG, status messaging, BOSS mobile, Multi Agency Incident Transfer (MAIT).

3.2.4   Future systems will look to minimise the use of voice monitoring and maximise the use of data in the provision of their mobilising system.

3.2.5   Future systems will provide capability for the sharing of information across control rooms, linking into multi-agency control systems where appropriate.

3.2.6   Future systems will support mobilisation for national incident response, and effective control of assets at major incidents.

3.2.7   Future systems will support operational access to FRS risk information, and the sharing of information with front-line crews. Systems will also support the provision of Fire Survival Guidance to affected persons.

3.2.8   Future systems will communicate and coordinate effectively with FRS availability systems, allowing efficient access to data and attributes.

3.3   System scope

For the purpose of this report, the scope of a future TVFCS replacement project has been defined according to three areas:

- Capability and Effectiveness
- Capacity and Efficiency
- Resilience and sustainability

3.4   Capability and Effectiveness

3.4.1   Any future system should provide the opportunity for FRS to consider the use of dynamic cover tools. These systems provide greater levels of capability for programming and managing the availability of FRS assets and the

coordination of appliances according to updated situational changes within the Thames Valley.

3.4.2 Future systems should also allow for the development of an improved attribute-based mobilisation system. Consideration may also be made towards a tiered response, designed to improve resilience of mobilised assets.

3.4.3 Any new system should aim to improve or enhance the current asset management and availability system: consideration will be needed as to whether a "data lake" or "warehouse" approach best suits the specific needs of the TVFRS for the integration of these.

3.4.4 In order to both manage and mitigate risks; any new system will look to improve the current use of data and data sharing both within TVFCS and with partner agencies. This will involve the use of both the current MAIT and a move towards MAIT2.

3.4.5 Consideration will also be given to the integration of new technologies: this may include video streaming capabilities, body worn video, 999-eye, GoodSAM, advanced location tool (e.g. W3W). There will also be capability for Fire Survival Guidance applications to be used.

3.4.6 Any new system should support simultaneous information sharing between FRS incident command units, the central control room and any FRS bridgehead operationally in use.

3.4.7 A future control system will be Emergency Service Network (ESN) compliant and will look to maximise the use of ESN functionality through approved user services. ESN is a national (government led) project, which is currently underway to procure and deploy the ESN which, when implemented, will replace the current Airwave service used by the emergency services in Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland).

3.4.8 Finally, any agreed contract will look to build in stipulations for "future-proofing" technology in order to provide reassurance to partners.

3.5 Capacity and Efficiency

3.5.1 In terms of efficiency, the replacement programme will look to provide contractual arrangements that maximise return on investment of any capital assets, considering product lifecycle and asset refresh options.

3.5.2 The program will aim to deliver a scalable solution that provides future options for potential additional partner agencies who may wish to join at a later date.

3.5.3 In terms of system-efficiency, any new control system will look to maximise the use of AI assisted technology to deploy efficient automation of workflows. Aligned to this, solutions will be identified which reduced the demand for FRS maintenance and support services.

3.5.4   A review of National Operational Guidance will also take place in order to ensure that resource allocations, particularly for low frequency/high impact scenarios, are appropriate.

3.5.5   A review will also take place to identify relationships between other TVFCS contracts, and FRS contracts related to TVFCS, to identify efficiencies in delivery and management across the suite of contracted services.

3.6   Resilience and sustainability

3.6.1   An upgraded and improved TVFCS function will lead to a review of the current fallback partner arrangements, specifically the use of Kidlington Fire Station as secondary control, leading to an improvement or amendment of this capability.

3.6.2   The current system resilience and business continuity functions will be enhanced and improved by any future system. This may be facilitated alongside a review of the relevant National Operational Guidance and Control Fire Standard, which stipulates requirements for a resilient control room and resilient communications, both into and out of control rooms (e.g. secondary/tertiary bearers, 999 failure).

3.7   The planning assumption is that an intent to deliver an Outline Business Case to the Joint Committee in July 2025, ahead of the Full Business Case being presented to the Joint Committee in December 2025. The business case will recommend the proposed optimal replacement solution, identify any future funding gaps and identify phase 2 resourcing. At this point, and through both TVFCS and FRS budget setting processes, Authorities will be required to make final a decision to continue to participate in TVFCS (and subsequently the replacement programme) or terminate the agreement.

4.   COMPLIANCE WITH THE TVFCS PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

4.1   This report complies with the TVFCS Inter Authority Agreement (IAA).

5.   FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1   Refer to Section 5 of the TVFCS replacement project mandate approved 12 December 2024 (see background papers).

Project Resource Summary

Role	Cost 25/26
Programme management (see 5.5)	14,000
Business Analyst (see 5.6)	75,000
Project manager (see 5.7)	28,000
Project support (see 5.8)	42,000
SME/Senior User (see 5.9)	35,000
Total	**194,000**

Proposed Annual Capex Profile - 2025/26

Item	£
Project resourcing	194,000
EISEC servers	4,000
Contingency	19,900
Total	**217,900**

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 Part 2 Core Functions, Section 7 Fire-fighting (2) (c) *'A fire and rescue authority must make provision for the purpose of-…. make arrangements for dealing with calls for help and for summoning personnel'*.

6.2 The Policing and Crime Act 2017 Section 2 (1) states a relevant service *"must keep under consideration whether entering into a collaboration agreement with one or more other relevant emergency services in England could be in the interests of the efficiency or effectiveness of that service and those other services."*

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Equality Diversity & Inclusion will be a key element of the scoping process, linked to service equality objectives, to provide confidence and assurance to TVFRS that the preferred supplier aligns to FRS ethics and has systems and processes in place that meet our expectations.

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

8.1 If the replacement of TVFCS is not considered in a timely way and that any replacement project is not properly commissioned or adequately resourced there is a high likelihood that Authorities will face significant challenges in delivering the statutory duty described in section 6.1. This would result from having unsuitable equipment, systems and governance arrangements in place to deliver that service.

9. CONTRIBUTION TO SERVICE AIMS

9.1 As stated in the TVFCS IAA schedule 2: 'Primary objectives':

9.2 To satisfy the core functions of the Fire Authorities as defined in the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.

9.3 To satisfy the statutory duty of all the Fire Authorities as category one responders as defined in the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

9.4 To improve the resilience, effectiveness and efficiency of the current control room function.

9.5   To ensure TVFCS is integral in delivering the outputs demanded of the Fire
       Authorities' Integrated Risk Management Plans (IRMPs).

10.   PRINCIPAL CONSULTATION

10.1   Joint Coordinating Group.
10.2   Joint Committee workshop.

11.   BACKGROUND PAPERS

       **Agenda for Thames Valley Fire Control Service Joint Committee on
       Thursday, 12th December, 2024, 2.00 pm | Royal Berkshire Fire and
       Rescue Service**

       9 - TVFCS replacement project mandate.pdf

12.   APPENDICES

12.1   None.

13.   CONTACT DETAILS

13.1   Paul Scanes pscanes@bucksfire.gov.uk 07765041960
       Matt Chapman matt.chapman@oxfordshire.gov.uk 07920702269

This page is intentionally left blank

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE

SUBJECT	**TVFCS Q3 BUDGET OUTTURN 2024/25**
PRESENTED TO:	**JOINT COMMITTEE**
DATE OF MEETING	**17 MARCH 2025**
LEAD OFFICER	**IRENE KEMA ONYERI - RBFRS DEPUTY HEAD OF FINANCE & PROCUREMENT**
EXEMPT INFORMATION	**NONE**
ACTION	**NOTE**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 To provide Joint Committee with the 2024/25 Q3 revenue budget outturn position for TVFCS.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That Joint Committee **NOTE** the Q3 budget outturn position for 2024/25 as detailed in Appendix A.

3. REPORT

3.1 Commentary on Revenue Outturn

3.1.1 The budget provision for TVFCS for 2024/25 agreed at the Joint Committee meeting in December 2023 was £2,874,023 with a contingency allocation of £150,000 available, if required. The Q3 Forecast outturn for the year was £2,856,343, a variance of -0.62%. Appendix A provides an in-depth review of the in-year performance across all areas.

3.1.2 The pay awards have been lower than anticipated and have contributed to the lower salary costs and associated payments. The current year's budget is based on a pay award of 5% whereas the actual pay award agreed is 4%.

3.1.3 Lower than anticipated staff turnover has resulted in an 'in year' saving on recruitment.

3.1.4 Professional Services and General Equipment Purchase – the overspend is due to the requirement to provide specific equipment to a member of staff as a reasonable adjustment for disability, which has arisen during the year.

3.1.5 TVFCS Alarm Receiving Centre Income – the income is lower than forecast, as a result of changes in the Alarm Monitoring Sector, where small companies have been acquired by larger concerns, reducing the number of organisations paying for dedicated lines.

3.1.6 Vision System (maint) – overspend is due to a need to bring in engineering support for works that were not known to be required when the budget was set. Service credits are expected from NEC during Q4 which are likely to offset the current overspend.

3.1.7 DS3000 (for primary and secondary) ICCS – budget was based on anticipated costs of a new maintenance and support contract whilst we were still going through procurement. The actual costs of the contract proved to be slightly lower.

3.1.8 Software Maintenance – unexpected expenditure was required relating to the TVFCS domain and the Autopage tertiary bearer system. TVFCS use of the Autopage system is currently being reviewed.

3.2 Commentary on Capital Outturn

3.2.1 The Integrated Communications Control System (ICCS) provides a centralised command and control interface that integrates data from various sources, enabling emergency responders to have a comprehensive view of incidents and manage resources effectively. Our ICCS hardware was of an age that it would no longer be supported and needed replacing. The project to replace the hardware was carried out in two phases to minimize disruption and was completed in January 2025. The cost of the project was £539,280.

3.2.2 The total Capex Profile for 2024/25 is £665,000 as shown in Appendix B.

4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE TVFCS PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

4.1 This report complies with our statutory duty to collaborate.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The current Q3 Forecast underspend is £17,680.

5.2 The collaboration continues to deliver significant savings on an annual basis annual basis, in comparison to the three stand-alone control rooms.

5.3 The financial implications of capital expenditure are set out in 3.9 – 3.10 of the report.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 In accordance with Schedule 7, clause 12.1 of the legal agreement, costs are shared between partners in accordance with the cost apportionment model.

6.2 The 2024/25 budget and subsequent in year performance complies with statutory regulations.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1   The only implication is explained in section 3.4.

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

8.1   Financial performance is scrutinised monthly by the TVFCS Group Manager and quarterly through the service planning processes at Joint Coordinating Group. It is then subsequently reported to the Joint Committee as part of the wider performance reports to ensure strict controls are in place to maintain and monitor performance and value for money for all partners.

9. CONTRIBUTION TO SERVICE AIMS

9.1   The Committee provides oversight on behalf of the three Authorities, in relation to the performance of TVFCS.

10. PRINCIPAL CONSULTATION

10.1   Simon Harris, TVFCS Group Manager.
10.2   Conor Byrne, Head of Finance and Procurement, RBFRS.
10.3   Lead Finance contact at each respective partner.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1   TVFCS budget setting paper 2024/25, Joint Committee, 14 December 2023.

12. APPENDIXES

12.1   Appendix A: Outturn Statement 2024/25.
12.2   Appendix B: Capital Programme 2024/25.

13. CONTACT DETAILS

13.1   Irene Kema Onyeri, Deputy Head of Finance and Procurement, RBFRS.
13.2   Jana Samajova, Management Accountant, RBFRS.

APPENDIX A - TVFCS Budget Monitoring 2024/25 - Position as at 31 December 2024

	Total Annual Budget	Actual Expenditure To 31 December 2024	Forecast Outturn at Year End	Variance = Forecast Year End Outturn - Annual Budget	Variance %
Staff					
Employment Costs	2,100,116	1,549,545	2,073,200	-26,916	-1.28%
Mileage and Subsistence	5,850	4,778	6,362	512	8.75%
Training	1,000	3,688	3,688	2,688	268.80%
Recruitment	1,000	304	350	-650	-65.00%
Sub Total	**2,107,966**	**1,558,314**	**2,083,600**	**-24,366**	**-1.16%**
Corporate					
Facilities	148,960	111,720	148,960	0	0.00%
Finance	26,595	19,946	26,595	0	0.00%
HR	102,074	76,556	102,074	0	0.00%
ICT	116,141	87,106	116,141	0	0.00%
Liability and Equipment Insurance	12,964	9,723	12,964	0	0.00%
Management	22,546	16,910	22,546	0	0.00%
Sub Total	**429,280**	**321,961**	**429,280**	**0**	**0.00%**
Other					
Prof Services & General Equipment Purchase	4,600	1,066	5,388	788	17.13%
OFRS Costs (Includes Secondary Control Airwave Rental)	53,270	0	53,270	0	0.00%
Contingency Call Handling Provision	6,210	1,600	6,210	0	0.00%
TVFCS Alarm Receiving Centre Income	-13,721	-12,460	-12,460	1,261	-9.19%
Sub Total	**50,359**	**-9,794**	**52,408**	**2,049**	**4.07%**
Technology					
Vision System (maint)	83,506	86,002	91,502	7,996	9.58%
DS3000 (for primary and secondary) ICCS	106,668	103,090	103,090	-3,578	-3.35%
Charges for Unicorn network and telephony rental	46,454	22,983	46,454	0	0.00%
Software Maintenance	901	1,120	1,120	219	24.31%
EISEC Calcot (999 caller location)	9,000	6,750	9,000	0	0.00%
Smart services to switch 999 lines to secondary control / elsewhere	17,000	0	17,000	0	0.00%
Airwave rental (SAN I ,B) (Primary, secondary) (7+8)	22,889	0	22,889	0	0.00%
Sub Total	**286,418**	**219,945**	**291,055**	**4,637**	**1.62%**
Total Budgeted Expenditure	**2,874,023**	**2,090,427**	**2,856,343**	**-17,680**	**-0.62%**

Authority	Total Annual Budget	Actual Expenditure To 31 December 2024	Forecast Outturn at Year End	Variance = Forecast Year End Outturn - Annual Budget	Variance %	2024/25 Cost Apportionment Percentages
RBFRS	1,063,389	773,458	1,056,847	-6,542	-0.62%	37.0%
OXFRS	810,474	589,500	805,489	-4,985	-0.62%	28.2%
BFRS	1,000,160	727,469	994,007	-6,153	-0.62%	34.8%
TOTAL	**2,874,023**	**2,090,427**	**2,856,343**	**-17,680**	**-0.62%**	**100.0%**

Appendix B

Thames Valley Capital Expenditure Programme 2024/25

Item	£
Annual Profiled Capex	610,000
Contingency	55,000
Total	665,000
Expenditure	539,280
Variance	-125,720

This page is intentionally left blank

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE

SUBJECT	TVFCS PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT Q3 2024/25
PRESENTED TO:	TVFCS JOINT COMMITTEE
DATE OF MEETING	17 MARCH 2025
LEAD OFFICER	AREA COMMANDER PAUL SCANES
EXEMPT INFORMATION	NONE
ACTION	FOR NOTING

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 During 2022/23, the TVFCS Joint Coordination Group (JCG) developed a new range of key performance measures to improve and enhance the monitoring of the Service. The suite of measures were discussed and developed at the Joint Committee's December 2022 workshop meeting, and continue to be established as a comprehensive and robust monitoring process.

1.2 It is worth noting the report contains different types of target and methods of comparison. Some targets are aspirational, some are there to ensure minimum standards are met and others are there to identify exceptions within trends, allowing us to identify possible needs for change/reaction.

1.3 The range of performance measures are reviewed annually by the JCG in accordance with the requirements of the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA). Notably from July 2024 onwards, the measures include the average call handling time for different incident types, which is a development from the previous target-based approach. Additionally, development of the Control Room Mobilising System during 2023/24 has enabled the JCG to capture better information relating to call challenge. This will feature in future reports.

1.4   It is important to note that many indicators used within each measure represent change within the Service and do not always represent good or bad performance.

2.   RECOMMENDATION

2.1   That the TVFCS Q3 Performance Monitoring Report for 2024/25 be **NOTED**.

3.   REPORT

3.1   This report demonstrates Service performance for Quarter 3, between October and December 2024.

3.2   The number of emergency calls received are consistent with expected demand compared with the previous 5 years. It should be noted that the figures for December are artificially lower. This is a result of the final stages of the implementation of the TVFCS technology refresh, which necessitated TVFCS staff using fallback systems for call handling for a 10-day period. These fallback systems do not have same call logging functionality as the primary TVFCS systems.

3.3   The Service can report that the average call handling to building fires being faster than the target of 90 seconds throughout the quarter. Calls to vehicle fires have taken slightly longer than the target in October and December. Calls to fires in the open and Road Traffic Collisions (RTCs) take longer to pinpoint and therefore are not regularly meeting the 90 second target, although in December performance against mobilisation to RTCs was unusually good.

3.4   The Service has consistently performed well in answering emergency calls within five seconds, with performance routinely exceeding the 92 second target set by the JCG.

3.5   The monthly average number of calls handled per FTE during the period is relatively consistent, with the lower total in December also being attributable to the use of fallback systems during the technology refresh.

3.6   TVFCS have worked with all three FRSs to deliver a revised and aligned approach to challenging calls to Automatic Fire Alarms (AFAs). This approach has worked well and is reflected in higher numbers of calls being challenged with no requirement to attend.

3.7   Fire Survival Guidance (FSG) was given to the public on two occasions during the period. During Q3, TVFCS has been working with all three FRSs to develop systems to meet the recommendations of the Grenfell Tower Inquiry in relation to the management of incidents where multiple callers require FSG. This arrangement is now live and being assured through testing and exercising.

3.8   The employee headcount has remained above target, and staff turnover is zero so far this year.

3.9   TVFCS staff are progressing with the completion of a number of newly introduced mandatory training packages, and it is anticipated that the target will be reached by the end of Q4.

3.10   The one reportable data breach relates to a potential data breach where access to restricted data was accidently made available to unauthorised employees. This has been rectified and safeguards put in place.

3.11   Following higher than expected levels of staff turnover experienced in the two years immediately following the lifting of restrictions relating to the Covid19 pandemic, TVFCS reviewed its approach to recruitment and retention, which led to a number of changes. These changes appear to be effective, with TVFCS staff turnover having reduced significantly.

3.12   The number of service desk tickets being logged with the C&C system supplier is higher than desired. The JCG are engaging with the supplier, NEC, to effect an improvement in the support arrangements for this critical system.

Thames Valley Fire Control Service – Performance Monitoring Dashboard

Thames Valley Fire Control Service - Performance Monitoring Dashboard 2024/25

Last Updated: **17/10/2024**
Updated by: **Simon Harris**

Public Safety - Effectiveness

Ref:		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
PS1.1	Emergency calls answered	Within 10%	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	G	DS3000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.2	Emergency calls answered within 5 seconds	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 92%	B	B	DS3000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.3	Emergency calls answered within 10 seconds	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 97%	G	G	DS3000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.4	Calls handled per FTE	Monitoring only	Monthly	61	A	B	
PS1.5	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	TBC	TBC	
PS1.6	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Building fires)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	B	B	
PS1.7	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in vehicles)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	A	A	
PS1.8	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in the open)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	A	A	
PS1.9	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Road Traffic Collisions - Persons Trapped)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	B	R	
PS1.10	Challenged calls resulting in no requirement to attend	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	TBC	TBC	Master SQL DB - Exisiting report, but we need to check my definitions
PS1.11	Call Handling Target - Stations alerted within 90 seconds (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)	Higher is better	Monthly	Target 80%	R	R	
PS1.12	Fire Survival Guidance given	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	G	B	No report available. Manual data collection by SH
PS1.13	Safeguarding interventions	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	R	Vision - TAG query. Could be automated, but no problem to collect manually
PS1.14	Threats of Arson dealt with	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	B	Data held by Ange Chapman - Easy for Simon H to access

Great Place to Work - People

Ref:		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
GP1.1	Headcount Vs Establishment	Nearest target	Monthly	Target 39 FTE	B	B	RBFRS HR
GP1.2	Staff turnover	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <1%	B	B	RBFRS HR
GP1.3	Absence - Long term	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <3%	A	A	RBFRS HR
GP1.4	Absence - Short term	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <3%	A	G	RBFRS HR
GP1.5	Employee experience	Higher is better	Two yearly	Target 65%	B	B	RBFRS two-yearly staff survey - overall engagement
GP1.6	Appraisal (Personal Development) completion	Higher is better	Annually	Target 95%	B	B	RBFRS HR
GP1.7	Mandatory Training completion	Higher is better	Annually	Target 95%	R	R	RBFRS HR
GP1.8	Case Management completed within timeframe	Higher is better	Monthly	Target 85%	B	B	RBFRS HR
GP1.9	Workplace accidents/injuries	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	RBFRS H&S
GP1.10	Near misses and hazard reporting	Monitoring only	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	A	A	RBFRS H&S
GP1.11	RIDDOR reportable incidents	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	RBFRS H&S
GP1.12	Verbal or physical attacks on staff	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	No records currently

Public Value - Efficiency

Ref:		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
PV1.1	Reportable data breaches	Lower is better	Annually	Target of zero	R	R	Would need to capture data from TV FRS
PV1.2	Service Desk response	Higher is better	Monthly	Target >95%	B	A	SSS Service Reporting
PV1.3	Service Desk tickets logged	Within 10%	Monthly	Previous 3 year average	A	R	SSS Service Reporting
PV1.4	System uptime	Higher is better	Monthly	Target >98%	B	B	SSS Service Reporting

Key:

B	Better than expected
G	As expected
A	Worse than expected
R	Considerably worse than expected

Monitoring purposes only

B	Better than expected
G	As expected
A	Worse than expected
R	Considerably worse than expected

Detailed measures by category:

Public Safety – Effectiveness

Ref: 1.1   Emergency calls answered

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year	2918	3047	3294	3783	3916	3262	3248	2893	2944	2750	2601	2736
	2024	2801	2989	3424	3489	3435	3923	3318	3142	1919			
	Status	G	G	G	G	B	R	G	G	B			
Cumulative	Prev 5 year	2918	5965	9259	13042	16958	20220	23468	26361	29305	32055	34656	37392
	2024	2801	5790	9214	12703	16138	20061	23379	26521	28440			
	Status	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G			

B	<10%
G	Within 10%
A	>10%
R	>20%

What is good
Within 10% of previous five year average

Ref: 1.2   Emergency calls answered within 5 seconds

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%
	2024	97.08%	97.76%	95.21%	95.17%	95.24%	92.03%	96.79%	94.24%	95.90%			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	B	B	B			
Cumulative	Target	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%
	2024	97.08%	97.42%	96.68%	96.31%	96.09%	95.42%	95.61%	95.44%	95.49%			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	93%-100%
G	92%-92.9%
A	91.9%-81%
R	80.9%-0%

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.3   Emergency calls answered within 10 seconds

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
	2024	99.00%	99.03%	97.49%	99.44%	97.14%	95.52%	98.20%	96.96%	97.23%			
	Status	B	B	G	B	G	R	B	A	G			
Cumulative	Target	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
	2024	99.00%	99.02%	98.51%	98.74%	98.42%	97.94%	97.97%	97.85%	97.78%			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	G	G	G			

B	98%-100%
G	97%-97.9%
A	96.9%-86%
R	85.9%-0%

What is good
Higher is better

Ref 1.4 - Calls per FTE Control Operator

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61
	2024	78	83	95	97	95	109	92	87	53			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A			
Cumulative	Target												
	2024	78	80	85	88	90	93	93	92	88			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	>61
G	61
A	60-50
R	<49

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.5   Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2024												
	Status												
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2024												
	Status												

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-100
R	>100

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.6   Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Building fires)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	68	84	78	92	76	102	81	83	75			
	Status	B	B	B	A	B	A	B	B	B			
Cumulative	Target	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
	Avg Seconds	68	76	77	81	80	79	83	83	82			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.7   Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in vehicles)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	92	102	90	99	88	93	91	86	97			
	Status	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	B	A			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	92	97	95	96	94	94	106	93	93			
	Status	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.8   Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in the open)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	90	98	91	97	102	105	105	93	98			
	Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	90	94	93	94	96	97	112	98	98			
	Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.9   Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Road Traffic Collisions - Persons trapped)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	109	109	118	124	102	120	106	101	49			
	Status	A	A	R	R	A	R	A	A	B			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	109	109	112	115	112	114	127	111	104			
	Status	A	A	R	R	R	R	R	R	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.10   Challenged calls resulting in no requirement to attend

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year												
	2024	36	31	48	118	150	250	249	299	275			
	Status												
Cumulative	Prev 5 year												
	2024	36	67	115	233	383	633	882	1181	1456			
	Status												

B	
G	
A	
R	

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.11   Call Handling Target - Stations alerted within 90 seconds (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
	2024	67.7	63.4	63.8	66.6	63.9	62.3	63.9	69	69			
	Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R			
Cumulative	Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
	2024	67.7	65.6	65.0	65.4	65.1	64.6	64.5	65.1	65.5			
	Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R			

B	81%-100%
G	80%-80.9%
A	79.9%-70%
R	69.9%-0%

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.12 Fire Survival Guidance given

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Prev 5 year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2024	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2			
Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	B	B	G			
Prev 5 year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2024	1	1	3	3	4	4	4	4	6			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	0
G	1-3
A	4-5
R	>5

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.13 Safeguarding referrals made

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Prev 5 year	10	14	11	14	10	11	11	15	15	15	14	14
2024	17	13	19	19	19	12	22	30	11			
Status	R	G	R	R	R	G	R	R	B			
Prev 5 year	10	24	35	49	59	70	81	96	111	126	140	154
2024	17	30	49	68	87	99	121	151	162	162	162	162
Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R			

B	<10%
G	Within 10%
A	>10%
R	>20%

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.14 Threats of Arson dealt with

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Prev 5 year	11	11	15	15	17	18	18	20	17	11	10	10
2024	13	10	15	9	15	10	16	12	10			
Status	A	G	G	B	B	B	B	B	B			
Prev 5 year	11	22	37	52	69	87	105	125	142	153	163	173
2024	13	23	38	47	62	72	88	100	110	110	110	110
Status	A	G	G	G	B	B	B	B	B			

B	<10%
G	Within 10%
A	>10%
R	>20%

What is good
Monitor

Great Place to Work – People

Ref: GP1.1   Headcount Vs Establishment

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
2024	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			
Target	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
2024	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	>100%
G	>94.9%
A	<95%
R	<90%

What is good
Nearest target

Ref: GP1.2   % Staff turnover

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			
Target	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	
G	<1%
A	1.1% -2.5%
R	>2.5%

What is good
Lower is better

Ref: GP1.3   % Long-term Absence

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		B	<1%
Monthly	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%		G	1.1%-3%
	2024	7.69%	7.37%	4.91%	4.58%	3.95%	2.63%	2.47%	4.61%	3.12%					A	3.1%-10%
	Status	A	A	A	A	A	G	G	A	A					R	>10.1%
Cumulative	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%		What is good	
	2024	7.69%	7.53%	6.66%	6.14%	5.70%	5.19%	4.80%	4.78%	4.59%					Lower is better	
	Status	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A						

Ref: GP1.4   % Short-term Absence

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		B	<1%
Monthly	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%		G	1.1%-3%
	2024	1.80%	5.57%	0.65%	2.78%	1.97%	1.81%	3.62%	3.45%	4.77%					A	3.1%-10%
	Status	G	A	B	G	G	G	A	A	A					R	>10.1%
Cumulative	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%		What is good	
	2024	1.80%	3.69%	2.67%	2.70%	2.55%	2.43%	2.60%	2.71%	2.94%					Lower is better	
	Status	G	A	G	G	G	G	G	G	G						

Ref: GP1.5   Employee Experience (Core Engagement)

		23/24	25/26												B	>65%
Two yearly	Target	65%	65%												G	55%-65%
	Actual	74%													A	45%-55%
	Status	B													R	<45%
															What is good	
															Higher is better	

Ref: GP1.6   Appraisal (Personal Development) Completion

		18/19	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25								B	>95%
Annually	Target	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%								G	85%-95%
	Actual	78.38%	100%	100%	100%	97%									A	65%-84%
	Status	A	B	B	B	B									R	<65%
															What is good	
															Higher is better	

Ref: GP1.7   Mandatory Training Completion

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4										B	>95%
Annually	Target	95%	95%	95%											G	85%-95%
	2024	72%	35%	63%											A	65%-84%
	Status	A	R	R											R	<65%
															What is good	
															Higher is better	

Ref: GP1.8   Case management - % Completed within timeframe

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		B	>95%
Monthly	Target	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%		G	85%-95%
	2024	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%					A	65%-84%
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B					R	<65%
															What is good	
															Higher is better	

Ref: GP1.9   Number of workplace related accidents/injuries

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4										B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0											G	<1
	2024	0	0	0											A	1
	Status	G	G	G											R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0											**What is good**	
	2024	0	0	0											Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G												

Ref: GP1.10   Number of near miss/hazard reports

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4										B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0											G	<1
	2024	0	0	1											A	1
	2024	G	G	A											R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0											**What is good**	
	2024	0	0	1											Monitor	
	Status	G	G	A												

Ref: GP1.11   RIDDOR reportable injuries

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4										B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0										G	<1
	2024	0	0	0											A	1
	Status	G	G	G											R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0										**What is good**	
	2024	0	0	0											Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G												

Ref: GP1.12   Verbal or physical attacks on staff

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4										B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0										G	<1
	2024	0	0	0											A	1
	Status	G	G	G											R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0										**What is good**	
	2024	0	0	0											Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G												

Public Value – Efficiency

PV.1.1 - Number of reportable data breaches

	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25		B	
Target									G	0
Actual	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		A	
Status	G	G	G	G	G	G	R		R	>0
									What is good	
									Less is better	

PV.1.2 - Service Desk Response

Monthly

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
2023	100	91	100	96	96	100	96	100	100			
Status	B	R	B	A	A	B	A	B	B			

Cumulative

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
2023	100	96	97	97	97	97	97	97	98	88	80	73
Status	B	R	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			

B	100%
G	> 97.9%
A	> 95.9%
R	< 96%

What is good
Higher is better

PV.1.3 - Service Desk tickets logged

Monthly

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Prev 3 year												
2023	15	21	19	45	26	25	26	14	24			
Status	G	A	A	R	R	A	R	G	A			

Cumulative

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target												
2023	15	36	55	100	126	151	177	191	215	215	215	0
Status	G	A	A	R	R	R	R	A	R			

B	<10
G	10-15
A	16-25
R	>25

What is good
Monitor

PV.1.4- System Uptime

Monthly

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
2023	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

Cumulative

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
2022	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	100%
G	> 97.9%
A	> 95.9%
R	< 96%

What is good
Higher is better

4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE TVFCS PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

4.1 This report complies with clause 4 of the IAA – 'Principles of Collaboration'.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None identified at this time.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None identified at this time.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None identified at this time .

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

8.1 None identified at this time.

9. CONTRIBUTION TO SERVICE AIMS

9.1 As stated in the TVFCS IAA schedule 2: 'Primary objectives':

9.2   To satisfy the core functions of the Fire Authorities as defined in the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004

9.3   To satisfy the statutory duty of all the Fire Authorities as category one responders as defined in the Civil Contingencies Act 2004

9.4   To improve the resilience of the control room function

9.5   To provide the capability for future expansion of TVFCS with other agencies or clients.

10.   PRINCIPAL CONSULTATION

10.1   Monitoring Officer BMKFA, RBFA
10.2   Joint Coordinating Group.

11.   BACKGROUND PAPERS

https://bucksfire.gov.uk/documents/2022/12/tvfcs-joint-committee-agenda-and-reports-15-december-2022.pdf/

Agenda for Thames Valley Fire Control Service Joint Committee on Thursday, 12th December, 2024, 2.00 pm | Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service

12.   APPENDICES

12.1   None.

13.   CONTACT DETAILS

13.1   Area Commander Paul Scanes pscanes@bucksfire.gov.uk 07765041960

ITEM	NEXT REPORTING DATE	RECOMMENDED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	LEAD MEMBER	PART I / II
Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2025/26 (Bucks)	10-Jul-25	Agree	Monitoring Officer	N/A	Part I
Chairman's Annual Report 2024/25	10-Jul-25	Note	Senior Responsible Officers	Chairman	Part I
TVFCS Performance Report Q4	10-Jul-25	Note	Group Manager	N/A	Part I
Outturn	10-Jul-25	Note	Deputy Head of Finance		
TVFCS replacement strategic business case	10-Jul-25	Agree	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I
TVFCS Call Handling Contract Award	10-Jul-25	Agree and recommend	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I
TVFCS Proposed Budget 2026/27	15-Dec-25	Agree	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I
TVFCS Performance Report Q1	15-Dec-25	Note	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I
TVFCS replacement Full business case	15-Dec-25	Agree and recommend	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I
TVFCS Performance Report Q2 and Q3	16-Mar-26	Note	Senior Responsible Officers	N/A	Part I

This page is intentionally left blank