Animate

Scottish Fire and Rescue Service

Reducing Unwanted Fire Alarm Signals -

Evaluating Options for Responding to Automatic Fire Alarms

Staff & Stakeholder Workshop

Online Event – 24th February 2021

Introduction

This brief report sets out the findings from the Staff and Stakeholder Benefits and Risks Assessment exercise in relation to 5 Options for responding to automatic fire alarm actuations.

The participants were organised into 5 diverse Panels comprising representatives from the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), the Fire Brigades Union (FBU), the Fire Safety Industry, the NHS, Business and Higher/Further Education sector. The Panels were facilitated by independent facilitators (Animate) and supported by SFRS subject matter experts. The findings of the 5 Panels are presented below.

Summary of findings and key themes arising from Panel discussions

Benefits:

Panels 1 & 2 concluded Option 4 '*Call challenge all AFA's from non-domestic premises and respond only to those where the call challenging process cannot verify the cause of the AFA. No exemptions to call challenging apply'* was the most beneficial. This difference appeared to hinge on the clarification offered by the subject matter experts about the impact of Option 4 having no exemptions and therefore greater potential for UFAS reductions (85%) when compared to Option 5 (71%).

Two Panels 4 & 5 concluded that Option 5 *'Non-attendance to all AFA's from non-domestic premises, unless back-up 999 call is received. Exemptions apply to sleeping risk premises and the weight of response is dependent on time of day and premises type'* offered the greatest benefit towards a reduction in UFAS. This difference appeared to hinge on panel members doubting if the Call Challenge aspect of Option 4 would realise the full reductions of 85%, whereas with Option 5 – Non-attendance, there was more certainty of realising the estimated reductions of 71%.

Panel 3 scored Options 4 & 5 the same, offering up a similar reason as Panels 4 & 5.

Risks:

Four of the five Panels found Option 5 to offer the highest risk when seeking to reduce UFAS. Panel 2 again concluded that Option 4 offered the highest risk.

Key themes arising in the Panel discussions

- More detail around the Call Challenge process would have made it easier to assess the associated benefits and risks.

- The relative differences afforded by location of services – balancing a desire for reduced demand on central belt reserves by remote/rural areas with the fact that fewer call outs may risk stations closing.
- The desire for ongoing involvement of organisations to measure the impact of the changes and to consider local arrangements
- That Options 3, 4 and 5 increased the pressure on call handling staff to manage 'moral dilemmas'.
- Fewer call outs would lead to 'Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies' and increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities' but this would not be evenly spread across the SFRS.
- There are sector/organisational specific variations – one size doesn't fit all – e.g. the NHS does not evacuate immediately in some instances.
- Allocating scores when thinking about large complex sites was challenging. For example, the age and type of buildings could lead to very different risk scores for the same option, or whether the alarm is in a staffed or unstaffed area.
- If speed of response is key. Does a Call Challenge process automatically slow down a response? If a Call Challenge process is more complicated then presumably response times will be slower. As response time is a key factor in reducing building damage and loss of life, then the scoring of any option that has Call Challenge within it could be expected to attract a higher risk score and have an impact on the benefits.
- How to weigh up the impact of the options on the different motivational factors for the firefighters if call outs were reduced (e.g. if Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) firefighters the potential for lost earnings, but on the other hand potential for reduced disruption to their main employers). However, it was argued, that serving the community was the overriding motivational factor for RVDS firefighters.

Panel 1: Benefits Matrix

Benefits Scoring Matrix 1 = No change in benefit 2 = Marginal increase 3 = Small increase 4 = Moderate increase 5 = Large increase **Key Benefits**	Relative Weight	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Reduced response costs	10	1 (10)	2 (20)	3 (30)	5 (50)	4 (40)
Reduced fleet carbon emissions	10	1 (10)	3 (30)	3 (30)	3 (30)	3 (30)
Total Weight/Score	**100**	**100**	**290**	**300**	**480**	**390**
Ranking		**5** least benefit	**4**	**3**	**1** greatest benefit	**2**

Panel 1: Risks Matrix

Risk Scoring Matrix Key Risks	Impact if Risk Occurs	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Increased risk of building damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Increased risk to building occupants	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	1 (4)	2 (8)	1 (4)
Increased risk to firefighter safety	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	2 (8)
Fire and rescue reputational damage	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	3 (12)
Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) retention and recruitment issues	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	2 (8) urban *3 (12) remote/rural*	2 (8) urban *3 (12) remote/rural*
Total Risk Score		**20**	**28**	**24**	**36** ***40***	**44** ***48***
Ranking		**5** lowest risk	**3**	**4**	**2**	**1** highest risk

Impact Weighting	**Probability Weighting**
1 – Very Low	1 - Improbable/unlikely
2 - Low	2 - possible/unlikely
3 - Medium	3 - likely/probably
4 - High	4 - highly probable
5 – Very High	5 - certain to occur

Panel 1 Commentary on discussion

Benefits Matrix:

Responses were caveated given a lack of knowledge of what the specifics of a Call Challenge process would be.

The panel questioned the estimates of reductions in blue light journeys for options 4 and 5 – they thought they were the wrong way round (Option 5: 71%, Option 4: 85%), and initially assessed the options on that basis. However, when the reasons why the percentages were right were explained they revised their assessment to those represented above.

Risk Matrix:

Again, the responses were caveated given a lack of knowledge of what the specifics of a Call Challenge process would be.

There was confusion about Option 2 – COVID response, but this was clarified by the subject matter expert as *one of the options* for consideration after COVID-19 restrictions eased, in addition to the other options in the table being discussed. The panel therefore scored the Options with that assumption in mind (During COVID their score would be different because a lot of buildings would be empty).

The Panel assumed risk to life as low in all instances because evacuations would take place following a fire alarm actuating (There was no NHS rep on the Panel, so this may have been challenged).

Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) – a lot of discussion of the differences between RVDS - urban based areas and RVDS - remote/rural based areas. Urban based – employers would be very happy if reserves are called out less often, but in remote/rural areas fewer call outs may risk stations closing, so they assessed risk differently for these two scenarios.

Panel 2: Benefits Matrix

Benefits Scoring Matrix 1 = No change in benefit 2 = Marginal increase 3 = Small increase 4 = Moderate increase 5 = Large increase **Key Benefits**	Relative Weight	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys	20	1 (20)	4 (80)	4 (80)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies	20	1 (20)	4 (80)	4 (80)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities	20	1 (20)	4 (80)	4 (80)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland	20	1 (20)	4 (80)	4 (80)	5 (100)	4 (80)
Reduced response costs	10	1 (10)	3 (30)	4 (40)	5 (50)	4 (40)
Reduced fleet carbon emissions	10	1 (10)	3 (30)	4 (40)	5 (50)	4 (40)
Total Weight/Score	**100**	**100**	**380**	**400**	**500**	**400**
Ranking		**5** least benefit	**4**	**2**	**1** greatest benefit	**2**

Panel 2: Risks Matrix

Risk Scoring Matrix Key Risks	Impact if Risk Occurs	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Increased risk of building damage	4	1 (4)	3 (12)	4 (16)	5 (20)	5 (20)
Increased risk to building occupants	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	2 (8)
Increased risk to firefighter safety	4	1 (4)	3 (12)	3 (12)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Fire and rescue reputational damage	4	1 (4)	3 (12)	4 (16)	5 (20)	4 (16)
Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) retention and recruitment issues	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	2 (8)	3 (12)	2 (8)
Total Risk Score		**20**	**48**	**60**	**76**	**64**
Ranking		**5** lowest risk	**4**	**3**	**1** highest risk	**2**

Impact Weighting	**Probability Weighting**
1 – Very Low	1 - Improbable/unlikely
2 - Low	2 - possible/unlikely
3 - Medium	3 - likely/probably
4 - High	4 - highly probable
5 – Very High	5 - certain to occur

Panel 2 Commentary on discussion

Benefits Matrix

There was a lot of consensus in this exercise. The subject matter expert offered information about the descriptors and the figures and from this people felt the outcomes to be quite clear.

There was some talk about issues which veered outwith the scope of the exercise but are related to future considerations:

- Who is exempt from Call Challenge procedures need to be nailed down.
- There will be a need to liaise with big multi sited organisations with multi risk categories.
- There should be ongoing involvement of organisations to measure the impact of the changes and to consider local arrangements.
- The question was asked, will there be further consultation regarding these options after this event?

Risk Matrix:

There were more points of disagreement in assessing risk although the Panel still came to consensus. In particular the issue of firefighter safety caused the most divergence with the FBU believing there is a high risk involved whenever there is a reduction in pre-determined attendance. One of the SFRS staff reps agreed with this from the perspective of mental health as well as physical safety, with firefighters having to manage the emotional impact of no longer responding to situations where there 'could' be a fire. The operations control (OC) rep was happy to agree with the middle ground risk level but thought that with Options 3, 4 and 5 the pressure of managing 'moral dilemma' increased a lot for call handling staff. Opinions on the other side of this discussion felt the risk to be low to firefighters because regardless of the situation, their response is always based on dynamic risk assessment and they are trained in this. Another perspective suggested road traffic collisions (RTC) may decrease if sending fewer vehicles on to the road.

There was also disagreement about the safety of building occupants. An NHS rep felt strongly that for buildings in rural areas, there could be an increased risk as response times could be longer. Others disagreed because the risk impact scoring already assigned should ensure a response within a set period of time. The NHS rep questioned whether this would be the case if vehicles were called when already out and about.

Unlike all of the others, the Panel always scored option 4 as the highest risk. This seemed to be because of the clarification offered by the subject matter expert about Option 4 having no exemptions. They focussed on this factor throughout the exercise.

Panel 3: Benefits Matrix

Benefits Scoring Matrix 1 = No change in benefit 2 = Marginal increase 3 = Small increase 4 = Moderate increase 5 = Large increase **Key Benefits**	Relative Weight	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	4 (80)	4 (80)	4 (80)
Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	4 (80)	4 (80)	4 (80)
Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	4 (80)	4 (80)
Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	4 (80)	4 (80)
Reduced response costs	10	1 (10)	4 (40)	4 (40)	4 (40)	4 (40)
Reduced fleet carbon emissions	10	1 (10)	4 (40)	4 (40)	4 (40)	4 (40)
Total Weight/Score	**100**	**100**	**320**	**360**	**400**	**400**
Ranking		**5** least benefit	**4**	**3**	**1** greatest benefit	**1** greatest benefit

Panel 3: Risks Matrix

Risk Scoring Matrix **Key Risks**	Impact if Risk Occurs	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Increased risk of building damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)
Increased risk to building occupants	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Increased risk to firefighter safety	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Fire and rescue reputational damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) retention and recruitment issues	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	2 (8)	2 (8)
Total Risk Score		**20**	**40**	**40**	**52**	**56**
Ranking		**5** lowest risk	**3**	**3**	**2**	**1** highest risk

Impact Weighting	**Probability Weighting**
1 – Very Low	1 - Improbable/unlikely
2 - Low	2 - possible/unlikely
3 - Medium	3 - likely/probably
4 - High	4 - highly probable
5 – Very High	5 - certain to occur

Panel 3 Commentary on discussion

Benefits Matrix:

Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys – The number of blue light journeys was felt to be very premises type dependent e.g. Option 2 exemptions allow for high risk premises to get a multi- pump response instead of the 'blanket' 1 pump. Call Challenge could potentially reduce blue light journeys and deliver a moderate increase in benefit.

Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies – Seen as station area and station specialism dependent (reduced movements of certain specialist appliances). Also, resources can be moved between areas as required to improve availability, broadly speaking. With Call Challenge more resources are available, enabling a more nuanced response (as opposed to blanket) dependent on responses to questions.

Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities – if less time was spent attending UFAS more time could be used for these purposes, and Call Challenge could support that. However, it would depend on what part of the service you worked in (e.g. Operations Control Centre would experience very little freed up time).

Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland – the benefit would be different for different parts of the service, depending on the service/station footprint (the extent of their capacity, involvement and embeddedness in their communities).

Specific points covered in discussion:

- Matrix is Fire Service centric – the Panel were reminded that we are thinking about benefits to SFRS.

- Benefits of 5-minute investigation period to see if there is a fire – alarm can be reset if no fire is discovered (evacuation can still happen). However, a 5-minute delay isn't desirable in NHS premises.
- Option 2 is 'safe' because it is a blanket 1 pump response and there is an inherent reduction in incidents (RTCs) due to fewer pumps going out.
- NHS services, and fire industry represented on the Panel saw Option 4 as the least desirable.
- Whisky Society rep preferred Option 5 – but concerned about unstaffed premises.

Risks Matrix:

Increased risk of building damage – scoring hampered by not knowing the full detail of what the Call Challenge would be. Panel heard that a small-time delay can have significant impact. Option 5 has an inherent higher risk. Some types of premises are more likely to have a 999 call, and some are unstaffed.

Increased risk to building occupants – the Panel felt that the risk may be higher for NHS per se, due to their no immediate evacuation policy and varied building use - Call Challenge procedures are relevant factors to consider. For Option 3 - NHS (and potential others) do not immediately evacuate, so exemptions are key here – reported fires get full response, Option 4 - again, dependant on evacuation management systems. Increased risk where people are vulnerable i.e. care homes, Option 5 - exemptions reduce risk to life.

Increased risk to firefighter safety – Option 2 - information from the caller is key. Option 3 - information given to OC staff is key as there may be a full response required, if confirmed fire or signs of fire. Statistically, data shows a minimal risk. Option 4 - information obtained will determine response. For instance, care homes are often listed as commercial premises, which would get a single pump dispatched. Relies on experience of OC staff to respond adequately.

Fire and rescue reputational damage - Option 5 - agreed this increases the potential for loss of life.

RVDS retention and recruitment issues – Option 4 - Station footprint is a key variable. Option 5 - location of station and serving rural areas are factors.

Specific points covered in discussion:

- NHS don't evacuate buildings, indicating that one size does not fit all.
- If premises are in highly populated area and fire takes hold it presents a risk to fire fighters/community.
- 5-minute investigation period - again, not one size fits all (useful in some types of premises).
- If there are a significant number of people in buildings then there isn't necessarily time to find evidence of fire, if alarm has been sounded.

Panel 4: Benefits Matrix

Benefits Scoring Matrix 1 = No change in benefit 2 = Marginal increase 3 = Small increase 4 = Moderate increase 5 = Large increase **Key Benefits**	**Relative Weight**	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys	20	1 (20)	2 (40)	3 (60)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland	20	1 (20)	3 (60)	3 (60)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Reduced response costs	10	1 (10)	3 (30)	3 (30)	4 (40)	5 (50)
Reduced fleet carbon emissions	10	1 (10)	4 (40)	3 (30)	4 (40)	5 (50)
Total Weight/Score	**100**	**100**	**290**	**300**	**400**	**500**
Ranking		**5** least benefit	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1** greatest benefit

Panel 4: Risks Matrix

Risk Scoring Matrix **Key Risks**	Impact if Risk Occurs	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Increased risk of building damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	4/5 (18)
Increased risk to building occupants	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	3 (12)	4 (16)
Increased risk to firefighter safety	4	1 (4)	3 (12)	2 (8)	4 (16)	4 (16)
Fire and rescue reputational damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	3 (12)	4 (16)	4 (16)
Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) retention and recruitment issues	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)
Total Risk Score		**20**	**40**	**40**	**60**	**70**
Ranking		**5** lowest risk	**3**	**3**	**2**	**1** highest risk

Impact Weighting	**Probability Weighting**
1 – Very Low	1 - Improbable/unlikely
2 - Low	2 - possible/unlikely
3 - Medium	3 - likely/probably
4 - High	4 - highly probable
5 – Very High	5 - certain to occur

Panel 4 Commentary on discussion

Benefits Matrix:

A relatively small group. The discussion often focused on comments made by an Independent Fire Consultant, balanced by an SFRS representative, and with comments offering clarity from the subject matter expert. This was a little challenging as technical issues meant that the sound quality from the subject matter expert was poor.

Key themes related to:

Call challenge – without knowing the full detail of any Call Challenge procedure it was difficult to allocate scores, and felt a bit like guesswork. The Panel particularly struggled to draw distinctions between options 2 and 3 i.e. to understand how different Call Challenge would be from the current COVID response.

Scores – most of the scores rose sequentially from left to right across the options i.e. there were greater benefits going from Options 2 - 5. One exception to this was in 'reduced fleet carbon emissions' where it is already known that the COVID 19 response option has reduced the response to 1 pump thereby making savings, whereas the Call Challenge options may not make the same immediate reduction.

Additional discussion was centred around the differences between scores e.g. 2 (marginal) and 3 (small) and here the extended definitions helped people to land on scores.

Risk Matrix:

A bigger group than previously, with the NHS perspective dominating the discussion, often focusing on worse case examples.

Call challenge – again the question as to what Call challenge would entail and what exceptions there would be was a constant theme underlying the discussion. Perhaps the best conclusion from this element of the discussion was that it boils down to 'speed of response'. Does a Call Challenge process automatically slow down a response? If a Call Challenge process is more complicated then presumably response time will be slower. As response time is a key factor in reducing building damage and loss of life, then the scoring of any option that has Call Challenge within it could be expected to attract a higher risk score.

Practical situations – examples were given of how a Call Challenge process might not be very practical e.g. in a large factory where a security guard is the person on the call. They could be asked if they can see / smell fire but this could be far away on a large site. They could then be in danger if they are asked to investigate.

Variables – other variables led the Panel to experience difficulty allocating scores. For example, the age and type of buildings could lead to very different risk scores for the same option. Or whether the alarm is in a staffed or unstaffed area.

Interesting discussion points – in relation to 'increase to firefighter safety', the COVID response scored higher risk than Call Challenge. The point was made that with only one pump attending, there could be a moral pressure for firefighters attending to do whatever they could in a situation, putting themselves at more risk, while a Call Challenge process might have determined that a fuller response was more appropriate.

Regarding the RVDS retention and recruitment criterion, these were all scored as 1, as those contributing regarded people's motivation to be involved in the RVDS was to serve their local communities and outweighed any monetary factor.

Whilst strong views were expressed that Option 5 would definitely at some point, somewhere lead to loss of life / increased damage and therefore reputational risk, it was generally agreed that this was ‘highly probable’ rather than ‘certain’.

Panel 5: Benefits Matrix

Benefits Scoring Matrix 1 = No change in benefit 2 = Marginal increase 3 = Small increase 4 = Moderate increase 5 = Large increase **Key Benefits**	**Relative Weight**	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Improved firefighter and community safety through the reduction of blue light journeys	20	1 (20)	2 (40)	3 (60)	4 (80)	5 (100)
Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies	20	1 (20)	2 (40)	3 (60)	4 (80	5 (100)
Increased time available for training, prevention and diversionary activities	20	1 (20)	2 (40)	4 (80)	5 (100)	5 (100)
Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland	20	1 (20)	2 (40)	4 (80)	5 (100)	5 (100)
Reduced response costs	10	1 (10)	2 (20)	4 (40)	5 (50)	5 (50)
Reduced fleet carbon emissions	10	1 (10)	2 (20)	3 (30)	4 (40)	5 (50)
Total Weight/Score	**100**	**100**	**200**	**350**	**450**	**500**
Ranking		**5** least benefit	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1** greatest benefit

Panel 5: Risks Matrix

Risk Scoring Matrix Key Risks	Impact if Risk Occurs	**Option 1** - Status Quo (Base Case)	**Option 2** - COVID-19 Interim Response – blanket one pump response	**Option 3** - Call Challenge with exemptions time & risk variable response	**Option 4** - Call Challenge, no exemptions, time & risk variable response	**Option 5** - Non-attendance with exemptions, time & risk variable response
Increased risk of building damage	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	2 (8)	2 (8)	4 (16)
Increased risk to building occupants	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)	5 (20)
Increased risk to firefighter safety	4	1 (4)	2 (8)	3 (12)	3 (12)	1 (4)
Fire and rescue reputational damage	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	5 (20)	5 (20)	5 (20)
Retained and Volunteer Duty System (RVDS) retention and recruitment issues	4	1 (4)	1 (4)	3 (12)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Total Risk Score		**20**	**32**	**64**	**64**	**72**
Ranking		**5** lowest risk	**4**	**2**	**2**	**1** highest risk

Impact Weighting	**Probability Weighting**
1 – Very Low	1 - Improbable/unlikely
2 - Low	2 - possible/unlikely
3 - Medium	3 - likely/probably
4 - High	4 - highly probable
5 – Very High	5 - certain to occur

Panel 5 Commentary on discussion

Benefits Matrix:

Initial technical issues and non-attendance/call offs on the day of the event, left the panel a bit top-heavy with SFRS personnel. Nevertheless, there were thoughtful contributions from NHS and Colleges representatives, ably supported by the SFRS subject matter expert who regularly referred them to the Benefit (and Risk) Descriptors to assist decision making.

In general terms the Panel identified increasing benefits moving from Option 2 - 5 for all the key benefit criteria, with the potential for less UFAS attendance. Despite the panellists feeling that they didn't have sufficient details of the Call Challenge procedure, the Panel agreed that it would likely reduce the number of blue light journeys, and that the number of incidents impacting on 'fire fighter and community safety' (e.g. RTCs), would be affected by the time of day/night of the response. It followed logically that there would be 'Improved availability of resources for attending real emergencies' but that this would not be evenly spread across the SFRS. This applied similarly to 'Extra capacity to meet future challenges and risks, and do so much more for the communities of Scotland'. Reduced attendance would produce 'Reduced response costs', and 'Reduced fleet carbon emissions'.

Risk Matrix:

In relation to 'Increased risk of building damage' – the Panel felt that Options 2- 4 were unlikely to increase the risk, whereas the non-attendance associated with Option 5 would be highly probable to increase the risk. There was a discussion about 'sector specific differences' in risk. For example, evacuation policies differ. The number of buildings on NHS sites and staffing levels at different times of the day could be key factors when it came to confirming the existence of a fire. It was wondered if there would be a longer delay if there were more premises, and how call handler experience and discretion would impact too. In relation to' firefighter safety' it was generally felt that much of the risk would be mitigated by firefighter safety protocols and procedures. In respect of 'reputational damage' the Panel felt that the introduction of the Call

Challenge would be certain to damage the reputation of the SFRS in terms of public perception. Finally, in respect of 'RVDS retention and recruitment issues', there was a discussion about how to weigh up the impact of the Options on the different motivational factors for the firefighters if call outs were reduced (e.g. potential for lost earnings) – as well as the disruption to their main employers.