

**Government of South Australia** 

South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission

**Project Plan** 

# **Emergency Service Delivery Standards**

APPROVED:SAFECOM Board, 25/3/10CONTACT:Cathie Brown, Director Strategic Services 8463 4142VERSION:2.0DATE:March 25, 2010STATUS:ApprovedCONFIDENTIALITY:C1



## Table of contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Background	3
3	Aims	4
4	Approved Project Principles	4
5	Project Deliverables	5
6	Scope	5
7	Assumptions and Constraints	6
8	Organisation and Governance	6
9	Stakeholder Consultation	7
10	Timeframes	7
11	Funding	8
12	Reporting	8
13	Implementation Plan	8
14	Document Control	9
15	Appendix 1 - Indicative timelines	10



#### **1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Developing Emergency Services Delivery Standards is a complex undertaking. Over the years, many reviews conducted on the emergency services sector have stated that the allocation of resources across the three responding agencies is based more on historical precedent than risk. These reviews have recommended a risk-based approach be implemented.

The purpose of this project is therefore to develop Emergency Service Delivery Standards (ESDS) that can be applied over time across SA and across the SAFECOM sector to ensure the emergency services budget is spent to deliver our mission of having a safer and more resilient South Australia.

A key element in this project's success is that it is well managed and that all parties are clear about their responsibilities, what is to be accomplished, how and when and who is to be involved. That is the purpose of this Plan. This Plan builds on Version 1 which was approved by the Board in January 2009. Since then, progress on the project has not progressed as originally anticipated for a number of reasons which have been brought to the Board's attention. This Plan reflects the new approach as approved by the SAFECOM Board in February.

With the approval of the SAFECOM Board the Plan will continue to be modified to reflect increased understandings as the project progresses and deliverables are more specifically defined.

#### 2 BACKGROUND

Under legislation, the SAFECOM Board is responsible for ensuring there is an effective allocation of resources across the Sector. There is currently no method of benchmarking or validating that this is occurring.

The current Strategic Plan sets a target of being below the national average in fire death and injuries by 2015. For many years, South Australia has been well above the National average. Continuing to operate the way we currently do will seemingly not allow us to reach our target.

In 1986, the Country Fire Service developed the Standards of Fire and Emergency Service Cover which saw the merging of many brigades and standards set for the number of appliances in various regions and the numbers of volunteers required in those regions. This system has worked well for the service.

Since then, AS/NZS ISO 31000 *Risk Management 2009* has been agreed to be used by the sector. We now need to use this to guide the development of an agreed Statewide-approach to service delivery standards. This will ensure resourcing decisions are made based on risk.



## 3 AIMS

The aim of the project is to:

"Develop Standards with which to determine where best to place sector resources and prevention leading to a safer and more resilient South Australian community".

The Standards need to:

- provide a framework of risk categories and prevention/attendance standards
- match response and prevention to risk
- be defendable
- be simple to apply
- allow benchmarking and thus identify unnecessary duplication
- be cost effective to implement
- be flexible and able to be adapted to changing technologies and risk levels
- include performance measures which relate to improving community outcomes.

#### 4 APPROVED PROJECT PRINCIPLES

The following principles were agreed by the SAFECOM Board in January 2010. The purpose of these principles is to set the fundamental basis for the project.

- The over-riding outcome of emergency service activity is safer communities. Performance measures will generally be based on the number and cost of death and injury; loss and damage to critical infrastructure; industry; property and the environment and the cost of restoring community functionality.
- 2. Possible treatments to fire and emergency risk are prevention, mitigation, preparedness and response and all will be considered from the perspective of community safety not historical precedent.
- 3. Resources are limited and will be allocated to areas of greatest need, current and future, based on evidenced risk.
- 4. "Like risk" should receive "like fire and emergency cover".
- 5. The treatment of a risk needs to be explicitly linked to the outcomes at a community or landscape level (ie: cost of risk treatment versus value of risk reduction from applying that treatment).
- 6. Emergency service delivery will be based on seamless integration and cooperation.
- 7. Resource use will take account of economic, environmental and social considerations.
- 8. The safety and welfare of emergency services members engaged in operations is of the highest priority.
- 9. AS/NZ ISO 31000 Risk Management 2009 will be used in managing risk.
- 10. Change management issues need to be considered including the potential impact on communities, responders, sector resources and Government.



11. Risk treatment standards are independent of service provider.

## **5 PROJECT DELIVERABLES**

The key work packages to be delivered by this project are:

- An agreed hazard list
- A risk model
- Hazard data
- LGA risk profiles
- A risk treatment menu
- Standards against hazards and risk profiles
- An Implementation Plan for Government consideration

In-depth risk assessments will also be conducted in those LGAs which represent the top 10% of risk for each hazard.

Project-specific deliverables that will be developed to support the management requirements include:

- Communications Plan
- Risk Management Plan
- Project Schedule
- Stage plans and reports
- Work packages
- Project updates
- Action log
- Risk log

#### 6 SCOPE

The scope of this project relates to the development of the Standards for Government consideration. As part of the scope an implementation strategy will be developed. Implementing the Standards, once approved by Government, is out of the scope of this project and will be treated as a separate project.

In developing Standards of Emergency Service Delivery the following aspects will be considered:

- History of incidents and current response by type, size and time
- Relevant competency standards of responders
- Capability of vehicles and equipment for a particular risk type
- Prevention and mitigation (engineering, education and enforcement)
- Community response capacity
- Capacity and capability of the risk owner
- Capacity of other responders and escalation triggers
- Innovative responses
- Land Management, community and commercial objectives
- Cost of risk treatment versus value of risk reduction

## 7 ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

The major constraint facing this project is staff availability. This project relies on staff in the Strategic Services Division of SAFECOM being able to devote significant time for this project and as such this project has been re-prioritised in the Strategic Services Division work plan.

It also relies on the timely input of staff from the agencies as well as the other members of the working party. Particularly during summer, operational requirements often take precedence over projects of this nature. This will need to be monitored against the project timelines to ensure that slippage does not occur.

The project's success is also dependent on:

• Availability of Mingara GRN activity data, Commissioned by Justice. To date we have agreement that this data will be available for our use.

If issues arise they will be raised with the project sponsor and escalated where appropriate.

#### 8 ORGANISATION AND GOVERNANCE

The SAFECOM Board is the principal authority for all matters associated with this project and will be responsible for the project's overall performance and outcomes. The Board is the decision-making body for the project. The project sponsor is the Chair of the SAFECOM Board, David Place.

The Board has established an ESDS Working Party to provide input and advice to the project and to assist the SAFECOM Strategic Services project team. The chair of the ESDS Working Party is David Place.

Membership of the Working Party consists of representatives from the following stakeholders:

- o CFS (2)
- o MFS (2)
- SES (2)
- CFS Volunteers Association (2)
- SES Volunteers Association (2)
- United Fire Fighters Union (2)
- o Director, Strategic Services, SAFECOM

The Working Party's Terms of Reference provide further information about its role and responsibilities.

## **9 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION**

Establishing a working party will allow for much consultation to occur with agencies and their representative associations. Consultation will also occur at various times with other groups including:

- Local Government
- Insurance Council of Australia
- Other State Government agencies
- Specific communities and interest groups (in-depth risk assessments)

#### **10 TIMEFRAMES**

It is anticipated that Emergency Services Delivery Standards will be developed and ready to be provided to the Government for its consideration by April 2011. Until the number of hazards that require standards is known as well as how complex our risk model will be, it is not possible to be more definitive about the timelines. A high level Gantt Chart is included in Appendix 1 and indicative completion dates are listed below:

Workpackage	Expected completion date
Agree project principles	Completed
Key hazard list agreed	March 2010
Risk model agreed	May 2010
Risk profile elements agreed	May 2010
Common risk profiles defined	June 2010
Data for hazards compiled	August 2010
Risk treatment menu developed	August 2010
LGAs put into risk profiles	September 2010
Local in-depth risk assessments begin	Ongoing
Consider future risks and revise profiles	October 2010
Standards agreed for each hazard and risk profile	December 2010
Match Standards to LGA and gap analysis done	January 2011
Plan developed and provided to Govt	April 2011



#### **11 FUNDING**

Item	Estimate
Working party travel to meetings for non-agency representatives	\$10,000
Mingara assistance	\$15,000
Stationary/printing	\$1,000
Incidentals	\$4,000
Total	\$30,000

This will be funded from the existing SAFECOM budget.

Agencies will be responsible for funding any travel costs associated with their working party nominees.

#### **12 REPORTING**

Regular highlight reports will be provided to the Board including the following:

- Progress and achievements
- Risks and treatments
- Schedule
- Budget

#### **13 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The Emergency Services Delivery Standards will include an implementation plan showing where resources need to re-balanced and indicating priorities and timeframes. This will be provided for Government approval and then consultation with communities.

Building community resilience, changing service delivery approaches and engineering out risks will not happen over night. The implementation plan will be to be mindful of these constraints and recommend accordingly.

The implementation of the Standards will be managed as a separate project.



Government of South Australia South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission

## **14 DOCUMENT CONTROL**

Revision Date	Version	Distributed to	Updated by
22.1.09	0.1	SAFECOM Board	Cathie Brown
29.1.09	1.0	Working Party	Cathie Brown
18.3.10	1.1	Working Party for comment	Cathie Brown
25.3.10	1.1	SAFECOM Board	



#### **15 APPENDIX 1 - INDICATIVE TIMELINES**

ID	Task Name	Nov'09	Dec '09	Jan'10	Feb '10	Mar '10	Apr '10	May'10	Jun'10	Jul '10	Aug '10	Sep '10	Oct'10	Nov'10	Dec'10	Jan'11	Feb '11	Mar '11	Apr '11	May'1
1	ESDS PROJECT SCHEDULE		ý.																, ,	4
2	Project documentation		<u> </u>				$\sim$													
4	Principles agreed			$\sim$																
7	Key hazards agreed		$\sim$																	
10	Data gathered		<u> </u>																	
15	IRMPs conducted											4							$\sim$	
20	Area profiles developed						$\sim$													
26	Area profiles future changes considered									4										
30	Risk Treatments agreed							$\sim$												
33	Gap analysis															$\sim$				
35	Emergency Services Delivery Standards Drafted																		<u> </u>	