

## **Appendix 2 - HMICFRS Consultation feedback**

### **1. What do you think of the proposed approach to FRS inspection that HMICFRS proposes to conduct in 2018/19? How could this be improved?**

- The current proposed approach does seem to be relatively straight forward and suitable and sufficient to assess the three core questions identified. This approach could obviously possibly be amended following on from the pilot inspections but at present it doesn't pose any significant concerns.

### **2. Do you agree that an integrated inspection of fire and rescue services effectiveness and efficiency, and how they look after their people, is better than separate thematic inspections?**

- We feel having the integrated approach is a positive for FRS, as it reduces the burden on FRS to facilitate the HMICFRS inspection team on three separate occasions. This will also give the inspector's an opportunity for a more holistic approach to the inspections, where they can witness the evidence we have to offer against the inspection criteria and how each core element has a relationship to another, being underpinned by leadership.

### **3. Are there any other areas of FRS activity that should be included in the integrated inspections?**

- How North West Fire Control will be included in the inspection process with being a joint control?

### **4. Does the draft inspection methodology include the right questions to gather evidence for a rounded assessment of FRS? How could this be improved?**

- It could be useful for the methodology to be supported with a 'notes for guidance' document as some questions can be interpreted in many different ways which would result in a considerable response. Clearer direction on key themes may help prevent this.
- The language and terminology can vary which can create confusion. At times, the core questions can be referred to as the three pillars, KLOE's or the principle questions? Any terminology/ language used should be consistent and maintained.

**5. How else could HMICFRS adapt the way in which it acquires information to take full account of the circumstances of FRS and of the risk to public safety?**

- Case studies of performance seem a natural method for providing evidence. They allow for a greater depth of information to be communicated that could be missed by interviews when people may feel slightly under pressure.

**6. What, if any, new or emerging problems for FRS should HMICFRS take into account in its inspections?**

- The challenges being faced by other emergency services and partners (reduction in delivery), which could be having an impact on how we assess our community risks and target vulnerability going forwards.
- National events which may have a significant impact on FRS, Grenfell etc.

**7. What else should HMICFRS consider doing to make FRS assessments fair as they can be?**

- The Service Liaison Lead (SLL) role is pivotal and we hope that this relationship is an open and honest one. We would also hope that during the inspection week all the inspectors adopt this approach and we can have a relationship where the inspection team become part of LFRS for the week and align themselves to our service values. The programme is designed to encourage improvements and we hope our relationship with the team can be transparent and any concerns are identified at the time and we have an opportunity to consider a response and not read about them in a public report first.