

PSP Consultation: Qualitative Comments**Proposal 1: Working even closely with other Fire and Rescue Services, Police and Ambulance Services and undertaking a joint options appraisal to look at opportunities for future joint working**

- As long as staff are trained to do their role
- Commit to being a United emergency service and utilise the resources of neighbouring brigades more widely
- It is important to maintain collaborative working practices with partner agencies to benefit the public
- Co-operative working is all well & good as long as SFRS does not lose sight of its prime objectives and not providing 'free' cover to other budget cut emergency services to the detriment of its own service.
- Should utilise staff more
- We would agree that collaboration across fire and rescue services and with other blue light partners creates more robust, resilient and relevant service delivery for the public and offers best value through the effective and efficient use of resources. As this work continues we would value the opportunity to be part of discussions and align our work with Surrey FRS and other fire and Rescue Services across the region. We believe this is important for the varying boundaries of different blue light services and therefore the value that can be achieved by all parties working towards effective collaboration beyond those boundaries. For example both FRS's work with South East Coast Ambulance Service. Alignment and collaboration in similar areas of work with SECAMB would add value for all services in for the future.
- teamwork is important
- Joint working needs to be agreed before trials take place to ensure all parties are aware of each other's limitations, and to see what we are able to assist with.
- If joint working means combined call centre, back office and more collaboration then I am all for it. If it means sending a fire engine and crew to attend emergency health issues then I am not. This I feel is unsustainable, gives duplication of services & call outs. This is a waste of resources and cannot be cost effective.
- It is crucial that the fire service works closely with other emergency services, to provide a better service for Surrey residents.
- Whilst maintaining focus on local issues and requirements
- Where duplication is avoided and savings can be made this should be a priority.
- More integration with the other 2 emergency services. Cut costs by merging the call centres and train fire-fighters to double up as paramedics
- I believe money can be saved by joint use of command and control facilities. We also need to think about the most appropriate use of the 3 services at a scene. It does not make sense to send all 3 where with a little more training one would do.
- The aftermath of a terrorist attack is a typical example of a situation where collaborative work is crucial. Should such an event take place (and one hopes and prays it will not) having blue light services well accustomed to work together would mean faster and better coordinated action.

- Further collaboration can only serve to offer more effective emergency services.
- Your strength has been in your success to protect your ability to respond. You have resilience. One cannot help but feel that the fire and rescue programme to assist the ambulance service is more of a reflection of their underfunding. It would be a shame for your service delivery to be affected negatively in the pursuit of papering over deficiencies in a partner agency.
- Why aren't ambulance and fire stations based together to save costs and promote joint working?
- Fire, police and ambulance teams sharing premises is a good idea, although the services are too different to be merged into one, with a single management.
- The amount of down-time Fire and Rescue have would be best spent acting as paramedic back up
- The Fire Service must modernise and it is vital that all staff are gainfully employed for all of each shift less meal breaks.
- Close working and co-operation between all emergency services is very desirable and if improvements can be made, it can only be for the benefit of all who work in them, plus the general public (providing this does not mean staffing cuts as they are already cut down to their limit).
- Believe that the control room functions of the fire service should be moved to the police service control room site.
- no opposition to training with other services but co-responding is of great concern
- It reads very much like working together in a way that people and therefore services will be cut as others are available. Lock fire and rescue is extremely important, working together must be an acronym for sharing resource at the expense of safety
- Keep the fire service police and ambulance separate and concentrate on what you are good on.
- Working together planning, training and attending incidents is fine, but integration is not. It will worsen the service to the public by watering down the effectiveness of each service.
- You should also look at other service providers, highways England, local council etc
- There are times when other counties need help and times when we may. Working with other services in Surrey will help in a serious time.
- Not sure why this is a proposal, I thought this was already happening.
- Considerable potential cost savings in joint working.
- Must overcome all data/information silos - read about Gen McChrystal in Afghanistan - would lead to better response, Greater flexibility and over time a greater range of capabilities with better career opportunities to boot
- Understand the need but feel Surrey needs to remember it is a Fire Service first of all. Does seem to be forgetting that in the proposals.
- The distinct lines between the services need to remain, particularly between fire and police as the fire service is seen as neutral in the eyes of the public. The fire service are NOT the police and should NOT do any policing or police jobs.
- It needs to be done to ensure joint working is effective and efficient. It must ensure that all services understand and support the role of each other using common communication methods. it should not be to cut costs alone.
- I would like to have a say in agreeing or disagreeing the final option selected

- The fire and rescue service should not be used to fill shortfalls in other services.
Reducing its availability
- The compilation of 'new' ideas outside of conventional standards is vital.
- Makes economic sense, but have to be careful each service retains its individual identity
- I disagree with what is happening to all emergency services in Surrey.
- Major savings could be made by sharing costs of buildings and back office support. Further savings could be possible by sharing software and databases and enabling staff to work across services, esp rescue and ambulance services
- While I agree that joint working is a positive thing, there needs to be clear definition between the different emergency services to protect the level of service to the public and recognise the levels of specialist skills that are required to carry out each role. Too much joint working will lead to a jack of all trades emergency service, unable to deal with anything properly
- I think it is vital we collaborate closely with partner agencies. We need to do this to comply with the direction of central government policy. In doing so we must be mindful that we protect and preserve our identity and purpose.
- Collaboration if cost effective could be great but done in a rushed ill informed way could be detrimental to the fire service. We need to make sure the core strengths don't suffer and the fire service gets dragged down by an underperforming service
- I believe that too much is now being added to the firefighters role! They are being asked to complete and get involved that other services should be managing. Cutting the watch numbers is not practical to maintain public safety.
- Joint working has the opportunity to deliver savings and efficiencies however caution is needed to ensure that quality of specialism is not lost and that bureaucracy does not become obstructive.
- Better collaboration between the services, will always give a better outcome to those who need the emergency services.
- I feel the traditional view of the Emergency Services working separately to each other no longer fits with the modern world... so I think there should be more collaboration between the services. Obviously, each have their own specialties, but there is still quite a lot of overlap.
- It is important to support other services where possible but not to dilute the work of the Fire Brigade or try to duplicate services already provided.
- Must be carefully managed so resources for primary fire service roles & skills are not degraded whilst supporting (propping up!) other services.
- You should remember what your role is and the rep the fire service has, this will be dramatically reduced if you have anything to do with the police, not because there's bad but because young people do not trust them as they do the fire service, collaboration with the ambulance service is on the other hand a great idea, you should be saving life!
- Work closely whilst keeping the fire service a separate entity is important
- There are likely to be further financial restrictions on all public services, so looking at ways to work together to improve services, maintain quality and remain financially viable are essential.
- Should not compromise public safety or undervalue staff
- They already work closely with the police and ambulance services

- Only by doing this will SFRS have a say in its destiny.
- Whilst it's good to discuss working practices with other services, it's very important that each service and each area maintains independence and a local physical presence.
- Options appraisal very important
- SECAMB are very busy and will be biting your hand off to accept any help you can provide. How will you maintain appropriate fire cover if your crews are tied up at medical emergencies?
- Question (b) is unhelpfully worded - by "work" do you mean the work of Fire and Rescue or the cooperation between F&R and Police and AMB (both of which are vital), or the options appraisal work, which is less vital.
- I think the fire service should be kept separate from other services.
- Concerned the Fire Service will become distracted from its main purpose which is to attend life critical fires and road accidents etc.
- The discussion should be based on what the public want and NOT on austerity and cost cutting
- Makes sense to have a joined up approach and best use of resource
- It totally depends on what is in the detail of the proposal. All genres are very different, they are specialist. None of the different jobs can be totally merged because of the specialisms.
- this needs to include community safety work as well as operational and support functions
- I live in Epsom, a small town of around 30,000 people. Within a few hundred yards there are police, fire and ambulance stations. Consideration should be given to a common estates policy, and a sharing of resources around fleet management and maintenance etc. I recognise that budgeting arrangements come into play, but these should not drive what would be common sense solutions.
- Coordinated service provision must have the primary aim of better responses, and a secondary aim of reducing costs.
- Cuts to such vital services are unacceptable. We are an area with some major risks around us - the M25, M4 and M5, as well as the airport. Added to which the affect of the floods had on us in 2014, and we need our services to remain intact.
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Meaningless without information on what joint working will involve
- Joint working should not be an excuse for making cuts
- Skill sets needed for Paramedics or Fire officers are significantly higher than for Police. It's important that Police are not used to deliver high skill services just share property and phone resources.
- I think there is great value to be had from emergency services working more closely together, it should improve services to the public. Not really sure why there are so many separate fire services with separate and expensive management structures in place. Streamline that before cutting frontline services.
- It is essential to all work together going into the future
- Look at working with local charities like Surrey Search and Rescue
- This should be 3 questions, it's wrong to put ambulance and police comments together

- All services should remain independent of each other.
- It saves time, effort, cost and most importantly lives
- Working closely together will build a stronger (and one team approach) emergency service with a wide variety of skill. All emergency services have the same common goal to keep the County and Country safe and save lives.
- Emergency operation the dark ages of public sector - True modernisation is required to deliver a vital service, but in a more business like way
- This work should not be at the expense of the core roles of the fire service.
- Evidence within this document highlights the work that SFRS is undertaking on behalf of the Surrey Police and SECamb. This demonstrates the collaboration work we are pioneering in rendering assistance and saving lives. What it does not contain are any direct and tangible benefits to the SFRS in delivering its own responsibilities. This means we are taking on additional responsibilities but it is very one sided. In addition there is a distinct lack of evidence of effective collaboration with other Fire and Rescue Services. The document references what we would like to do but in practice this is not supported with meaningful action and dialogue.
- Important to not be filling in other services gaps
- If firefighters are going to work closely with the ambulance service they must have adequate training in first aid and also how to support relatives if there has been a fatality before the ambulance gets there. Also psychological help may be needed by the firefighters.
- While this includes Blue Light partners it does not show how joint working with other public services and partners will happen
- It is critically important for the emergency services to be working more closely and where possible to integrate functions and responsibilities - this will result in improved services to the community, savings and efficiencies and better training and career opportunities for staff.
- The three emergency services have various common ground in respect to back office functions, Training, office and workshop facilities. These areas should provide easy wins in respect of joint working and in line with the JESIP principles of co-location and training.
- Ensure that staff are trained and rewarded correctly in line with taking on these new and collaborative roles
- support fire/amb integration - less keen on overlap with police work
- Joint working saves lives. Not just financial
- As long as this does not mean that staff and appliances are to be spread out to serve the area in order to reduce staffing and appliances as a means to save money.
- Fire service should be separate from ambulance and police services
- Police and Fire are totally different functions and will totally lose their way under these proposals
- it works in other countries like France however it should not happen if it makes our fire service less efficient by diverting too many resources elsewhere
- The correct training should be given, the co-responding/IEC roll out was and continues to be poor. You need to listen and respond to frontline feedback. Where are our Hep B jabs for example.....

- I notice that internationally the fire and ambulance/EMS are very often combined but in far fewer countries the fire and ambulance services are combined. Will a greater proportion of the overall collaboration be with the police or ambulance service?
- All three services work in a very different way and have different competing priorities - how can you have a one size fits all approach when the case is one size will not fit. I can only see this as a reduction of service whereby fire are trying to cover up/pick up those things the other services cannot achieve due to cuts in their services but as the fire is being cut too how will they cope
- Makes sense in this time of austerity
- It is important for services to work together, however NOT TO TAKE ON EACH OTHERS WORK
- All 3 services should remain separate and experts in their field, however back office functions and buildings could be shared to save money but not at a cost to the frontline
- The words are guff, this doesn't say or change anything, but rather sounds like something a comms team have come up with.
- Fire and Ambulance should become one emergency service as we've seen in so many other countries. I cannot see Fire service and Police being efficient nor cost effective to the fire service.
- Firefighters are firefighters NOT paramedics or police officers!!!
- Fire & Rescue Service is there to provide emergency aid when there is a fire, or when rescues need to be performed, not to undertake tasks that could, and should, be done by others.

Proposal 2: Using data to identify those most at risk of fire

- The focus on fire prevention should not diminish your ability and resources to deal with incidents on a large scale when they do occur
- Helping vulnerable folk protect themselves is admirable but in any emergency, eg fire or flood, crisis has no respect for artificial social barriers.
- We anticipate that, as a statutory Fire and Rescue Service, this approach would be used to effectively underpin understanding of risk. This understanding would inform where and how resources are directed to reduce and mitigate risk as well as respond in the event of an emergency. As a service that has recently undertaken a risk review we would willingly share our experiences and learning. As work is undertaken, given the shared border between Hampshire and Surrey, we would have a particular interest in any findings and subsequent decisions about how Surrey FRS might deploy Service Delivery resources that may in turn impact on Hampshire FRS. We would welcome the opportunity to align our views on risk so that we have a common approach to addressing that risk.
- I thought this was being done everyday at every fire station?
- If this can prevent fires in the first place, it can only be for the good. Issues such as data protection need to be addressed. How will you define and identify "old and vulnerable" adults?
- If services aren't able to share information about who is the most vulnerable then this really hinders our firefighters in knowing what to expect at an address and how best to prepare, so this is really important.

- Presumably this would result in a register similar to that operated by the electricity companies
- This is bread and butter for the fire service I would hope that this is just continuing what they already do.
- More effective prevention measures will inevitably leads to less of a requirement to be reactive where poor measures have failed.
- Fire reduction is a sensible use of your time. Far better to prevent hinge catching fire than to purely react when they are on fire.
- The service should be careful not to decrease its focus on other sections of the community, as some vulnerable people are bound to be overlooked.
- they could link in with 39/24 sent to social services by police
- Surely this is done already ? If not I would be amazed.
- While I agree that some premises etc are more vulnerable than others, I do not believe this would be the best way forward because it would be going over matters that have already been covered to a certain extent.
- Very important to protect vulnerable persons - should work alongside police vulnerable adult teams and MASH units to identify those at risk
- Do not reply understand the question, but think it's quite obvious in the majority who is most risky
- Who's right is it to decide who's vulnerable and who's not?!
- No one agency has all information if data can be shared it helps protect everyone
- Information & data analysis key - a competence that could only be afforded on a national basis though - MUST NOT be reproduced regionally
- My wife and I and our 2 neighbours live [address details removed] and we have always been worried by the difficult access to our houses if Fire Services or Ambulances are needed. We are situated at the end of the bridle path [address details removed] and access is not improved by 2 iron posts with a gap of 7 foot between them, put there for insurance purposes required [location information removed]. The only other access is from the bridle path's exit onto [address details removed], a steep slope of 100 yards. Our main concern is age, I'm 81, my wife 74 and all 3 of our neighbours are over 65.
- I would be against cold calling or door knocking to achieve these goals. Social services or housing associations should insist on these visits etc being done without the need to cold call.
- It is important, but the most vulnerable often live alone and privately and there are no laws permitting us to help them when they refuse it.
- Once identified, what will you or the service do about it proactively?
- of my 'normal' building survey process, I look at conditions and associated risk elements closely, and report back on same.
- Data needs to be kept up to date and should include all those living within sheltered and assisted housing eg adults with learning disabilities need to be supported by those trained and experienced to understand their needs.
- Prevention is better than cure
- Consider connecting to the charity sector to identify vulnerable groups, especially older people living alone.

Once identified, education should be offered to groups other than schools such as day centres for adults with learning disabilities. They can then learn how to keep themselves safe in their own homes.

- Recent incidents involving fire fighter fatalities have exposed a lack of risk information as a primary factor in unsuccessful outcome of the event. The risk to the public must also be quantified so that we can accurately gauge our provision of fire cover.
- targeting should save money by less wide spread publicity needed
- How peoples personal and private space should not be invaded upon and we should not force ourselves on people unannounced
- Prevention is always better than cure however as trends show fire calls are declining is there a need to invest to accelerate this fall or would it be better to maintain current services and therefore the current trend and use the money where greater focus is needed?
- I think that a stronger regulatory hand is needed to ensure these higher risk businesses make improvements to reduce the chance of fire and reduce the severity that the fire can become.
- These businesses that are particularly vulnerable should also be made to make improvements to their premises to reduce the chance of fire and reduce the chance of a fire becoming a major incident. A sterner Regulation role is needed.
- I can't see the point of the the Fire Brigade duplicating others work, support for sure but all emergency services must share information
- Tight management & maintenance of current & relevant data vital
- Are you not already doing this, this is concerning that in the 21st century this is only a proposal!
- This method has been tried previously but with little success as other agencies / partners seem reluctant to share the information the Fire Service require to reach the vulnerable people.
- It is just common sense
- With all that is required of a crew is their time hugely valuable. We now have a database of vulnerable adults to target our safe & well visits. So, no more having spend huge amounts of time trying to locate them ourselves. So now 100% of our visits will be to vulnerable people. A perfect solution.
- I would have thought this data already available and used
- Sounds like good, common sense.
- Am shocked you have not been doing this already!!
- this should be done anyway adn regularly updated
- This kind of work is already in progress, however there are still services in my experience that don't seem to carry this through. For example Social Services still gets referrals for the police highlighting fire hazards, they could make a direct referral to SFRS but they expect Social Services to do it. They forget there is a Memorandum of understanding.
- Businesses should undertake this activity themselves with the fire service checking and assisting where needed
- to do this effectively we need correctly resourced intel team, back office systems and admin support

- You should be doing this anyway, but it makes sense to review in the light of developments in 'big data'.
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Far less important than proper resourcing to respond to demands.
- Targeting resources delivers better results
- Don't you do this already?
- With less personnel and a greater expectation of our responses we need to address and identify our vulnerable people in the community
- This is a good thing to do
- Highlighting those most vulnerable will allow the service to focus on those most in need.
- Prevention of fires is very important - talks in schools, community groups etc
- It is important that we have data and analysis to have a better understanding of how effectively our service operates - as well as others - and it is even more important that we make specific and general improvements on the basis of this evidence.
- Information sharing is as equally important at the scene of operations as it is behind the scenes. Working with other agencies to identify those at greater risk will enable the emergency services to provide a better targeted response to the vulnerable
- A targeted approach will bring about the greatest improvements
- Important but would be more efficient if the agencies / businesses could identify the risk and buy in to the reduction model - they need incentive/value - similar to Neighbourhood watch for crime maybe.
- prevent better than cure
- People have to take responsibility for themselves to a certain degree. Prevention is important but not to the detriment of the provision of emergency capacity.
- I don't quite see how that would happen in practice. I am sure the Fire Service knows most of this already....
- I have no real knowledge beyond that of the armchair expert (!) so struggle to say how important this work is. I can only really ask how will this deliver savings. Will it deliver savings to the same degree as collaborating and partnership or is it more about being intelligent and creative in managing risk with less overall resources and thus keeping a lid on, for instance, fire deaths.
- Prevention and sharing data represent vfm
- Not to rely on data as it can be flawed
- I keep a 'Neighbourhood Watch' list for my road which identifies vulnerable residents.

Proposal 3: Working with Police and Ambulance Partners to assist and add public value

- Working with the police and ambulance is important to give the public the whole emergency service approach they deserve. However it shouldn't be forgotten they are still individual services and that should be maintained... Police for policing issues, fire and rescue for just that and ambulance for complete casualty care

- Co-operative working is all well & good as long as SFRS does not lose sight of its prime objectives and not providing 'free' cover to other budget cut emergency services to the detriment of its own service.
- it is achievable , but we MUST be able to respond to a fire call firstly and foremost. If we can have the assurance that if we attend a minor RTC (police assist) then should a firecall require us we get remobilised to the more serious incident, every time.
- I remain convinced that sending a crewed fire appliance to attend when other services are stretched is not the best use of resources and finance. Money would be better spent on more ambulance crews and/or paramedics in cars.
- Ultimately all the emergency services are serving the same group of residents, so working together is the only efficient way of managing demand. Co-responding not only helps Surrey residents but also increases the skills of our firefighters.
- If there is spare capacity in the Fire & Rescue Service to allow this to happen. Should the budget be transferred to SEACamb to give them the resources to manage these emergencies. It seems a bit pointless to dispatch both services
- Police and ambulance services are under more pressure than ever, its time the fire service stepped up to the plate and got stuck in using their existing powers of entry to relieve the pressure on police.
- This relates to what I wrote in (1) above
- It's important but a firefighters expertise should not be intertwined with the skills of paramedics or police officers
- Its should not however be a precursor to cuts where services are diluted or withdrawn.
- Need to alleviate some pressure off ambulance and police, as their capacity is lower and they are over utilised.
- Again, this should not result in a merger of the services. I fear fire crews becoming first responders to too many incidents for which they are not properly trained.
- There is no doubt that in the public eye the Ambulance Service and Police are seen to be extremely busy whilst the Fire Service have spare capacity.
- This is almost the same as Proposal One, as far as I can tell, as I am hoping that Proposal One would also take 'meeting demand, improving safety and adding public value' into account.
- As with Q1 believe that the command and control aspect of the fire service should be absorbed into the police control room functionality - not just in Surrey, but nationally.
- firefighters arriving when an ambulance is required is bad enough but to meet demand of others is madness. firefighters have no powers to stop and search or arrest and so asking them to attend police calls is ridiculous and takes away fire cover
- Is that not happening already?
- Each service should focus on their own responsibilities.
- More important to work with ambulance saving lives. Not sure how fire service can assist police service especially with arrests and burglaries.
- Totally agree that this should be the case, as long as each of the three emergency services do not have too many skills to maintain, which may lead to unprofessionalism.

- While I am happy to see an American model fire station with a paramedic vehicle I don't want firemen to have general arrest rights unless they are fire related and on or near an incident
- I think that each service should concentrate on its strengths and not try and be everything to everyone
- This proposal is s ok aslong as it doesn't take our fire fighters away from doing their job.
- Cost savings in joint use of buildings and good opportunities in co-responding. I still think a core fire response is essential.
- Ideally co-located
- As per q1b, you are a fire service primarily, don't forget this.
- Fire and Ambulance should work together. Police side not so much very different role.
- Consider stronger ties with adjacent services to hopefully reduce overheads and improve overall service
- I'd like more detail and be kept informed as the work proceeds
- Getting worried that maybe you're proposing to create a 'nerve centre' for 'combined' services?
- Consider firefighters' training to include paramedic training and the police/ambulance to consider basic fire fighting. First responder needs to be multi skilled.
- too many changes, things should stay as they are and let each section deal with their own problems
- As above, too much collaboration will lead to added stress on staff and a lack of capacity to deal properly with incidents due to a lack of knowledge and experience. To do one of these jobs is tough, to try and learn all three would be impossible
- This is important, but the caveat is that all of this work must be rigorously assessed to ensure we are making the best use of our limited resources. There is a danger that we overcommit, or take on work that is easy to achieve (the low hanging fruit) but of negligible value to the public. Secondly we must ensure we adequately trained and equipped for new roles. The service should also seek to access new income streams associated with undertaking work for partner agencies. It is not right that we continually offer our services for free, we need to be busier but we should also be financially recognised. Increasing responsibilities for staff should also result in increasing remuneration.
- this is exactly the same as the first question so see my response
- Better collaboration between the services, will always give a better outcome to those who need the emergency services.
- Fire Brigades budget should be spent on Fire Services, of course aid where-ever possible in a life threatening emergency. If Police or Ambulance are having trouble meeting demand they should receive extra funding rather than depleting Fire budgets
- Stay away from the police, this is not your role in anyway! You are to save life & reduce risk not chase baddies and slow traffic.
- Keep the fire service separate and concentrate on its core duties rather than propping up other services
- They should stop cutting the services and invest in them to meet demand. Why would you want a paramedic trying to put out a fire or a firefighter trying to arrest someone. They are trained in that area for a reason and decided to do that job

because that's their passion. The more they try to mop up for each other to meet the demands, the more the public are at risk.

- Multi agency approach to co responding is a good thing but the right level of investment in training & equipment must be provided if this is to succeed
- Where appropriate
- There is scope for all kinds of joint working some of which we are not yet aware of but it will evolve over time. It will be interesting to see the final model.
- Important, however any gaps in police or ambulance services should not be plugged Fire and Rescue but addressed individually.
- Fire service should deal with Fire issues only and should not be used just to supplement the shortfall of the NHS let alone the Police. Ambulance staff did not join the NHS to be firemen. If there is a decline in calls for the fire service then downgrading stations to retained status would save money.
- Nothing new here too
- Shared facilities sound like a good idea. HQ buildings, workshops, Control rooms, training facilities.
- Fire service should be completely separate from other services
- Concerned the Fire Service will become distracted from its main purpose which is to attend life critical fires and road accidents etc.
- but each agency should play to their own strengths
- Again this relies on the other agencies to actually value and work with SFRS. If SFRS are supporting the other agencies will the other agencies support SFRS? There are probably more that SFRS can do for the other agencies but not a lot they can do for SFRS.
- we need to monitor this with care so that we maintain time for community and business safety and risk management work - this protects firefighters and the public from injury and death
- In a world of change, with budget increases unlikely, sharing and partnering is not just sensible, it should be mandatory.
- What does that even mean?
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Obvious but not a key objective
- Only if it improves service to the public. I don't want firefighters doing Police enforcement work, they need to stay neutral and continue to be seen as a service that helps the public.
- Again these should be separate questions this is wrong and misleading
- I have no problem with red 1 calls. We should not be committing resources to other ambulance incidents where the patients need transporting to hospital. We have no right to attend minor RTC as we hold no powers in directing traffic. You are tying up resources and while we are in attendance both the other services will not prioritise the incident we are dealing with
- Working together as one emergency service will ensure the community are kept safe by the increase of demand.
- Many opportunities to save money AND provide a better more tied up total service.

- Assisting the ambulance when possible is very important, firefighters join to help people in their hour of need. The collaboration with the police I believe is less important, sharing premises etc yes but carrying out police work (e.g. minor rtc) no.
- Police and Ambulance issues are theirs to deal with. It is not for the fire service to bridge this gap.
- There needs to be an assessment that this does not come at the cost a deterioration in the services that SFRs currently provide or a negative impact on response times
- Aligning with police could damage fire service image, and with ambulance already stretched to the limit they could become too dependant on the fire service
- Work with them to share infrastructure, but not overlap of responsibilities. It is a larger decision to combine tasks
- We should be striving to be an singular emergency service to reduce the time it takes to get the most suitable response asset to those that are in need.
- Must not affect the FRS ability to attend efficiently & effectively to their priority and specialism
- What does 'help meet demand' actually mean? If it is responding to calls which the Police/Ambulance would normally deal with how will this be financed?
- coordination and cost saving
- Working together will improve efficiency and the service to the public but the parameters for each service must not be allowed to become blurred. I do not think that fire appliances should routinely be sent to urgent ambulance calls for example as has been my experience in the recent past.
- it works in other countries like France however it should not happen if it makes our fire service less efficient by diverting too many resources elsewhere
- I still believe the joint approach is needed however we are plugging holes for the ambulance service, in essence robbing Peter to pay Paul. The is not a robust solution.
- Employ more skilled police and ambulance rather than trying to upskill an already stretched, important and essential service.
- Let the police and ambulance service do their job, with proper funding and let the fire service do your job, again with the correct funding. One cap does not fit all.
- What does "help meet demand" mean - who's demand, what demand - you state traditional fires are reducing so fire would be meeting the demand of the other services which we know are already stretched. I can only see this as bringing the fire down to the level of other services so they struggle to meet their own demand
- The public should receive the best service from the best qualified people, the services should not cross over especially with very little training and no experience and no compensation for taking on extra work
- Working with is one thing, doing the job of another service should not happen as this dilutes expertise.
- Again, the words means nothing, of course these are things you will do, but how will you do it?
- Each of the services should be funded and resourced enough internally to meet their own service demand without relying on other services to fill the gaps. Improving safety and adding public value is a must and savings can undoubtedly be made by 'joint' working across some areas however I do believe it is not necessarily done through multi - skilling firefighters to be first responders for ambulance or first on

scene for RTCs for Police. Whilst I agree sending a fire engine to a critical call to save a patient is better than no ambulance for 30 mins due to shortages, I believe the ambulance shortages should be addressed first before using the fire service as a 'stop the clock/response time' facility

- The resources need to be used in the correct manner not just sent because another partner doesn't want to deal with it as part of their normal day to day work. Fire service is the only highly skilled to train with fires this must be the highest priority for what they attend.
- Early intervention by Fire Service if they are better placed to attend would be good. Could be conflict with other Services re pay, terms and conditions as 3 emergency services are not equitable. Fire Service helping to lift people who have fallen could be really helpful as comparably younger workforce.
- I believe we learned how effective joint operations worked during the 2013/14 flood.
- How is this different from proposal 1? Looks very similar, see answer to Q1.
- Currently disappointed that cost savings and budget restraints have curbed visible neighbourhood policing teams. They were a vulnerable asset.

Proposal 4: 999 control centre operations

- All data should be shared with other services without fail. That doesn't mean joint control centres. Computing in this day and age gets information across quicker and more effective. You should focus on the integrity of the fire service as an individual and share information on a technical basis
- Reducing back office costs is good as long as staff have sufficient time and knowledge to know the geographical boundaries of their respective services. Currently Police & Fire seem to follow County demarcation lines whilst NHS has its own territories & boundaries.
- We would be interested in working in conjunction with Surrey FRS and other services in the Region to explore the above question. We would want to go further and identify viable options, a means for achieving improvements and putting those improvements in place. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service are part of the Network Fire Control Service Partnership with Dorset and Wiltshire FRS and Devon and Somerset FRS. We are open to discuss how Surrey might benefit from this experience and arrangement.
- If money can be saved through shared working then it can only be supported, as long as the operators are kept up to the level that ours is at this moment, no shortcuts or reduction in skills base.
- I cannot believe this hasn't been done before. No duplication of call outs, the right service first time. This will require careful planning however but it has been done by multinational organisations. i.e. British Gas.
- All part of the collaboration work that needs to go further.
- National call centres to receive emergency calls and direct relevant services is achievable, huge savings can be made. This is achievable and I would like to see a firm plan that would make this happen , rather than just being an aspiration. Most

commercial organisations that run 24 hour response services have already centralised their emergency call centres.

- It cannot be cost effective to work in isolation to the other 2 emergency services - merge the control room with the police to cut costs.
- This relates to what I wrote in (1) above
- If you desire a joint Control Centre for Fire, police and Ambulance please can someone have the guts to say it!
- This is on the face of it sounds a good idea as when there are incidents involving two or more of the services then it can only be a benefit to have greater comms. Consideration is required however where comms relating to criminal activities or operations of the Police could be compromised by non police personnel working in the same control room
- Of course it is important to communicate well. Who would ever suggest it isn't?!
- Should there be a shared control centre? This would help with major incident coordination
- Share control centre information more, but do not have a single control room.
- It is about time that one Control Room covered all three Services.
- Surely covered under Proposal One again, unless my logic is at fault?
- As with Q1 believe that the command and control aspect of the fire service should be absorbed into the police control room functionality - not just in Surrey, but nationally.
- Will lead to job losses and a clouding of skills in each department
- I think the existing small fire control is perfectly adequate and able to meet its needs
- Please see answer above.
- We are behind the curve on this - speed is essential
- Don't cause delays, overload your staff or impact local knowledge.
- Surely it is about time the service used the new number - 112.
- Makes sense to help co-ordination
- Important to consider integrating with adjacent operations to get benefit of scale and hopefully reduce overheads.
- Local knowledge in an emergency situation is key!
- See comment above..there's an old saying "If it aint broke, don't mend it" safety and service is NOT all about money.
- I have used the 999 service and found it to be very efficient.
- Communication at early stages can allow appropriate response to be deployed
- Absolutely. Rationalisation that results in a quicker and more efficient emergency response is difficult to argue against. However we need to be mindful of the difficulties that major projects IT present (I am sure the regional control fiasco is in the fore front of everybody's minds). The public sector has a very poor track record in this area. If this work is outsourced then there needs to be very careful legal scrutiny of the contracts as it seems that when private companies get it wrong it is the commissioning public organisation that carries the burden, both financial and reputational rather than the consultants that draft the contract.
- again we do not want to become a jack of all trades and master of none
- The work is extremely important and should be a specialist service not linked to other emergency services

- I don't know enough about any current issues or trends to comment meaningfully about this. I would have thought that if it's not broken it doesn't need fixing - is it broken? Are the potential improvements a greater need/easier win than other areas, is this needed to sustain services in future?
- I think that an incident is an incident, and having to decide which service to call, and then either follow up to the other services, or hope that the message is passed on to other services, wastes time. A combined call 'emergency incident' centre could provide a better incident notification system.
- Communication is key to Any situation... An incident is an incident, and proportional response can include several branches of our emergency services... having to decide which service to ask for on the phone, then hope they get the message to the other services, is wasted effort, in my opinion.
- A sharing of premises to house all control rooms seems sensible
- Individual Services skills & standards must be respected & retained not lost under the umbrella of technology. People skills and person to person communications are vital.
- The police are not great at sharing information and their mobilisation is a joke! You call the fire service they respond with 10 to 15 mins. The police may or may not turn up a few days later.
- All forces need to share information- I don't understand why this doesn't already happen
- Joint control rooms may not provide the best response to the public. If for instance you call the Fire Service you generally get an immediate response, however if you call police or ambulance the response may not always be immediate, in particular with the ambulance service being stretched to capacity & having no resource available to send, & the police depending upon the nature of the call being assessed by their operatives as urgent or non urgent may turn up a week or so later.
- It is a no brainer
- There should be one control room covering all the services. All services should be housed under one authority.
- Any improvements possible will be very welcome
- Combined Control rooms would improve communication.
- This would mean improving the skills and knowledge of the 999 workers.
- Explore the possibilities of sharing your Mobilising & Control Centre with the Police
- information sharing is key to timely interventions
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Poorly described and lacking specific outcomes. Needs a complete review and re-provision to cater for new technologies and modern ways of working.
- Surely in 2016 you can share information quickly and easily between services!
- Moving in the right direction to have joint 999 Centres
- Needs a lot of thought to get this right
- having the 3 services in one large building may be beneficial, as long as there are no job cuts between the control staff
- This should be vital and fundamental to future working.
- So much waste with current setup not a particularly great service for incredible amounts of money.

- Lots of cost savings to be gained. Although the work has some differences it is largely similar
- The 999 control centres must not cover too large an area - it is important that the operators have local knowledge.
- appointing a response asset to a emergency call should be as simple as selecting the right asset and sending them the details of where to go. Why is there a need for three different control centres?
- explore/promote new technologies to enhance 999 response re text and videos
- This information needs to be collated and used by all agencies to improve their own overall situational awareness. There should be greater freedom on information sharing between responders.
- Place your control room with either surrey police or secamb
- Common sense -
- on going self assesement/review
- This will and has led to mistakes. Once misdirected call will and has led to loss of life. An ambulance was mobilised from Poole for a fatal road acciident between Haslemere and Liphook
- I would have thought you already do this
- This is just common sense.
- As long as it is only sharing information. Not joint mobilising.
- These must not be merged they all have different requirements and ways of working, again there has been much evidence of failings in both police and ambulance control centres
- Most residents would assume this happens already
- More business as usual.
- It needs to be explored in the right manner that all partners get equal say in the future of the control rooms as they have highly trained staff in them with a depth of knowledge and experience that could be last
- Fire Control staff are specialists in their field and should not be expected to cover work meant for other organisations.
- Again, what about parity of pay, terms and conditions? Would we need different/ new control centres?
- And let the public know. Many citizens know you are working together! Highways Customer Panel. (Resident enclosed leaflet about the Highways Customer Panel, writing on it 'Not every citizen has the facility! However a modern Fire Service must have!').

Proposal 5: Review our training

- To maintain safety to crews and public.
- Can't agree more. The community we serve is diverse in its structure, there are still the simplistic old houses and buildings that should be trained for along with the modern state of the art buildings that are complex. The same as motor cars, boats etc. Along with all he other services that are provided.

- Rather surprised this is not happening already as continuing appraisal of demands on the service should have already revealed this shift in demands on the FRS.
- We would agree that realistic and sufficient training are of critical importance to both firefighter safety and to ensure effective delivery of services. As Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service develops its own Training Academy we would welcome enquiries from Surrey Fire and Rescue Service as to how they can benefit from this capability and provision.
- Still using PPV defensively after 12 years of promising that we will train offensively?
- Would this mean training Fire fighters as paramedics and using them during off peak and quiet times? If so, this would require careful planning so as not to leave the Fire emergencies without cover.
- It's great that demand is falling, but skills need to be developed so our crews know what to do when they get to an incident.
- The implication is that training will be reduced. This potentially puts your employees at risk as the type of problem to be dealt with remains the same though less frequent resulting in a greater need for training.
- This is an obvious thing to do, more training with how to deal with a terrorist attack I hope would feature in the future plans more so than they do now.
- If your service is more and more successful at preventing fires it makes sense to use your current down time more effectively.
- Motorway accidents with multiple vehicles involved is the typical example, also with the increased number of foreign drivers/vehicles in our roads the risk profile has changed considerably in the last 5 years or so.
- An outcome of greater fire prevention and reduced general risks means that the service has to adapt to a wider public safety service including the provision of medical services in an emergency.
- Training is not a luxury. It is the bedrock of resilience.
- Training must take into account of changing technology of buildings and vehicles
- Training within the fire service needs to be maintained to meet the changing needs of the local community as well as the changing technology for both building and vehicle design and construction
- Better and more realistic training can never be wrong.
- Life moves on, training must reflect this.
- I read recently that less than half of Fire Service response staff had agreed to extra training in order for them to attend certain medical episodes if there would otherwise be a delay in an ambulance attending. It should be compulsory.
- Training is important but this sounds like an excuse to drop fire training and increase other so can co respond more resulting in less fire cover for public
- Who said the traditional services are falling? People still being rescued or dying in fires and car accidents.
- It is nonsense to change training based on demand. Firefighters need to be fully trained for all incident types. If they are attending certain incidents types less frequently, then experience is lost, so more training is required for those types. This does not allow time for training on the work of other services.
- The training should still be the same in case of an event which warrants it - perhaps the demand for traditional services is tending to decline but to not have firefighters trained in case would be detrimental to safety.

- Why is this a proposal and not an existing dynamic process of feedback, training design, execution & feedback-answering my own question are you getting feedback to unsure Unions to move??
- We have the best fire and rescue service in the world. Do not change it
- Training is paramount, you could argue that more time should be devoted to training as less time is accrued in experience at incidents
- Are you saying that training is currently not realistic,
- You have to review training so that you protect both the public and yourself
- Most training is already realistic. Future methods should not be allowed de fault to on line training, just to meet guidelines. There is no substitute to face to face and practical training. On line tick box is not training!
- Are you suggesting that firefighters aren't properly trained?
- Ensure that your training protocol combats this incessant requirement for saving money.
- Hard to comment since we do not know what is the problem
- We are in an ever changing world and everyone needs to adapt to it
- Include awareness training of vulnerable groups eg dementia, autism, learning disability etc
- what does this statement even mean?? doing less training? more of the things we don't do a lot of? different things ie propping up a failing ambulance service??
- You have to meet needs, and there is no point in having staff who cannot deliver.
- While I think that realistic training is extremely important, I think that the fire service already provide amazingly realistic training to it's staff, from what I've seen at open days.
- Having seen some of the training at Fire Station open days... I'm not sure how much more realistic the training can get... it already is extremely good.
- Major incidents and fires with persons reported are thankfully rare. It has taken many years and sacrifices to get to that position. Fire Services must be fully trained and funded
- Demand may have fallen but traditional skills & and standards cannot be downgraded. Training to cover wider spectrum to cover wider role.
- Without knowing what training the firefighter have to do this is not a great question!
- Realistic training is very important
- There may be less fires but what about RTA's that are on the increase?
- Training for the Fire Service personnel has always been a high priority to ensure the safety of crews & the public. This should continue with investment being directed towards this area as fires will always occur. Also with the ever expanding role of the modern firefighter now including water rescue, flooding, wildfire, chemical incidents , CBRN incidents etc investment in training for these type of incidents is crucial.
- The concept has been with us for a good number of years but the reality has never quite matched the aspiration. It would be true to suggest we are going in the right direction and future collaboration should help to realise this aim. Often it is the time it takes that is the frustration.
- Not possible to make a decision on no information
- If the services do not move with the times then you have problems
- Isn't the fall in demand a good thing?

- The traditional role of the Firefighter will not go away even it has reduced. Maybe you could reduce the amount of staff who get all the training so that you always have some fully trained staff available.
- take care to include resilience into this rather than the minimal training and ongoing access required to maintain training standards
- less reviewing and more action required as we have been discussing this of a few years
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Establish why there has been a fall in demand
- It is really important that firefighters are fully trained and equipped to deal with the incidents they respond to.
- Develop a commercial arm to training
- As FF's we have a large skill base in lots of different aspects. To keep the service working to the top of their ability training should be frequent and consistent. By taking on all the other projects that get mentioned we are gradually getting away from doing our basic training on station which can't necessarily be a good thing
- Training should be in-line with the current trends of incidents the service is attending regularly.
- Fewer incidents, means less experienced personnel - move away from online training - It's cheap, but doesn't add sufficient value.
- The provision in training is being reviewed as a result of the need to make savings and the limited capacity of operational personnel to be detached from operational duties to attend training. It is wrong to state that a review of training is down to the fall in demand for traditional services. It is simply less money means less training. Frequency of training is being reduced to accommodate these factors, based not on risk but on cost. Currently we do not provide sufficient practical operational training. This is misleading and inaccurate.
- As incident numbers decline frequent quality training is the only way to reduce the risk to staff. Also as FRS attend more diverse incident types training of core skills will keep staff safe and competent.
- More realistic training needed if firefighters are to be the first people to arrive at an emergency
- I feel the level of training current fire officers receive is of a very good standard and officers are well trained in all areas they are involved in/respond to. Training will need to be amended/reviewed if their roles and responsibilities do so that can ensure they are fit for their role.
- Training should be harder and more frequent than the real event ensuring that when called upon staff are more than capable of meeting the demands of the job
- The Fire and Rescue Service has been extremely successful in the recent past and this should be a good indication that we will be successful in meeting the emerging new requirements and demands - it is therefore important that our staff have the best available training and equipment.
- Realistic multi-agency training is essential to get it right when it's really needed in real situations.
- Has there been a fall in demand for the traditional services.
- The training must be relevant to the role. It should not be a deskilling but a development

- don't think there is a fall in demand for an instantly responsive professional trained force at a fire whether it is one house fire a year or hundreds no cost can be put on a life.
- If the way of working is to change then obviously training needs to follow
- With all of the admin and community work we have to do now you give us little or no time to maintain our core competencies through drills. This needs to be addressed, you can only spread us so thin.
- I take this extra training would be such that the service can respond to call that it perhaps does not currently; will this mean responding to calls which are currently the preserve of the police and/or ambulance service. My only potential concern is that the service could find itself like the police, in a situation where the organisation has expanded its remit so far that it takes on roles which are far beyond its core purpose and expertise that a whole host of problems are caused and then the painful process of contracting away from some areas has to happen.
- This proposal is not very clear, what type of traditional services have fallen in demand? Fires do and will always occur as well as cats in trees, people stuck in lifts, RTC, water rescue etc etc
- I'm starting to wonder what the point of this survey is, it's clear you should already be doing all these things and should continue to do so.
- Then why has the training over the last few years been cut right back?
- If you want to introduce more realistic training then you need to start by allowing crews to actually practise the skills that are dropping off from 'traditional services' by giving them appropriate exposure to realistic training scenarios without being trained on the run! A W@H session interrupted 4 times by fire calls etc is of no benefit to anyone least of all the firefighters whose only exposure to that skill may be their 'annual' refresher. Realistic training for firefighters is predominantly practical based exercises. Stations and HQ need a huge amount of investment to make training more viable and realistic for all
- Although fires are an every day situation that cannot be avoided, I think firefighters on all units should be equipped and trained for water rescues in our county due to the amount of water and not reliant on water rescue units.
- Still need firefighters to be highly trained in their own area of expertise but would require additional training, support ambulance and police.
- I did express concern at the meeting that the services continue to recruit young officers.

Proposal 6: Communities and local needs

- Stop the use of front line firefighters carrying out needless tasks for the sake of number crunching and employ people that choose to carry out these roles.
- Does this mean increasing local knowledge so that appropriate vehicles are dispatched as required?
- We need to also better understand and provide increased safety to those passing through/visiting our county ie those travelling on Surrey roads and motorways and not just residents.
- Accepting the approach proposed in question 2 we would also agree with this proposal as it aligns to the better understanding of risk and targeting of resources.

We would highlight the role FRS might play in the wider public health agenda and the potential alignment between FRS risk, target groups and priorities and those of colleagues in Public Health, Social Care and Health Care. HFRS are progressing work in this area and we welcome the opportunity to work together to find alignment with our progressive approach to 'Safe and Well' and 'Fire as a Health Asset' work, so that programmes that operate near or on the Hampshire/Surrey borders are aligned.

- we know our local communities, we see them daily. we work with(or against) them regularly, we understand most if not almost every persons needs in fire/RTC and social wellbeing, and we adapt our safety messages accordingly already.
- Common sense!! Silly question!
- It's important to have a county-wide offer, but to make sure that local areas can tailor their work to the needs and circumstances of their residents.
- Programmes needs to reach community leaders, as well as those on the service line in positions of responsibility for the safety of others, such as wardens, caretakers.
- It is hard to see how this concept translates into anything tangible
- More community education is required, to further reduce the risk of fires. Perhaps the fire service needs to get more involved in schools.
- Prevention is so much more productive than funerals.
- whatever your background you're still flammable!
- Don't overcomplicate putting out fires or cutting roofs off cars.
- I think that all those that are willing to be educated have been already
- Forces need to be able to mutually support - skills/trg should reflect all threats, liaison might reflect local circumstances
- Without impacting on full and retained staff front line availability.
- Doesn't really say anything. The public need trained, motivated, appropriately equipped fire and rescue service.
- we already live in our community and know what are local needs are.
- Why is this never been done before?
- Being a Man from the 'Fifties' we used to have a understanding of 'initiative' where did that go?
- see my comment above regarding those with learning disabilities.
- more communication is required between publics and services
- In culturally diverse communities, education is essential
- again this is a very blank wishy washy statement that doesn't really say anything
- Need to work in partnership with Voluntary and Community Groups which may already being working in this area to reduce duplication
- I'm surprised this is not already the case, what is the value in a service that does not understand the community it is serving.
- As they say prevention is better than cure...
- Better prevention is always going to beat better response...
- This should already be happening.
- Need to look at a provision for schools again
- Safety is safety; localising basic safety programmes is probably not cost effective.
- Concerned the Fire Service will become distracted from its main purpose which is to attend life critical fires and road accidents etc.
- this may benefit from working with other aprts of the council such as public health
- This would mean pulling on the resources of the SFRS personnel that are LOCAL and not central offices that don't actually work in the field anymore. You need to listen to the folk that are in field and working with the public.
- may be difficult to achieve with current resources and a declining budget

- Without a true picture of needs, the temptation will be to continue to do what was done yesterday and repeat the current model. It will be tough, as doubtless there will be resistance to change.
- Fire service is a key community stakeholder
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- How will you achieve? Use big data. Age of buildings, occupancy and use to determine risk areas.
- Again, don't you do this already? But if you can improve it why not!
- Focus on the vulnerable
- Important to target for local needs
- This needs to be a structured and targetted activity but its impacts will be limited by other factors and issues such as income levels and education levels etc among the groups being targetted.
- I read this as prevention and this is the real gold in the service.
- But you already do this!!!
- We are a emergency service, not a social work agency. Let us stick to what we do and do it better rather than being jack of all trades, masters of none.
- More money should be spent on actual 999 response that prevention attempts because they are not 100% effective, especially in the world we live in today.
- To let the people of Woking know how the new Fire Station is coming along and building on this for local knowledge and understanding.
- Public value in Woking can be a bridge from the past to the future. A new beginning with all the old goodness brought forward to a new Fire Station. What an opportunity!
- Seems to be working well already contributing to fall in demand.
- I have attended a number of meetings. It is apparent that councils and community services are endeavouring to combine these activities for the benefit of the community.

Proposal 7: Income Generation, cost avoidance, cost recovery

- Budgets are important but understaffing is not an option for safety for the public or staff
- I disagree that reducing costs is necessarily the way to go as this potentially details that the brigade can be run on a lesser budget. I agree with further investment into the workforce. But bearing in mind the council tax for policing is ridiculous compared to the measly budget allowed for fire and rescue services. Why not consult for the public to change the way it's funded.
- No more cuts to fire stations and pumps available
- Constant reviewing to increase effectiveness through change and evolution of response within decreasing budgets has to happen. Does not Wray Park already earn money from running training courses etc. Increasing income could mean anything from car washing in the station yard to offering fire extinguisher inspection services etc to community buildings etc, BUT commercial companies may shout 'Foul'
- Use volunteers
- It is not possible to keep on cutting costs without reducing services. Central Government need to realise this before there is a real disaster caused by cuts to Fire and Rescue services

- We would agree that, as with all public services, all FRS should be continually applying measures to deliver efficient services.
- every justifiable cut without diminishing the frontline forces protecting the public should be explored to provide a capable and enthusiastic workforce. Also a pay rise would be great!
- Joint call centres, Joint servicing contracts, Joint training, Joint IT projects. Flexible and versatile equipment. Charge for 2nd (?) and subsequent false alarms. Look for income by offering training schemes, safety assessments etc. (in commercial Office and retail sectors). This could cover Fire Marshall courses, Evacuation procedures Risk assessments etc.
- The scale of the savings needed is large, and requires concerted collaboration and income generation to get there.
- need to get the balance right reducing costs implies reduced services and training.. Maximising income implies charging for some types of call out.
- This relates to what I wrote in (1) above - joint use of command and control facilities. Income generation could be, charging for fire safety checks in line with the insurance industry, to reducing claims.
- Appreciate finances are tight and every penny counts but please don't become too commercially focussed.
- The reducing of costs whilst being continuously explored should only happen if it does not impact on the safety of the community it serves or the fire & rescue crews
- Reducing Costs should only be considered if it can be done without reducing safety of the local and national community as well as the safety of fire fighting & rescue staff
- A bit concerned about maximising income opportunities if it means hiring out fire crews for commercial undertakings such as filming.
- I've seen Fire Service BMW X5's running around Surrey. I suggest that if you are serious about cutting costs you buy something cheaper. How exactly will money be invested in communities ? More like take from communities by charging for certain services.
- The fire service is essential and cost should not be an issue
- The better use of budgets, and the creation of income should be concentrated on, while not denying that there may be some areas where costs can be significantly reduced.
- Perhaps cut the number of people in headquarters and put more firefighters on the engines.
- Pleased to see you taking a cost saving rather than service cutting approach.
- Wasting money on wages trying to find income. The balance is not right
- Cutting costs is good but not when it puts employees under more pressure to do the job with less staff etc
- Stop reducing front line service, it's all well and good having a fireman who's also a paramedic in a special new vehicle, but if there's only one and he's too far away.....a waste
- Reducing costs only if it has no effect on front line services
- The more you cut costs the more the government will think you've got too much budget in the first place and will cut you even further!!
- Bread & butter - worried it is a question

- "Reducing costs" normally isn't associated with investing money back into the work force. I agree with reducing costs in areas which are ineffective and have no impact on the safety of the community.
- Don't impact front line response in the quest to earn money.
- The staff on the front line should not be the ones to suffer from cutbacks it needs to be middle/management that get hit.
- We need to look at methods for cutting waste, before cutting more costs.
- Don't quite see how you expect an income from services mostly based on other peoples misfortunes - charging for ambulances etc?
- Please do not make this the number one priority even if disguised behind political words.
- not be an issue. Corrupt politicians should not be squeezing the emergency services of this country!
- Money, I thought as much!
- Must not reduce cost as expense of service provision
- although important, should not be at the expense of public safety.
- Don't want to see the FRS become a commercial operation!
- cutting services is not the answer, all emergency people should be on duty when required.
- When the sole purpose of the fire service is to save money, things have already gone too wrong. The cuts have had a huge impact already, and now should be a time for reversing those decisions, not cutting deeper into a stretched service
- Why not use hose equipped motorbikes?
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motorcycles_in_the_United_Kingdom_fire_services#cite_note-Telegraph23Jul2010-5 Why not use hose equipped motorbikes?
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motorcycles_in_the_United_Kingdom_fire_services#cite_note-Telegraph23Jul2010-5 Why not use hose equipped motorbikes?
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motorcycles_in_the_United_Kingdom_fire_services#cite_note-Telegraph23Jul2010-5
- But should maintain sufficient numbers of staff for safe operation
- we can do more but not for less. why are we sending a £250000 17t fire engine with four people on to code reds. Could these people maybe be seconded to seacamb. The brigade cuts costs and the seacamb gets a boost!
- The reduction of costs and/or the maximising of income opportunities must not be done in a way that deteriorates, or detracts from, the current levels of service. Income streams should not come from areas where SFRS should be providing that service for free particularly in the areas of risk identification, raising awareness, and conducting any regulatory safety checks (involving "not for profit", charity, etc. organisations rather than commercial "for profit" people or organisations where the costs for such regulation compliance should be born by them as part of their cost of operating their business).
- But don't put yourselves in financial competition with Voluntary Sector organisations that are already delivering similar services
- This sadly is the future. The current government will strip all public services of the ability to operate without raising additional income. This has to be a priority as nothing else can be delivered without resources; collaboration and efficiencies only

partly fill the gap. However this should not be seen as an alternative to improving efficiencies.

- You need to charge more for automatic false alarm call outs!
- Fire Service needs to charge more for false call-outs (where possible), and charge businesses for fire response where negligence was the primary factor.
- Cuts to fund other areas sound great but rarely improve things
- Reducing costs is a fact of life but in real terms means reducing resources and response. No senior management have courage to fight cuts to front line but happy to upgrade to top of range officer transport etc.
- As long as it does not come at a cost to lives!
- I'm sure the public would rather pay a little more to know they were safe. It should never be finance over life
- It appears that very public service is having to make significant financial savings at the current time. It is however important to be able to provide a first rate professional service with the right amount of appliances & the right amount of stations in the correct location. If appliances & stations are reduced to make further savings then I can only see the level of service will fall & the public will receive a reduced service with longer attendance times & fewer resources to deal with incidents.
- Being mindful of the primary requirement to promote risk reduction and provide first class emergency response
- all members of the emergency services (police fire & ambulance) deserve to be paid a fair wage that reflects their value to society. cost cutting should not be a priority
- Whilst I agree with the concept I am concerned that we do not cut funding to a point where it becomes impossible to provide an emergency service. I would like to think that savings made through collaboration can be channelled into other areas where it will have the greatest effect.
- You cannot cut costs when lives are at risk
- Yes it's important to monitor overheads but not at the expense of everything else. Often too much money is spent looking at savings and this counteracts any savings made! Saving lives costs what it costs.
- Not sure what this means
- Don't know meaning of "maximise income opportunities"
- Thanks to the Conservative Government budget cuts are now unfortunately taken as a given.
- Emergency services are fundamentally resource-intensive and low/no-income generating activities. That doesn't mean they should be curtailed. We can't invoice home owners for attendance at house fires.
- this is good practice and should be a regular and repeated process
- Again , it is about listening to those that work day to day in field and how it affects their working practice. Saving money isn't always possible and could put peoples lives at risk. Charging people who waste the Brigades time would be one way, just the same as charging folk who waste Ambulances time. Actually listen to the firemen and not the Officers who don't work on the engine day in day out
- may the solution to dealing with proposal 6 requirements
- Partnering, sharing and collaborating are key. In addition, the opportunity to deliver services for other government departments and agencies (e.g. health and safety assurance, not just fire) is real and tangible.

- Quality of service must not suffer
- Not clear about income opportunities.... Provision of these services is a cost. However if it means recovering cost of fire services from insurers then could be worth considering.
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Cost reduction is a poor outcome. Targets must be outcome driven first.
- Cost cutting needs a service delivery focus not driven solely by budget
- Nothing good seems to come out of cutting costs. Personally I'd be happy to pay more tax rather than have a stretched emergency service
- Yes - remove duplication in back office / management and protect front line services.
- You are cutting the work force and the savings on this alone should cover the expense of training
- Reducing overheads should not be at the cost of vital services
- Lots of areas for savings - Collaboration being at the heart of this opportunities
- Reducing costs? At Leatherhead Fire Station there are new mats with the SFRS emblem, which get taken away for cleaning every 2-3 weeks. This is an unnecessary cost to the Fire Service, and has been actioned whilst we are under financial restraints.
- This needs to be balanced with maintaining at least a minimal level of operational support.
- Large market for fire related training not to be priding it is foolish. A small amount of effort for a big return.. SCC not always supportive of things like this - the more money you make the more we reduce your budget!!!!!!
- Everything should be based on need - not always on cost.
- Income generation opportunities should be pursued that will provide long term income streams as well as opportunities for operational staff to take up non operational roles if their health requires it. As well as supporting the mission of making surrey safer.
- Given the economic pressures over the last decade which look to continue for many years ahead it is important that we reduce costs and maximise income - this should be done in collaboration with our neighbouring FRS's as well as other partners.
- However, I believe that you should invest in your WHOLE workforce, not just the ones that wear the uniform!!
- Saving costs and working efficiently is sensible and reasonable but has to be balanced with the potential impacts from the changes.
- I don't think this is a very well worded question. Are you trying to hide the fact you will in fact cut engines and stations without saying that?
- An improved and maintained service is best for the people and it all develops ownership and healthy interest in the service.
- but not at the cost of reducing the quality of fire fighting
- None of the reduction in costs must be at the expense of firefighter numbers or their pay or conditions.
- You must already be doing this. don't divert energy and resources further from the real job by looking at admin and peripheral activity
- I do not have enough information about what Proposal 7 would involve. The wording is so broad that it is difficult to give a definitive answer.

- You are linking two different projects. Yes reduce efficiency but don't try to turn the service into a profit centre, its still a public service.
- This is a public service which should be funded by the taxpayer and not treated as a commercial operation
- as long as firefighters and fire engines are not cut
- By employing and training some key additional resources permanently rather than offering overtime every watch should save a huge amount
- Reduce costs yes but not at the cost of frontline services
- Not my area of knowledge, but if there are fewer staff on station then we need fewer managers?
- Combining fire and ambulance would save time, but what is also needed is for no further fire engines being taken off the run and all pumps manned by at least 5 firefighters or 4 firefighters and one paramedic
- Invest in the workforce and the right equipment to meet the needs of the public
- We pay enough in council tax to cover the emergency services without having to pay again when we need them.
- Value for money is important as long as it does not diminish the service
- Would need to understand more about "making income opportunities" before commenting further

Proposal 8: Surrey Response Standard

- Also within this to meet attendance times for all incidents. And going back to a previous proposal work more closely with neighbouring brigades to use their resources when required
- This seems to link with Q6 above on increasing local knowledge of the 'patch'.
- Whilst in principle we would agree HFRS would want to understand future response standards in Surrey and how this may impact upon agreements under section 13 and 16 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act. It is noted the current agreement was formed in 2007. We would value the opportunity to understand any substantial changes by Surrey FRS which might increase demand for HFRS appliances responding into Surrey or increase availability of Surrey resources to respond into Hampshire. With this knowledge we may wish to review the agreement under Section 13 and 16 of the FRSA and consider associated charges. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority agreed proposals from HFRS Risk Review in February 2016. The proposals were consulted on by all stakeholders and we ask that you give due consideration to the now planned capabilities in Hampshire. We would ask that particular attention is paid to the Farnham area and key risks such as the Hindhead tunnel so we are assured that we have properly considered risk and have aligned resources accordingly. HFRS having just undergone a Risk Review have a lot of experience and learning particularly in developing our approach to implementing new SD capabilities in the future. We would welcome the opportunity to share our experience and learning in this area.
- All our equipment should be standardised and available at every station, we, as firefighters are expected to work anywhere in Surrey, why vary tools/ equipment at

each station resulting in more training and pumps off the run when crewing shortfalls occur?

- No Fire appliance to attend health issues. Consider Flexible vehicles and equipment. Fire officer in cars to attend first unless absolutely sure of needs.
- Review response standard to reflect first officer on site (see above). This will immediately provide cost savings. i.e. fuel, wear and tear of equipment Surrey residents would expect this response standard to not fall, although the levels of traffic across the county provide quite a challenge for maintaining a quick response standard.
- This needs to be under constant review in order to keep up with the current trends and types of incidents the fire service is required to attend
- Already mentioned this above
- This is somewhat obvious, is it not? In any case, it must not affect negatively present response times.
- Understand the need to be effective with appliancesbut don't use this as an opportunity to diminish the service.
- Restricting the type of attendance could cause problems and too-late mobilisation of the correct resources when the exact nature of the incident is ascertained.
- Why wouldn't you send the right resource for the scene?
- sending a fire engine to a smoke alarm installation is a dreadful waste of resources
- I would have thought that it is important to review this Standard on a regular basis anyway.
- If you send a small vehicle to a bin fire that has by the time the crew arrived spread and engulfed half a house how will you justify the death of the public because of cost saving. Surrey residents pay for fire engines not cars or motorcycles or any other ideas you might have.
- A fire engine. With a crew of 5. Within 8 minutes followed by a second within 10 should be gold standard
- Information from the public is often inaccurate or insufficient to justify anything other than sending at least one fully crewed conventional fire engine. Even information from other emergency services can be inaccurate. Mucking about with converted vans and smaller crews will put firefighters and the public in danger.
- Integration of Sussex response standard to ensure compatibility especially in areas on county boundaries
- As long as the review doesn't downgrade or if two options of vehicle
- Essential: (Another question to pressure unions, ?) QUESTION: National vision for future Fire/Ambulance /Police co-operation with Union involvement - role of the 21st century firefighter, Data specialist, Arson cell with Police, Paramedic training, Nuclear, biological, chemical training, floods, boat skills etc Direct Officer Entry, Pay escalator in return for no strikes
- Other local fire services have looked into this. Really unpopular with staff and scares the public. Right equipment and ability to act if incident is different when first team arrive is better than less arriving in a van to tick your time to arrive box.
- Seems to be a vehicle to justify sending "lesser" fire appliances MRV's etc to incidents that used to be attended by proper fire appliances with all the resources which they carry. Could be viewed as clock stopping or watering down of fire service capabilities and flexibility. The type of incident reported and the type of incident which

is actually occurring are very often different if you sent a fully crewed fully equipped proper fire appliance it can deal with most of these incidents or the initial stages of them until back up arrives. "lesser" fire appliances, MRV's etc do not have the same capabilities. It is ALWAYS better to over resource an incident than under resource it, otherwise unacceptable risks to fire service personnel will occur (and massive public pressure to do something without the appropriate personnel/equipment)

- I would have expected this to be a recurring activity for continual service improvements.
- The key reason perhaps NOT to be a combined service?
- This makes economic sense
- I would expect this to happen each year anyway and an assessment made of the number of times the response rate was missed or the number of times an inappropriate vehicle was sent to an incident and how this impacted on the outcome of the incident. How do response times compare to other home counties? are they appropriate to dealing with motorway incidents?
- Perhaps other modes of transport need to be considered appropriate to the need
- Haven't read the standard I'm afraid.
- Sending the right vehicle must be more important than sending just any vehicle, just for the purpose of target hitting, as some ambulance services have done...
- Sending the right vehicle is more important than sending just any vehicle.
- Why is this considered a new proposal - this has always been the concept!
- As long as it doesn't make things less safe
- The right number of appliances & personnel to an incident has a dramatic effect on how well the incident will be resolved. In general the correct weight of attack at an incident determines a successful outcome, if fewer resources & personnel are available I feel more incidents will be lost & safety of personnel put at risk.
- Where risk and safety have higher ranking than operational cost saving
- As resident of Surrey I would be concerned if the response standard were diluted any further. 10 minutes is a long time to wait when you are in urgent need of assistance and a lot can happen in that time. I am not overly concerned on the type of vehicle that attends as long as it is up to the task and has sufficient crew to make a positive impact. As an employee of the SFRS I want to know that the response standard will give crews a better than average chance of making a positive impact when they arrive at the scene and that the vehicle they arrive in, and the equipment they use can be used to good effect. What would not be acceptable is for solution that sees an inappropriate resource despatched where the crew cannot make an intervention because they are too few and/or lack the right equipment.
- Some intelligence is needed here depending on what is reported. Witnesses or people in shock may not always report everything.
- Are we looking at the American format where fire crews act as medics
- A more flexible response capability sounds important and sensible.
- The criteria should be reviewed, but attendance times should be made quicker not slower.
- Taking into account geography and demographics.
- Crews and vehicles are a sunk cost - they are already there and waiting. Better to have them out on a call than doing nothing in base.
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.

- Setting criteria is pointless unless there is a delivery methodology and they follow the strategy. Premature to include in a strategy review.
- Make sure it's clear so that people can easily understand it.
- Improve our data collection Use many partners
- It is important that the nearest appliances attend an incident, as this is not the case now in some areas.
- The Surrey Response Standard should be reviewed in-line with the current environment, workforce and type of incident.
- Measuring whats easy to measure, not whats important. More focus needed on quality of service on arrival.
- It is right that the most appropriate resources are mobilised to an incident. However this requires additional work on call challenge and intelligent mobilising rather than basing mobilising on historical data. No matter how you word it, a lesser response time means a reduction in standards.
- The highest priority
- There is no point sending resources that are not needed however need to be careful that not enough resources are available
- allows better application of resources across the county based on risk identification for business and communities from the previous proposal
- At many incidents man power is a more important asset to manage than appliances and this should be the standard we mobilise against. How many Fire fighters do you need to deal with the scenario and what is the fastest and safest way to deploy them.
- We need to maintain the Surrey Response Standard recognising that this has become more difficult with the increasing amount of traffic - this is rightly an expectation of all members of the public and particularly the most vulnerable.
- This is a very ambiguously worded proposal. This review of response should be led by requirement of resource not by budget constraint. Do not use the surrey publics safety as a financial argument to reduce resources
- This is a sensible approach but not always practical as timigs is also a factor, as is the lack of situational understanding in the early stages of some incidents.
- I don't understand why you need to send a HGV to each call when maybe a smaller vehicle with a crew of two would do.
- Hope your current standards are working
- If this is leading to sending smaller vehicles to bin fires this is dangerous. I have heard of said incidents that are actually premise fires and this puts lives of crews attending in a real moral dilema which is unfair and unsafe.
- This sounds like code for a lesser service with lengthened response time. SECAM already misses targets in the south west of the county and there is no excuse for other servcies to do the same
- SURELY you must already be doing this!!!!!!
- You continue to get this wrong, I'd be intrested to see if you act in the intrest of your staffs safety and that of the communities that pay for us. We are dangerous low on numbers and response times get worse and worse, particulary for second pumps.
- This is increasinly getting worse, needs addressing
- As long as this doesn't reduce weight of attack or increase attendance times
- These should not compromise firefighter safety just to meet cost savings

- Too much reliance on the knowledge of the caller could prove to be catastrophic if they get their facts wrong, as often happens.
- History takes time!

Proposal 9: Automatic Fire Alarms

- To have special response vehicles
- Building monitoring can be carried out by outside companies employed by the building proprietor.
- You don't ever go to AFA's you only ever come back from them. I feel it's important to respond to them because it could be a genuine emergency
- Difficult to be too 'tough' on guilty auto callers, do nurses homes and toasters come to mind? As one day it will be a real shout!
- We would support an approach that reduces demand of these Automatic Fire Alarm incidents, has an effective call challenge and call handling system in place and provides a proportionate response given the nature of the risk. We have explored this and found that a distinction can be drawn between building types when taken into account with the nature and associated risk of the occupancy.
- our unwanted AFA's have dropped dramatically to call challenging already, could you produce a leaflet which we could deliver to any AFA's which occur due to poorly maintained systems.
- Charge for 2nd (?) and subsequent false alarms. 97% is NOT acceptable in any business model! Drastically reduce by liaising with senior/responsible persons on site if possible to ascertain problem (ie Hotels/ Retail Outlets/Offices). Send Officer in car as first response unless in very remote areas where time to attend would be an issue
- This work must ensure that the vulnerable (care homes, schools, hospitals) are not put at risk. More work should be done with fire safety officers premises to reduce false alarms.
- I have experienced trying to cancel yourselves from attending a false alarm but you still insisted on doing so. It obviously depends on which professional body is cancelling you but there are saving here to be had. Also, after say 3 false alarms, refuse to attend until their alarm has been upgraded. This could be enforced through the insurance industry.
- Continuous false alarms undermine the service ...but again measures to prevent attendance in the regard have in the past just resulted in a opportunity to reduce the number of personnel rather than the issue of genuine emergency cover.
- This is one area where charging for continual false alarms should be bringing in funds.
- If all you need is eyes on scene a car is faster and less resource intensive than an appliance.
- It is a matter of priorities. You divert to the most serious emergency. If an appliance wasn't at an alarm it would most likely be at a Fire Station. Either may be nearer to an emergency.
- Automatic fire alarms must be fitted for a reason. maybe consider that if someone calls to say your not required then don't turn up instead of sending a fire engine to check anyway

- Not all fire alarms are false alarms. Have you learnt anything from clandon?
- Automatic fire alarm calls can be genuine emergencies, so until you arrive and confirm the call is false, you should treat the call as a potential fire. Anything else is unprofessional and irresponsible.
- A review is needed but educating businesses and general public is important
- How many response times to serious incidents have not been met because an appliance was attending a fire alarm ?
- Yes - false call outs should not be used to justify resources - data analysis and tailored response key
- Are alarms always false? If the answer is no, then send the proper response.
- Fire service attends very few fire alarms compared with previous times I can't believe that they affect the ability to attend other incidents that much.
- Fine all false call outs but ensure quicker response to all call outs. Ensure all installations are registered with up-to-date contact details etc.
- Back to the drawing board.
- Introduce stricter penalties for persistent FAs - source of income generation?
- The initial call should surely be dealt with in the same way as a genuine emergency, until such time as it can be confirmed.
- Perhaps responding with different modes of transport, use of CCTV, fire volunteer response.
- would need some justification if there was a fire no one had seen
- Balance needs to be achieved. For commercial properties where the automatic alarm can be shown to have been activated due to a fault or neglected maintenance then cost recovery should be considered.
- My experience of Housing Associations would suggest that this is very important as they are employing less staff to oversee fire tests and alarms.
- You need to charge them more. It's not the fire services responsibility to fix a poor industry... Charge them more and eventually the users and manufacturers will improve the false alarm rate.
- While I totally agree that something needs to be done to reduce false automatic call outs... I don't believe that this is the responsibility of the Fire Service. This is a country wide problem that the onus should be on the manufacturers and users of such devices. I think the Fire Service should limit their involvement in fixing this problem to just charging more for false call outs. That may motivate industry to fix the problem, if not then they just pay for it.
- A single person could quickly assess these situations responding in a car or motorbike
- You should respond as it will catch you out one day, don't play with lives.
- Fine them if not real ?
- Where commercial premises are concerned a serious look at how AFAs are managed and the training they undertake to do this could be a starting point.
- Not enough information
- Put more responsibility on the building's owners unless in a high risk to life building. Owners should confirm fire is present first before SFRS respond.
- An automatic fire alarm could be a genuine emergency.

- Not sure this does affect performance significantly, ie how many genuine emergencies have been impacted in this way. This needs to be balanced by risk of not attending automatic fire alarms and people dying or property being lost, or by putting people at risk to enter buildings that might be on fire to check things out for you.
- its a waste of time going to all the automatic alarms. businesses should have a procedure in place to confirm its a real alarm before anything is sent out
- People should not be interrogated by control, or sent to check if there is a fire. Send an appliance asap.
- we should continue going to life risk / sleeping risk premises
- The Fire and Rescue Services should lobby government, through the Home Office/DCLG, for private companies to install CCTV in large buildings to monitor areas reported as being 'on fire' when automatic fire alarms sound.
- impact on ability to respond to emergencies must be minimised - there needs to be a balanced approach and alarm owners must take responsibility for their kit
- under no circumstances should any staff be cut.
- Redraft to say improve validation of automated alarms received to reduce responses to false alarms
- I would rather you were out helping people in need rather than dealing with a faulty alarm system that someone should be maintaining properly but make sure that you do it safely. How will you make sure you know the difference between a false alarm and a real one?
- Develop a workable strategy
- Public do not understand this
- People pay their fees and expect a response. This is more important than attending a minor RTC for the police as there is the possibility of a fire.
- Why look to stop attending these incidents, yet actively seek other incidents from other sources, particularly those that other services don't want to do, but have a legal duty to do so!
- Why do you even go to them the police don't respond to burglary alarm unless there are robbers on site Why don't you do the same with fire alarms only go if there s a fire
- There are other areas priority areas.
- Fewer incidents - this is not a problem for FRSs currently. Focusing on the wrong issues
- Automatic fire calls could be the first sign of a serious fire. Progress this issue but not dealing with them to some form of conclusion is not acceptable.
- Amount of AFA's is costly
- The attendance at Automatic fire alarms should remain unchanged but have a more streamlined ability to charge repeat locations who do not correct their faults. An automatic charge at repeat addresses over a 6month period maybe?
- Either a car or motorbike to attend to make an assessment with a pump to back up if needed
- 16k calls a year 97% not necessary - there has to be a better way. Find it.
- AFA can, even though a low amount, can be confirmed fires dangerous ideas!!

- While I understand the problem, I would not like SFRS to reduce the service it provides.
- Every call should be reacted to in the same way. Pre-judging without reviewing the situation onsite could be very costly
- surely a fire alarm can be an early warning of fire so it must be important to ensure the alarm is not identifying a fire - this would be a genuine emergency
- Potentially putting the caller at risk and delaying turn out of crews if there is indeed a fire, should get an appliance moving until/ unless it is confirmed fire/false alarm
- Single response units. Or allowing police to respond to assess
- Fire units should still be sent to fire alarms incase they are genuine calls
- AFAs are not automatically false alarms.

This page is intentionally left blank