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Abstract
Fire and Rescue Services (FRS) have demonstrably improved their services and operations under the previous performance management regimes of Comprehensive Performance Assessments (CPA) and Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAA). However, the Coalition Government have announced that they will abolish CAA and the Audit Commission have suspended their inspections.

In his recent speech to the FRS conference in Harrogate the new Fire Minister, Bob Neil, stated his belief that there is significant scope to find efficiencies in the way FRS operate. He claimed that an overly bureaucratic system had developed with "too much central government prescription" based on national standards and targets. The Fire Minister therefore challenged FRS collectively to take responsibility for the sector, come up with radical solutions and join him in a "strategic review of the sector".

This paper and presentation is an attempt to assess the various parts of the previous performance management regimes for FRS and other local public service delivery organisations. Identify which elements of these past regimes have demonstrably worked in the past and may be appropriate for adaptation to the FR sector. Review these elements against the coalition governments stated intentions and suggest some elements that may form part of the regime in the future.

This is a preliminary paper and the intention is that it will be subject to further research and consultation before being presented at the Institute of Engineers Research and Development conference at the Fire Services College (RE10) It will then be further developed before submission to the Minister Strategic Review.

Introduction

Fire and Rescue Services (FRS) have demonstrably improved their services and operations under the previous performance management regimes of Comprehensive Performance Assessments (CPA) and Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAA). However, the Coalition Government have announced that they will abolish CAA and the Audit Commission have suspended their inspections.

In his recent speech to the FRS conference in Harrogate the new Fire Minister, Bob Neil, stated his belief that there is significant scope to find efficiencies in the way FRS operate. He claimed that an overly bureaucratic system had developed with "too much central government prescription" based on national standards and targets. The Fire Minister therefore challenged FRS collectively to take responsibility for the sector, come up with radical solutions and join him in a "strategic review of the sector".
The paper will therefore seek to

- Explain the historical context of the development of the performance management regime for Fire and Rescue Services;
- Identify the emerging policy from the new coalition government
- Establish the apparent parameters and guidance explicit or implicit in the government's emerging position
- Set out some initial research findings and lessons from past experience
- Identify some key components of a new regime
- Suggest which organisations nationally and locally could take ownership for developing the various parts of the new framework
- Identify areas for further research or detailed policy and methodological development

In addition to being a contribution to the ministers' strategic review of Fire and Rescue Services, this may be of interest to academics, practitioners, and policy makers interested in the form and content of post CAA performance management regimes in the forthcoming era of austerity.

**Methodological approach**

The literature review for this paper will concentrate on two areas. The first is the official documents published by the government, the Audit Commission and others as part of the developments of the various post-1999 performance management regimes from the introduction of Best Value to the CAA. This includes both original consultation documents and the reports of the responses to these consultations but particularly the responses from the local delivery organisations such as Fire and Rescue Services Local Authorities (collectively and individually) Health Trusts and Criminal Justice organisations.

The new coalition government's position will be distilled from policy papers published in the run up to the election and formal speeches delivered by ministers since May 2010.

Our research to date has focused on the assessment of previous performance management regimes which is being complemented by formal and informal consultations with Fire and Rescue Services, academics and other interested parties from both the Fire and Rescue Services community and from practitioners and policy makers from other parts of the public services sector. This is therefore primarily operational research using information collected for the purposes it was originally used and is currently being used as part of this study. All information used are from sources, reports, statistics, and assessments that are in the public domain or were previously published in the public domain—although some of the earlier reports may have been removed from official websites. (They will however still be available in the national archives).
The historical development of the performance management regime for Fire and Rescue Services in England from Best Value to CAA.

The first part of the paper will attempt to provide an overview and commentary on the emergence and development of the performance management regime for Fire and Rescue Services in England and its relationship with the performance management regime for local authorities since it is the latter regime that has formed the context for its development to date.

Over the last 10 years since the passing of the 1999 Local Government (Best Value) Act, the local government performance management regime has generally been one of the most powerful levers for change within local public services (Martin and Bovaird 2005, AC 2009a).

Fire and Rescue Services were designated Best Value organisations by the 1999 Act and this has formed a key part of the statutory basis for Best Value CPA CAA and all of the subsequent performance management regimes for those authorities and services identified as BV organisations across health local government and criminal justice sectors in England.

All of these public service sectors have been subject to successive “generations” of performance management regimes following the Comprehensive Spending Reviews (CSR) and associated central government Public Service Agreements of 2000, 2002, 2005, and 2007. The development of the first and successive generations of CPA and its replacement with Comprehensive Area Assessments ultimately resulted from these successive CSRs. The CSR for 2009 originally scheduled for July 2009 and then 2010 were postponed by the government due to the forthcoming election. The 2010 CSR from the new coalition government is currently scheduled to be published in October 2010.

In 2008 the government, the Audit Commission, and the other regulators of local public services, collectively published their proposals for the next generation of performance management regimes for health services, local government and the criminal justice system focused around the new CAAs (AC 2008). This system includes the assessment of the performance of public services across a local administrative area and area assessments were complemented by organisational assessments of specific services such as the Fire and Rescue Service.

At the time of writing the government have announced the termination of CAA (Ref) and all inspections have been discontinued (AC 2010). It has also announced that it intends to abolish the Audit Commission, and transfer some of its responsibilities to the National Audit Office (Ref).
The next part of this paper will consider the development of the performance management regime for Fire and Rescue Services within the following 4 generally chronological but overlapping phases of development:-

1. Home Office responsibility for the service up to the time of the second national fire dispute - a period which was characterised by institutional inertia.

2. The national fire dispute, local government “modernisation” and the first assessments of Fire and Rescue Services in 2005 - a period of sectoral upheaval dominated by the national dispute and its aftermath rather than the introduction or development of the performance management regime.

3. From 2006 to 2008 a period when the later iterations of the CPA performance management regimes were being effective across local government but were having only a very limited impact on equality targets in the Fire and Rescue Services, and

4. The current period, the latest targets and the context for the NRFS initiative.

Following this developmental chronology, the second part of the paper will look more specifically at the new coalition governments’ emerging position as distilled from policy papers published in the run up to the election and the formal speeches delivered by the Government and particularly the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Fire Minister since May 2010.

**Home Office responsibility and the period up to the second national fire dispute and the commissioning of the “Bain” report.**

In the period between the second world war and the turn of the century, when the fire service was the responsibility of the Home Office, there was little reform of the fire service despite frequent complaints that it needed structural and financial reorganisation (Ewan 2004, p.7). This was exacerbated after 1976 as the perceived needs of the national economy were reflected in ever more onerous restrictions on the expenditure of local authorities and other public service providers (Jones and Stewart 1983). This is also reflected in the annual income and expenditure returns collected by all authorities and published by the commercial arm of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountants (IPF 2009).

Although the Audit Commission was established in 1983, prior to the turn of the century, it only produced two national reports on the cost effectiveness of the fire service in 1986 and in 1995 (AC 1986 and 1995). Similarly although Fire Services have been included in annual performance indicator returns since they commenced in 1996 (AC 1996) these did not have the impact on the Fire Service that they had elsewhere in the public services and local government in particular (Campbell-Smith 2008, AC 2009a).
The 1997 Crime and Disorder Act, which re-introduced multiple and several responsibility into public service legislation and included Fire Services within Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, had little impact on their operational performance (AC 2002). The new duty of Best Value introduced in the 1999 Local Government Act resulted in few significant service reviews within the 46 Fire Services in England (AC 2002).

As the independent “Burchill” Review of the machinery for determining the conditions of service in the Fire Service reported in 2000

“There has been an almost total lack of real political engagement in the Fire Service since the last firefighters’ strike in 1977. The 1947 Act is hopelessly outdated. Local Authority employers of fire brigades have in general shown a lack of leadership and purpose especially when acting together to negotiate pay and conditions. The Fire Brigades Union, while professing its enthusiasm for change, has shown no real commitment to making it happen from the centre and in many parts of the service has mounted sustained and energetic opposition to change. The senior management of the Fire Service has shown a collective lack of leadership”. (Burchill 2000, p. 3)

The national fire dispute, local government modernisation and the first assessments of fire and rescue services in 2005.

If the post war period can be characterized as a period of sectoral inertia for the fire and rescue services, the period between 1998 and 2004 must be seen as a period of major sectoral upheaval.

The “Bain” review (Bain et al 2002) which was announced in September and published in December 2002 resulted directly from the national fire dispute of 2002-2003. This dispute was essentially fuelled by the requirements of the 1999 Best Value Act, the governments desire to “modernise” the service and the government and local authority employers desire to introduce new arrangements for national negotiations over pay and conditions. It was originally sparked in July 1998 with the publication of the Local Government White Paper, “Modern Local Government: in touch with the people”, when the national employer’s representatives sent a letter to the employee’s side secretary to inform them that the employers were seeking a more flexible negotiating framework at national level (Burchill 2004).

The dispute essentially revolved around, not only pay and conditions of service, but the general principle of devolved determination of pay and conditions. For a long time within the fire service, this dispute became synonymous with “modernisation” and eventually resulted in new national negotiating machinery. The dispute which effectively started in July 1998 was only formally resolved in June 2003, nearly five years later.

During this time, in 2001, the responsibility for the Fire Service was transferred from the Home Office to the short lived Department of Transport,
Local Government and the Regions in May 2001 and thence to the more powerful Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in May 2002. By the time that “Bain” reported in December 2002, the Best Value regime in local government was also about to be supplanted by the more robust Comprehensive Performance Assessments, although the first iteration of CPA did not include assessments for the (newly renamed) Fire and Rescue Services¹.

The Bain report, as Burchill before it, pulled no punches about the need for the service to change

“We did not realise until we started this Review just how much potential for reform exists in the current Fire Service. We were surprised at the extent to which the Fire Service has fallen behind best practice in the public and private sector. …The Fire Service needs to be changed from top to bottom and every aspect of its work reformed to bring it into line with best practice at the start of the twenty-first century”. (Bain 2002, p ii)

Between 1998 and 2004 the wider local government modernisation agenda, including the introduction of national performance indicators, the Best Value regime and the Comprehensive Performance Assessments were very significant drivers of change across local government in general. However in Fire and Rescue Services the “distraction” of the long running fire dispute, the strength of the services organisational culture together with the partial and weak application of the new performance management regime, meant that its impact was much less influential than in the rest of local government.

The national dispute dominated this period and even after its resolution in 2003 it was immediately followed by the introduction of the new Integrated Personal Development System for the staff and the introduction of Regional Management Boards and Integrated Risk Management Plans for the services. These initiatives tended to dominate the post-dispute “modernisation” agenda at the personal and organisational levels rather than the need for continuous improvements under best value or the other parts of the performance management agenda.

Outside of the service, it is not widely appreciated that the first CPA methodology did not address the operational parts of the service but only assessed the performance of the non-operational parts of Fire and Rescue Services. It is however widely acknowledged that the dominant organisational culture within the service derives from the uniformed or operational parts of the service.

Within the operational parts of the services the relative ambivalence to the performance indicators was further compounded by the fact that in 1999 the Home Office had set (later acknowledged) but demonstrably “arbitrary” targets for some of its key Performance Indicators such as the target of 15% of all

¹ The Fire Services were re-designated Fire and Rescue Services by the 2004 Fire and Rescue Services Act to reflect their wider responsibilities such as community safety and fire prevention as well as fire protection.
operational firefighters to be women by 2009 which was effectively regarded as unrealistic (ODPM 2004).

Finally, in practice, there has also been a greater delay in the post inspection publication of Fire Service reports by the Audit Commission, both in the first and subsequent rounds of CPA than has been the case for its other reports. This has tended to further diminish the impact of their publication because fire services have been afforded greater time to both respond to any findings in the reports and argue that any criticisms within the reports were “historical” and/or diminished by the passage of time.

2006 to 2008, the later iterations of CPA

By 2004/05 there was general agreement between central and local government, the local government regulators and inspectorates that a radical review and updating of the local government CPA regime was required.

Unlike the introduction of Best Value and the first iterations of CPA’s the general principle and desirability of a new version was relatively uncontested. By 2005 it was generally accepted, albeit grudgingly, that CPA had generated substantial quantitative and qualitative improvements across local government services as well as significant efficiencies in their running costs (Martin and Bovaird 2005). Nevertheless all parties considered that it could be significantly improved and one important area was in its treatment of equality and diversity issues.

There were clearly lessons to be learned from the implementation of the County Council and Single Tier CPA; from the District CPA and from the first round of Fire and Rescue Assessments as well as from performance management regimes in other sectors such as the police, education and health. The Office of Public Service Reform had produced its report on “Inspecting for Improvement” (OPSR 2003) and the 2005 Comprehensive Spending Review, and associated Public Service Agreements for Whitehall spending departments, had signaled a move to a new set of national objectives for the public sector focused on outcomes within communities rather than inputs or output measures for individual public services. It had also highlighted growing inequality in the benefits delivered by improved public services.

This time, there was no real debate as to which organisation would develop the new methodology, albeit within very firm parameters established by the government (ODPM 2005). The Audit Commission would be responsible for delivering the new regime, albeit in a new altogether more collaborative and consultative modus operandii working closely with both central government and local government, in a process later characterized as an example of co-production or co-design of policy and delivery.
Thus in 2005, “CPA the harder test” was published (AC 2005) which included within its new methodology a specific service assessment for the Fire and Rescue Services. (See figure 1 below)

![Figure 1. CPA methodology 2005 onwards](image)

It was also clear from the new methodology that, unlike some of their predecessors (including the Fire Services assessments) these new assessments would be assessments of the whole services, and in the case of Fire and Rescue would therefore included operational services. From 2006 a Fire and Rescue Service Assessment was included in the overall framework for CPA for those 13 councils with sole responsibility for Fire and Rescue Service in their area. The same methodology was also applied to the (then) 32 other “combined” Fire and Rescue Services and to the London Fire and Rescue Service.

CPA for fire and rescue services would essentially be built on the principles and processes in place for CPA in local government but would also address some issues specific to fire and rescue authorities. The overall CPA category would be determined by a corporate assessment which comprised self-assessment, peer challenge and a standard set of “key lines of enquiry”; supported by detailed diagnostics that were then combined to enable judgments’ to be made.

The corporate assessment was made up of three overall questions which were subdivided into nine themes.

The first question was “what is the fire authority trying to achieve?” which looked at the services leadership and priorities and its strategy. The second asked “how has the fire authority set about delivering its priorities?” and looked at organisational capacity in terms of its governance and management;
its resources and value for money and its human resources. This theme also looked at performance management within the service. Finally it asked “what has the fire authority achieved to date and, in light of that, what does it plan to do in the future?” which looked at the services achievement of its objectives, its improvement to date and its plans for the future.

In addition to these nine themes, five diagnostic or assessment frameworks were used to assemble the necessary evidence namely:-

• community fire safety;
• equality and diversity;
• integrated personal development system;
• integrated risk management planning; and
• partnership working.

The appointed auditor provided an opinion on the annual accounts and assessed the arrangements for the financial aspects of corporate governance in a manner similar to the system applied to local authorities and NHS Trusts (Audit Commission 2008a).

The introduction of Comprehensive Area Assessments

In 2007 following the successful implementation of Local Area Agreements of the government announced that the development of Comprehensive Area Assessments would replace the CPA in 2009 although a new methodology and common assessment framework for the “Use of Resources” would be developed and implemented from April 2008.

The following slides attempt to summarise the historical development of the performance management regime for FRS
How we got to where we were
The emergence and development of the Performance Management Regime in FRS

Our previous PAC paper identified 4 generally chronological but overlapping phases of development

• **Phase 1 - Pre 2000** – period of Home Office control prior to the national dispute and the Bain report (and CPA) a period characterised by institutional inertia

• **Phase 2 - The national fire dispute**, local government “modernisation” and the first Fire and Rescue Service Assessments of 2005 a period of sectoral upheaval dominated by the dispute and its aftermath - rather than the development of the performance management regime as in other sectors

• **Phase 3 - 2006 to 2008 the later iterations of CPA** which gradually developed the performance management regime and included operational governance inter-agency collaboration and more sophisticated Use of Resources assessments

• **Phase 4 – 2008 to 2010 the introduction of the CAA** which introduced area assessments and separate organisational assessments of LAs, PCTs Police and F&RS

Phase 1 and 2 - Best Value and the introduction of the Fire Service Assessment

Prior to 1999 Best Value Act

• Home Office responsibility
• Only 2 Audit Commission national reports 1985 and 1995
• BV Performance Indicators

1999 – 2002 Modernisation and the Best Value Regime

• Very few BV Reviews, external inspections or improvement plans
• National Fire Dispute dominated
• “Modernisation” means changes to terms and conditions not organisational performance, service delivery or improvements

2002 – 2005 Fire Service Assessment

• Service appraisal meant appraising back office functions not operational services or emergency preparedness (judged too sensitive)
• The methodology used a self-assessment, a peer challenge element, (with peers on the assessment teams), and AC key lines of enquiry (KLOE) supported by detailed diagnostic guidance –see next slide!
Phase 2 - Fire and Rescue Performance Assessment Framework for 2005

The 2005 approach was structured around a set of key lines of enquiry (KLOE) with three overall questions and nine themes (data rich?).

A What is the fire and rescue authority trying to achieve?
   • Leadership and priorities
   • A balanced strategy

B How has the fire and rescue authority set about delivering its priorities?
   • Capacity: governance and management
   • Capacity: resources and value for money
   • Capacity: people
   • Performance management

C What has the fire and rescue authority achieved to date and, in light of that, what does it plan to do in the future?
   • Achievement of objectives
   • Achievement of improvement
   • Future plans

Phase 2 - Collection of data and evidence

The Fire and Rescue CPA review teams used **five diagnostic tools** to help assess the evidence put forward by each fire and rescue authority.

- community fire safety;
- equality and diversity;
- integrated personal development system;
- Integrated risk management planning; and
- partnership working.

Source: The KLOE and diagnostics were available on [www.audit-commission.gov.uk/fire](http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/fire)
Phase 3 - Fire and Rescue Performance Assessment Framework for 2006/07

![Diagram of Phase 3 for 2006/07]

Source: Audit Commission

Phase 3 - Fire and Rescue Performance Assessment Framework for 2008

![Diagram of Phase 3 for 2008]

Source: Audit Commission
Phase 4 - Organisational Assessment of Fire and Rescue Services under CAA

Assessments (Scored between 1 and 4 in each category)

Managing Performance
Use of Resources (which consisted of)

- Managing Finances
- Governing the Business
- Managing Resources

Scores
1 Not meeting minimum standards – performs poorly
2 Meets only minimum standards – performs adequately
3 Exceeds minimum standards – performs well
4 Significantly exceeds minimum standards – performs excellently

The Coalition Government and the National Framework for FRS

We have analysed the content of the new coalition governments' policy papers published in the run up to the election and formal speeches delivered by the prime minister the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Fire Minister Bob Neill since the general election in May 2010. The most revealing and detailed speech on the future of the national framework was delivered by the Fire Ministers to the FRS conference in Harrogate in June in which he invited the assembled FRSs to join him in a Strategic Review of the National Framework for FRS published in 2008 (Ref).

The following slides attempt to summarise emerging position of the new coalition government in relation to FRS nationally and the performance management regimes
New Era of Austerity

Coalition government

Significant reductions in public finance
Abolishes CAA
Calls time on Audit Commission
What next?

DCLG Fire Minister - Bob Neil

• I am asking my department to seek out the sectors best ideas, your new thinking and your experience - to join me in a strategic review of the sector, government’s role in it and the future of the service, including whether or not we need a National Framework.

• To what extent does central government have to be involved directly in the running of the fire and rescue service?

• I want to be clear about what needs to be done at the national level – where does the national interest lie?

• Assurance over response to national emergencies and resilience seems sensible but is that where the national interest in the fire and rescue service stops?

• I need your help to answer and ask these questions.

Source: Speech to FRS Harrogate Conference June 2010
Coalition Governments Intentions
The things to go?

• Doing more for less and in some cases stopping activity that no longer needs to be done

• No moving back to prescriptive national standards – too much central government prescription

• “Should we be looking to regulate further” – “no”

• The Audit Commission!

Coalition Governments Intentions
The things to go?

• Doing more for less and in some cases stopping activity that no longer needs to be done

• No moving back to prescriptive national standards – too much central government prescription

• “Should we be looking to regulate further” – “no”

• The Audit Commission!
The things to stay

- Retained firefighters system (excellent example of localism) – how many is at local discretion
- Prevention initiatives – community safety and cohesion initiatives
- Integrated Risk Management Plan process (“already established and provides a sound basis to allow for the provision of local services driven by the local agenda and based on local risks and need of the local community” pg 5)
- Greater financial autonomy for Local Authorities and Communities
- Assurance over national emergencies and resilience

Areas questioned by the minister
some apparently more rhetorical than others

- The central definition of frontline services by government - but benchmarking needs comparative data.
- Working through Regional Management Boards
- National Diversity Targets for Workforce – local discretion?
- (Undefined) roles for Social Enterprises, the Voluntary Sector and local Business – local discretion
- How to recruit and develop staff – inputs for local discretion
- Does centrally handled have to mean centrally driven - yes but not necessarily by Central Government?
- Do we need a National Framework? – we need a means of co-ordinating that doesn’t add cost

Discussion of Initial research findings and lessons from past experience

Our research to date has focussed on the assessment of previous performance management regimes which is being complemented by formal and informal consultations with Fire and Rescue Services, academics and other interested parties from both the Fire and Rescue Services community and from practitioners and policy makers from other parts of the public services sector.
The following slides attempt to summarise emerging findings in relation to the FRS performance management regimes to the CPA/CAA and from the health and Criminal Justice regimes.

### Data development and Data use in “maturing” Performance Management Regimes

The normal development within any organisation, sector or area of interest – at first we realise “what gets measured gets done”

1) **Stage 1 : Data Poor** - ad hoc or no data poor quality assurance/compatibility

2) **Stage 2 : Becoming “Data Rich”**
   - Counting quality as well as quantity
   - Differentiating inputs, outputs and outcomes
   - Objective and subjective indicators
   - Absolute and relative indicators

3) **Stage 3 : Intelligent data**, strategic analysis and the use of data
   - “Count what counts not what can be counted”
   - Real Time and Remote Access to data
   - Standards based, absolute and objective

4) **Stage 4 : Self Regulation**, Self Assessment based on Quality Assured Data –
   “It is time to step up and take the responsibility for your sector” Bob Neil (p. 12)
The Development of the Performance Management Regimes

- “Data Poor” → “Data Rich” → “Intelligent Data” → “Self Regulation”
- Delivering individual projects and programmes → delivering wider improvements → developing sustainably → improving public sector organisations → sustainably improving networks
- Treating symptoms → treating causes → avoiding causes and developing future proofing.
- Top down centrally driven → regionally or locally driven → self driven and regulated

Public Service Improvement gradually adopted an Organisational Developmental approach.

Research Findings and Lessons from Past Experience

- The performance management regime in Fire and Rescue Services was introduced and developed later than other parts of the public sector.
- That between 2005 and 2009 Fire and Rescue services improved their performance as a result of the regime, but that there remains potential to improve these services and make further productivity and efficiency gains.

Use of Resources 2008/09
Research Findings and Lessons from Past Experience

• That the principles and key components of a national performance framework were widely supported but their details and application, in practice, generated opposition

• We contend that a new performance management regime can be delivered, with the burden on F&R Services themselves reduced, whilst the “quality assurance” offered to the government and the public is improved

• This new regime should incorporate proven effective elements from past regimes (both F&R services and other services) rather than creating wholesale new mechanisms

Conclusions and Emerging Recommendations - Suggested key components for a new regime

This final part of the paper and presentation is an early attempt to

• Assess the various parts of the previous performance management regimes for FRS and other local public service delivery organisations.

• Identify which elements of these past regimes have demonstrably worked in the past and may be appropriate for adaptation to the FR sector.

• Review these elements against the coalition governments stated intentions and suggest some elements that may form part of the regime in the future.

This is a preliminary paper and the intention is that it will be subject to further research and consultation before being presented at the Institute of Engineers Research and Development conference at the Fire Services College (RE10) It will then be further developed before submission to the Minister Strategic Review.

The following slides attempt to summarise our early ideas and emerging conclusions and recommendations
Key Components of the new regime

- An online system for Self Assessment and submission of evidence – including key documents such as Integrated Risk Management Plan (similar to but simpler than the World Class Commissioning appraisals system)

- Bi-annual Peer Review and Challenge rather than external Inspections – similar to both WCC panels and IDeA Peer Challenges

- A revised but simplified Annual Auditing and Use of Resources appraisal (based on CAA use or resources model) but carried out by external auditors appointed by AC/NAO

- Delivery of assessments, challenges and support for improvement and organisational development through the Local Government Improvement and Development Agency and the Fire Service College

Who should, in the future, take responsibility

The F&R Sector (collectively) and Local Government
- Peer review and external challenge for continuous service improvement
- Self assessment and benchmarking
- Establishing standards and indicators
- Public reporting and public assurance
- Dissemination of good practise and challenging underperformance
- An implementation date of 1st April 2011

The AC and then the NAO
- Annual Audit and Use of Resources Assessments

Central Government should assure itself of
- National and local resilience and emergency planning

The final part of the conference presentation will provide an opportunity for delegates to discuss areas for further research and future development prior to the next iteration of this paper.