



Rod Hammerton, Chief Fire Officer  
Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Service Headquarters  
St Michael's Street  
Shrewsbury  
Shropshire  
SY1 2HJ

Our Ref: JPC/JI

24 September 2020

Dear Rod,

Thank you for providing details of the public consultation for the Service's new Integrated Risk Management Plan 2021-25 (the IRMP). Having read through the draft document I have a number of observations to make which are set out below.

**CRMP Preparation** - I am aware that Shropshire FRS and Hereford and Worcester FRS have both agreed to align their approach to the preparation of their own IRMP / CRMP with the other force. I welcome this approach and the commitment set out in the document to do so.

**SFRS / HFRS Fire alliance** – The document makes a number of references to the fire alliance with SFRS and this approach is supported.

**Revised response standard** – The draft IRMP sets out a proposal for a revised standard in detail and is included in the consultation, however the HWFRS CRMP makes reference to a new service standard based on the alliance work with Shropshire, and it is unclear how the two will be aligned as a result. The rationale for changing the standard is also different in both plans. This disparity should be addressed to ensure the commitment to alignment across the alliance is achieved.

## Prevention

Water safety is specifically mentioned in the IRMP as a supporting activity of an aim to 'reduce the risks associated with other emergencies'. The plan makes reference to a static number of RTCs. However to better align the plan with HWFRS, West Mercia Police and my own Safer West Mercia Plan I would welcome a more specific reference to this.

Safe and Well visits to those at risk are referred to in both IRMP / CRMPs in support of an aim to 'increase fire safety awareness and behaviour', however the 'at risk' group is defined differently for each service. In the draft IRMP there is more of an emphasis on the rural risk, whereas in the HWFRS CRMP it relates to vulnerability. Consideration should be given to complete alignment of definitions and meanings across the alliance.

## **Protection**

The draft IRMP references MATES, and has a protection aim to '*reduce the number of arson related incidents in commercial premises*' with a supporting action to work with partners to support the CJ process and meet a common goal of protecting the public'. This is welcomed but the aim could be broadened to include a specific reference to serious and organised crime, acknowledging that the activities undertaken in partnership focus on a much wider range of criminal activities, not limited to arson.

Linked to the above, the service should evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of existing multi-agency working in reducing risks in the community and could actively explore opportunities for new ways of working with stakeholders and multi-agency partners in order to better mitigate community risks.

## **Value for money (VFM)**

This section could be expanded to include an explicit reference to the alliance and how it is achieving VFM. The current reference to alliance is very narrow in terms of joint procurement opportunities.

While there is some reference to the fire alliance and partnership working there is limited reference to seeking wider collaborative opportunities with other surrounding services. Further reference to how better to deliver value for money through joint working with other emergency service and wider partners could also be included.

## **Performance & impact**

Both the IRMP and CRMP reference KPIs. Issuing revised plans should provide an opportunity to align these across the two FRS in support of having aligned plans.

The IRMP provides only limited details on governance arrangements for oversight and monitoring of delivery.

I hope my comments will be helpful in shaping the final version of the IRMP.

Yours sincerely,



John Campion  
Police and Crime Commissioner  
**West Mercia**