

## **Facing the future: findings from the review of efficiencies and operations in fire and rescue authorities in England<sup>1</sup>**

### **Report of the Chief Fire Officer**

For further information about this report please contact Paul Raymond, Chief Fire Officer, on 01743 260201 or John Redmond, Deputy Chief Fire Officer, on 01743 260205.

### **1 Purpose of Report**

In December 2012 Sir Ken Knight, the outgoing Fire and Rescue Adviser, was commissioned by the Fire Minister to undertake a review into efficiencies and operational improvements in the delivery of fire and rescue services in England. This report provides an overview of each of the five chapters of the review report produced by Sir Ken and, where appropriate, provides commentary in respect of the position of Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service.

### **2 Recommendations**

The Fire Authority is asked to note the contents of the report.

### **3 Background**

Sir Ken's review consisted of desk-based analyses, coupled with visits to services across the UK. Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service was one of only fifteen Fire and Rescue Services, visited by Sir Ken during his review. His subsequent report features two case studies that remain anonymous in the document but are clearly references to the information he received from his visit here.

The report was released on 15 May 2013 with little prior warning to fire and rescue services and generated considerable interest in the national press.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/facing-the-future>

Following release of the report the Fire Minister held a teleconference with all fire authorities on 17 May 2013. A briefing on the main points discussed during the teleconference is attached at the appendix to this report.

It is interesting to note that, whilst there are no recommendations within the report, there are a number of key findings at the conclusion of each chapter. Sir Ken's aim was to "inspire debate and provoke action" (page 6).

## 4 Executive Summary

Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service welcomes the report as a stimulus for further discussion, debate and scrutiny to ensure that it provides the best service for the people of Shropshire.

The report makes the case that although, nationally, incident numbers have reduced by 40% in ten years fire and rescue services have shown very little change in resources to reflect the reduction in demand.

This Service compares very favourably in terms of the reduction in incidents highlighted in the report and also in the reduction in staffing and resources (15% fewer firefighters, 25% fewer station managers and above 20% drop in fire engines since 1998).

We spend £43 per head in Shropshire compared to the average of £38 nationally and £58 in the highest charging authority (London), cited in the report.

The report states, ominously, that "the potential savings highlighted in this review are unlikely to be sufficient for some FRS to be able to live within their reducing budgets". This Service calls for an impact assessment to be completed to identify the potential ramifications of this statement for the Service.

The report highlights that 'on-call' staff are an efficient way of providing the service and that a 10% increase nationally would save £123m. This Service compares well, with 82% of its fire engines staffed by retained firefighters. The report calls for **an increase to 51%** for other services

Staffing varies considerably across all services with the ratio of staff to managers being as high as 1:11 in one service. This Service's ratio at 1:23 is among the top three in England.

This Service agrees with Sir Ken that, if some of the larger authorities changed crewing types to include 'on-call' staff in urban areas very similar to Shrewsbury or Telford, much of the cuts imposed could be implemented without further impact on Shropshire.

If urban areas properly managed the demand due to false alarms they may be able to make even more significant savings.

The merger of services is still considered an option by fire and rescue services nationally, even with potential barriers, such as council tax equalisation.

Similar, if not better, outcomes can be achieved, however, via closer collaboration and joint working, as shown by this Service working with Hereford and Worcester.

We disagree with Sir Ken's assertion that the funding formula is fair, based on our experiences of recent years, which has seen unequal distribution and restriction on revenue raising imposed upon us.

We feel that greater scrutiny by fire authorities would help in some fire and Rescue services to address the inequalities between the provision of service between services.

Mergers and sharing resources is seen as a potential route to better efficiency across the blue light services. Mutualisation and the introduction of a Commissioner's role, such as the current Police model, are also discussed as well as the non-responder roles being allocated to the local authority. This Service would be interested in further investigations of these approaches.

## 5 Overview of the Report

The following sections provide an overview of each of the five chapters of Sir Ken's report and, where appropriate, provide commentary in respect of the position of Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service. The five chapters are as follows:

### Chapter 1

What is efficiency and how efficient is the delivery of fire and rescue services in England?

### Chapter 2

Deploying resources

### Chapter 3

Collaborating for efficiency

### Chapter 4

Driving efficiency

### Chapter 5

What is the future for Fire and Rescue?

## 6 Chapter 1

**What is efficiency and how efficient is the delivery of fire and rescue services in England?**

**Incidents have reduced by 40% and fire deaths are at an all-time low, but expenditure and firefighter numbers have stayed broadly the same.**

This Authority has been very successful in reducing the risk from fire and other emergencies since it became a Combined Fire Authority in 1998. Since 1998, we have reduced the number of primary fires we attend by 41%, which compares favourably with the average reduction seen in England of 39% (page 20). We have been particularly successful in reducing the number of accidental house fires by 30% over the same period.

Sir Ken's report states that the method of funding via the funding formula is fair and that 'money seems to go further in some areas than others'.

We disagree with Sir Ken's conclusion regarding the funding formula and believe that we have been significantly underfunded since 1998, with most of our funding being provided by local tax payers through council tax precept. Most other fire authorities receive the largest part of their funding through Government Grant. West Midlands receives 70% and Staffordshire 65%, compared with this Authority at only 35%. This is largely due, we believe, to fundamental flaws in the grant funding mechanism, which does not recognise the costs of delivering a fire and rescue service in a large, mostly rural, fire service without a coastline.

Our risk profile, together with available funding, means that we spend £43 per person per annum delivering our fire and rescue service. The average for England is £38, however the most expensive costs £58.98 per person

## Efficiency

Sir Ken cites efficiency as "achieving the best possible service for the public" (line 11 page 11). He applies a market economy approach to the provision of a fire service. It is more difficult to apply the concept of supply and demand for a fire service, because it is not just a case of focussing on the number of incidents, but the risks that need to be addressed. It takes the same number of firefighters and fire engines to extinguish a fire, whether it is ten fires per week or one per month.

In sparsely populated areas, such as Shropshire (which has the lowest per capita population density per hectare in England at 0.91/h), achieving a reasonable service is dependent upon meeting the risk, not just the level of activity, for much of our area. The comparisons in the report compare variables against population, which skews the results against low population density counties like Shropshire.

However, in terms of the basic tenet of the report to match budget to risk this Service has reduced resources in line with reducing the frequency of critical events. Between 1998 and 2013 we have:

- Removed 5 frontline fire engines or 20% of appliances;
- Reduced the number of firefighters by 15%, mostly being the more expensive full-time staff,
- Reduced incident commanders (senior officers) by 25%; and
- Outsourced support staff functions to reduce costs.

Sir Ken's report does not point out that the reduction in resources in line with the reduction in activity is only part of the story. The Fire Authority is legally required to provide an effective fire service, which must be based on risk. The Service locally provides sufficient resources to provide one fire engine in 15 minutes for 85% of incidents.

We believe that the current levels of resource provide a '**Minimum Acceptable Level of Provision**'. When many other fire and rescue services can guarantee one appliance in 6 minutes and three fire in 15 minutes I am sure you can agree with our position.

Of concern to this Service is the direction of travel of grant cuts in future, as the average reduction in grant per head was 9.9%, with the lowest at 5.4% (Avon) and the highest at 14% (Shropshire). Further substantial cuts could put this Service in jeopardy.

## **7 Chapter 2 Deploying resources**

**Prevention; protecting front line; on-call fire-fighters; only delivering other work that is really cost effective and delivering demand reduction**

Sir Ken recognises that moving resources to prevention work has delivered significant improvements in domestic and industrial safety from fire. He does not mention the extensive work that this Authority, for example, has done over the last ten years in road traffic collision prevention. Recent reports from the Department of Transport show that working with others has reduced those killed and seriously injured by such collisions by around 58% since 2000.

In the same section Sir Ken seems to suggest that authorities, who try to avoid redundancies, are not being effective. This is, of course, his opinion but this Authority has saved many hundreds of thousands of pounds in redundancy costs by professional headcount management. The decision to avoid redundancies has been a practical one and not one driven by moral or political reasons.

Sir Ken is the first to spell out very clearly what 'crewing efficiency', suggested in Sir George Bain's report of 2002, really means. Sir Ken points out that, if English fire and rescue authorities increased the number of on-call fire-fighters by just 10%, the savings could be as much as £123,400,000.

This Authority has long recognised that the most efficient fire service is delivered using the correct number of wholetime and on-call fire crews, based mainly on a quantum of demand and risk in any given area. Currently 82% of fire engines in Shropshire are crewed by on-call staff, saving approximately £900,000 per fire engine on full-time firefighter costs.

Sir Ken clearly points out that in many more urban areas the on-call crewing arrangement would be effective and cost efficient. London and West Midlands have no on-call crewing arrangements.

The report outlines several different crewing models some of which are in operation in this Service. It is interesting that one of the case studies of good practice, highlighted in the report, is the Retained Support Officer role employed here in Shropshire.

### **Demand Reduction**

Also in this section Sir Ken points to the work many brigades do in the wider community sense. We have all heard about fire-fighters teaching children to swim, mothers to cook healthily and youngsters to box. However Sir Ken asks the reasonable question: 'is this an effective use of resources?'

This Authority carried out an intensive 'Public Value' review in 2010 and concluded that the community wanted this Authority to concentrate on delivering an effective fire and rescue service at a cost that the public would accept. Since that time we have continued to deliver an effective fire prevention and incident response service but have withdrawn from many of the community activities encouraged by the previous Government.

The report discusses better targeting of resources to reduce the number of incidents. In order to achieve this, Shropshire continues a long association with partners in the health services, local authorities and, most recently, with housing trusts. The Service is working with housing and social care teams to identify and provide support in the form of home safety advice for the most vulnerable people living at home. By doing so, they are helping them to remain at home as part of their care package, saving residential care costs and at the same time reducing potential fire risks in the community.

### **Staffing**

The report identifies the huge difference in ratio of managers to staff across the English fire and rescue services. Each manager in Shropshire manages 23 staff (only three other brigades do better), whilst in Bedfordshire, for example, each manager has only 11 staff. What he does not point out, however, is that many authorities also have huge numbers of support staff as a percentage of all staff. Shropshire has just 11% of staff, supporting the front line, whereas authorities, such as Cheshire and Merseyside have 23% and 28% respectively, suggesting that it is these authorities, and many others like them, who have a great deal of room for making efficiencies.

He goes on to discuss using non-uniformed (green book) staff for protection and prevention roles. In Shropshire there is only one uniformed member of staff in the prevention team and we have had non-uniformed inspecting officers in the protection team since 1999.

Finally in this section Sir Ken identifies a wide range of success in demand reduction outside the reduction in fires and road traffic collisions. In particular, he points to reduction in false alarms. Nationally 42% of all calls to the Fire Service turn out to be false alarms. These cause a huge strain on the budget, a fact recognised by Shropshire as long ago as 2000. Since that time we have reduced false alarms by 50% and this call type only represents 27% of our total.

## **8 Chapter 3 Collaborating for efficiency Mergers; equipment; interoperability; and cooperation with other blue light services**

### **Structural collaboration**

In this chapter Sir Ken revisits many of the old arguments for regional or national fire and rescue services, very clearly in opposition to the national government direction for localisation of services. It is interesting to note that the report states that there is certainly no evidence that the biggest authorities are the most efficient, indeed, based on our investigations, they are among the most inefficient.

On mergers, he states that these could be a solution to further efficiencies but one of the main reasons this is not happening is that there is 'a lack of local political appetite and incentive to combine.'

There have been at least four pairs of authorities, who have attempted in recent years to combine. Many others, including this Authority, are considering merger as part of the cost savings review. We do not believe, therefore, that the principal reason for mergers not happening is a lack of political appetite. Having spoken to Members and Chief Fire Officers in a number of areas, where there have been abortive attempts at merging, we can report that the significant blocks have been:

- Firstly, the business cases identified that there would not be significant savings that could not be achieved through other means (such as strategic alliances); and
- Secondly, the inability to charge differential council tax across an area. This last point means that any opportunities for savings would be quickly swallowed up in equalising council tax down to the lower of the two authority levels (council tax increase limits of 2% would prevent upward movement without a costly referendum).

The report does state that "mergers may offer significant opportunities for efficiencies but a number of these efficiencies can be made by closer collaboration between fire and rescue authorities without the need for formal combination" (page 46 section 4), which reflects Shropshire's approach with regard to our collaboration with Hereford and Worcester.

Sir Ken also reiterates previous concerns at the duplication of effort in designing, commissioning and the evaluation of fire-related products and states that this is wasteful. He also states that there needs to be more trust between authorities to spread good ideas. There are two main points with this position;

Firstly, the duplication of effort – clearly, where authorities are looking at similar problems, it makes sense to join together in carrying out research etc. but there is also the argument that, on occasions, real improvements in facilities and equipment have only been achieved, when a fire authority takes the lead and develops solutions that are later picked up by others.

Take, for example, this Authority back in 1999, when we were the first to develop and buy PBI Gold fire kit. We were seen as mavericks and out of step. However, from 2012 all fire and rescue services in England now have PBI Gold or similar fire kit. Sir Ken also seems to miss out the huge amount of effort that goes into sharing procurement across all fire authorities. This Authority uses framework procurement, wherever possible and wherever it represents best value.

Secondly, is the question of interoperability. Although not stated, this can imply that fire and rescue services cannot work together, because they need to have the same equipment. It is the case that we cannot link every road traffic collision spreader to every hydraulic pump but the question is do we need to? If this was a problem, then, clearly, it would be a major part of any British Standard that we would all be required to buy against.

Customisation drives product development and, as long as the cost remains reasonable, this is generally acceptable. The alternatives could be national standard equipment (such as hose lines, fire kit etc.) but, on the negative side, there would be no product innovation amongst suppliers and a reduction in suppliers that would drive the price up. I am sure Sir Ken, with all his experience, understands that you play with the market at considerable risk.

Finally Sir Ken raises the discussion on shared blue-light services. There is no doubt that it makes a great deal of sense to join up fire and emergency medical provision. It happens across Europe and the USA and would make a great deal of sense locally. The question is which model would we use and what size should the joined up fire / emergency medical provision service be?

This Authority argues that such a joint provision for Shropshire would be very effective, especially if linked with ShropDoc, and a joint fire ambulance mobilisation centre in Shropshire. This is a theme proposed in a subsequent report to Sir Ken from the all-party Parliamentary Group on Homeland Security<sup>2</sup>

It is doubtful, however, if significant savings would be made, as recent incidents suggest that there is more funding needed for the ambulance service in the area. However, the increased size of a combined fire and ambulance service would create efficiencies of scale but still retain local control. A mix of on-call ambulances, using our model and joint full-time fire / ambulance / paramedic provision would, we believe, provide the people of the area with a much improved ambulance and fire service.

## **9 Chapter 4**

### **Driving efficiency**

#### **Funding, reserves and scrutiny arrangements**

Sir Ken suggests that most fire authorities spend to their budget and not to the risk within their areas. As this Authority is now going through a major review of risks and tackling funding pressures, whether this suggestion is fact or opinion will become clearer.

We are clear, however, and agree totally with the report, when it says that many authorities stated that funding needs to be reviewed, to ensure that this Authority does not continue to be a 'loser' in the funding share-out.

It is worth noting that the Government decides on how much money fire authorities need by doing their version of a risk assessment that drives the grant (and business rate share). This they then believe should be topped up locally with what local people can afford. Generally, this should be a three-way split between council tax, business rate and grant.

This Authority sets its budget by looking at its Integrated Risk Management Plan, Public Value, 2020 and medium-term financial plan, all risk-based planning tools. It decided on a 5p per week increase in council tax, which was agreed by the public through consultation. This was capped by Government at 3p. We are, therefore, managing down to budget not up to meet risk.

---

<sup>2</sup> which can be found at [http://henryjacksonsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Blue-light-Report\\_LR.pdf](http://henryjacksonsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Blue-light-Report_LR.pdf)



Sir Ken discusses reserves, which is a continued thread for Government to point to regarding cuts to front line. In reality the uncertain financial climate and the short-term nature of current government planning prompts institutions to expand their reserves in anticipation of changes and short-term needs.

The Service holds reserves that are allocated as follows:

- 1 For risk-assessed issues, such as losing a fire appliance or fire station;
- 2 To flatten out budgets that peak and trough, such as Retained Duty System salaries budgets that rely on how busy a station is, and to cover anticipated training needs;
- 3 Those built up to avoid borrowing; and
- 4 In the present financial climate those built up to cover the significant uncertainty of the current situation.

Sir Ken shows surprise that reserves have grown since 2010. This should not be a surprise, when the cuts are back-loaded but the retirement profile might not be. Some authorities, like ours (but not many others to be frank), froze recruitment and made cuts well ahead of the back-loaded curve. We have, therefore, built up larger reserves that we are using to make longer-term savings, such a procurement of appliances and equipment, paying for the new headquarters and station refurbishment. We save into reserves to spend to save in the long term.

Scrutiny arrangements are another of Sir Ken's long-time issues. He has experience of disengaged fire authorities and, indeed, was very surprised at the way our Members are so involved. He therefore feels that Chief Fire Officers have a free hand in doing whatever they like and are not challenged by their elected Members. Rather than making this situation better, he feels it preferable to change it completely and either go to down the Police and Crime Commissioner route, as recently advocated by the Home Secretary, or put in place external scrutiny.

My view is clear: yes, we should have improved scrutiny, perhaps with independent members, but the best way to obtain public scrutiny of our decisions is for Members to be more engaged with their local communities, as well as holding the Chief Fire Officer to account, which is the case here in Shropshire

## **10 Chapter 5**

### **What is the future for fire and rescue?**

The foreword to this chapter provides some interesting commentary. Firstly Sir Ken indicates that he hopes readers do not fall into the trap of adding up the various efficiency ideas of this report. He states they are inevitably broad-brush, designed to give a scale of the sense of opportunity. He also states that the review is half-way through the Government spending period, where efficiencies are being received.

His observations include: 'whichever way I look at the efficiencies picture, it seems to me that the scale of change needed to fully transform the FRS is unlikely to be achieved through individual local action alone'.

This insight paves the way for potential significant and national changes, outlined in section 5, albeit that the report indicates that fire and rescue services should not wait for any of these changes to be investigated, before taking advantage of the large number of opportunities that are already within their grasp.

It is in this section that a forecast is made of the aging population and impact that this will have on the risk profile, a key issue for Shropshire, albeit this future driver is not related back to level of service or, indeed, level of cost.

Attention is focused on the role of technology and innovation and, interestingly, in relation to sprinklers, Sir Ken suggests that, rather than lobbying the Government for regulation, local action should be taken to educate owners and occupiers of the benefits of fire suppression systems. Throughout this section, further examples are made of the application of sprinklers in relation to cooking related fires, and indeed the potential impact on firefighting technology.

### **Possible future operating models**

This section pulls no punches and suggests that localism may be used as a convenience for siloism. However, there are now five different authority governance models. In terms of the large-scale options to release greater efficiencies, the report indicates that these would need to be driven by Government and that these options include the following:

- Moving towards a more national model, through enforced mergers to reduce the number of fire and rescue authorities, potentially a full merger in the style of Scotland;
- Further embedding fire and rescue in local authorities, removing stand-alone fire and rescue authorities and ensuring that funding for fire and rescue services is contested locally alongside other local priorities;
- Finding a way to reflect efficiency in the funding formula;
- Allowing fire and rescue authorities to procure their fire and rescue service from a mutual company;
- Following international examples and privatising the provision of fire and rescue services;
- Merging fire and rescue services with one or more of the other blue-light services, improving interoperability;
- Sharing governance structures with other blue-light services, such as Police and Crime Commissioners taking on the role of fire and rescue authority; and / or
- Improving “join up” at a government level between sponsors of the blue-light services and other departments that hold an interest in activity related to fire and rescue work.

The report acknowledges that many would require upheaval, but indicates the gains could be considerable. The report makes comparisons to the transition costs in Scotland for one authority of £25m against the projected saving of £293m over 15 years. Interestingly, the report also indicates that, where fire authorities can provide business cases for local merger, then Central Government should step forward to provide financial support for transition.

This section discusses the issue of Police and Crime Commissioners and suggests a potential trial. However, if it does prove effective, then it would need to be adopted universally with clearly articulated benefits.

The final paragraphs of this section and this chapter suggest that further research is needed in respect of collaboration with other blue-light services and that there is potential for non-responder activity to be further embedded in the local authority, who also hold responsibility for community safety. Interestingly, there is no mention of the fire and rescue services, which effectively deliver community safety, expanding to take this work on behalf of others

The report concludes that these are challenging times for the Fire and Rescue Service and Sir Ken indicates a concern in terms of the pace of change and the hope that services redouble their efforts and come together to tackle change head on.

During the teleconference on 23 May 2013, the Minister outlined that he welcomed responses to the review in order for him to consider a Government response in the autumn.

The report makes a wide variety of assertions without actually identifying the root cause. Differences in “efficiencies” are highlighted but the rationale behind them is not explored, which could result in policy decisions at any level leading to unintended consequences that may be detrimental

The report assumes the Retained Duty System is sustainable and capable of greater demand. Whether this is the case would need investigating.

As we have seen, the grant formula needs to be reviewed, not only to reflect current risk and societal changes but also in anticipation of future changes.

The report makes no mention of external barriers to change, such as European employment legislation and, in some cases, over-burdensome regulations by Government policy.

The report totally misses the issue regarding the optimum size of a fire and rescue service. Whilst Holroyd provided some pointers in 1970, more could have been done in relation to criteria, such as geographical size, population, budget, optimum size of support services and / or the desire for co-terminosity with new ambulance trusts.

As with many other areas, due to the sophisticated nature of the research, there are resultant broad-brush statements, particularly in respect of 'latent capacity', scrutiny arrangements, public consultation, risk appetite and professional leadership.

We agree with the report in respect of sprinklers: they need to be targeted at the most vulnerable, builders need to make sprinklers aspirational and others will follow. Trying to replicate what has happened in Wales is likely to be a waste of time

The report does not mention attendance times as a method of assessing efficiency or linking it to the investment of resources. Neither does it discuss the assessment of risks faced by fire authorities. The Service itself is focussed on risk and yet it is not discussed within the report.

## **11 Conclusions**

As the report acknowledges, over the last ten t fifteen years there have been a number of reviews, which have been partially enacted in respect of improvements to the Fire and Rescue Service. 'Facing the future' reflects on a decade of decreasing demand as a rationale for the Service and Government to transform further the sector to ensure that, in austere times, available resources are best matched to resources.

Notwithstanding some of the inherent weaknesses in the contents of the report, it is a useful stimulus for all stakeholders in the sector to have a meaningful discussion and, it is hoped, a future vision about what is needed for a solvent, sustainable and successful Fire Service. For these reasons, it must be welcomed. Shropshire Fire and Rescue does welcome the report as a stimulus for further discussion and debate and also as a vehicle to change some elements of policy to ensure that it continues to provide the best service for the people of Shropshire.

## **12 Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

## **13 Legal Comment**

There are no legal implications arising directly from this report.

## **14 Appendix**

Main points from the teleconference with Fire Minister, Sir Ken Knight and English Fire and Rescue Services - 17 May 2013

## **15 Background Papers**

Sir Ken Knight CBE QFSM FIFireE  
Facing the Future: findings from the review of efficiencies and operations in fire and rescue authorities in England

This can be accessed via the following link:

<https://www.shropshirefire.gov.uk/news/shropshire-fire-and-rescue-service-welcomes-sir-ken-knight%E2%80%99s-efficiencies-report>

### **Teleconference with Fire Minister, Sir Ken Knight and English Fire and Rescue Services - 17 May 2013**

On 17 May, the Service also received a Fire and Rescue Service Immediate Bulletin (No.13) from DCLG advising of publication of the report and an invitation to participate in a teleconference with the Minister and Sir Ken on Thursday, 23 May.

In addition to the bulletin, the Minister wrote to fire and rescue services on 17 May, outlining the report and stating that he would 'now wish to take time to consider Sir Ken's findings and the Government will respond in due course later this year'.

Fire and rescue service officers participated in the teleconference, the key messages from which included:

- The Minister was unwilling to clarify his view on many points until the Government had considered the report, which would be in the autumn.
- The Minister was keen to re-emphasise that they were not seeking to privatise fire and rescue services.
- DCLG are seeking the views of chief fire officers, fire authorities, the wider fire sector and the representative bodies to inform their response.
- Sir Ken made it clear that the report was intended as much as a means to provoke debate as anything else. Figures used are indicative of potential savings, rather than targets.
- The Minister is particularly 'wary' of a single fire and rescue service model, feels this goes against localism and would incur large implementation costs.
- Sir Ken recognises that figures only represent the period up until 2011/12 and, while further changes may have been made, the principles behind his report would still be valid.
- Sir Ken believes that firefighter numbers grew in the ten years before the current austerity drive.
- Work does need to continue between the Department of Health, DCLG and the Home Office. Sir Ken had limited scope in this review, which prevented his looking at the blue light services as a whole.
- The Minister is very supportive of the retained model and feels it could be extended.
- The Minister signposted the transition funding available for those seeking innovative mergers.

