



# MERSEYSIDE FIRE BRIGADES UNION

THE PEOPLES CENTRE, 50-54 MOUNT PLEASANT, LIVERPOOL, L3 5UN.

PHONE 0151 702 6915/6, FAX 0151 708 5901

AM Mottram  
Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service  
Service Headquarters  
Bridle Road  
Bootle  
Merseyside  
L30 4YD

Fire Brigades Union  
The Peoples Centre  
50-54 Mount Pleasant  
Liverpool  
L3 5UN

Tel: 0151 702 6915  
0151 702 6916

Fax: 0151 708 5901

Email: [les.skarratts@fbu.org.uk](mailto:les.skarratts@fbu.org.uk)  
[mark.rowe@fbu.org.uk](mailto:mark.rowe@fbu.org.uk)

Date: Tuesday, 14 June 2011

Website: [www.merseysidefbu.co.uk](http://www.merseysidefbu.co.uk)

Ref: MACC Review - Questions to Process Evolution Ltd

Dear Mr Mottram,

As discussed and agreed the Fire brigades union have provided you with a series of questions relating to the report compiled by Process Evolution Ltd for Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service you have confirmed you will put to the company faithfully and without editing. It is highly unusual and irregular that such a third person approach has to be undertaken at your specific insistence and we feel it is in breach of the spirit, intent and indeed detail of the negotiation procedure, but to make the required progress we feel we have to accept the prohibitive position the Service has adopted on this matter.

I remain unsure why the Fire Brigades Union could not meet with representatives of Process Evolution as we have previously, we are aware you have recently met with the same officials.

For ease of reference we have numbered the questions as detailed below.

## Questions to Process Evolution

Firstly, we reiterate that the Fire Brigades Union would like to disassociate itself from the remarks made in question 4 of the previously submitted questions by Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service. At no point in any discussions did we, or would we, question the competence of Process Evolution.

## Section 2 Objectives

The report at Paragraph 2, Objectives (page 4), state that:

‘The objectives of the project were to:

Determine the workload undertaken by MACC staff, taking into account

- Emergency call volumes



- Other telephone calls
  - Other work undertaken by MACC staff (both within MACC and elsewhere)'
1. Can you list specifically each item of 'Other work undertaken by MACC staff (both within MACC and elsewhere)' that was taken into account?
  2. Can you list in detail each item of workload that was included in the study?
  3. How each item was taken into account?
  4. How such work is expressed in the report including any graphs used?
  5. Whether such work is included in any of the charts that match total call workload against resource levels available in each of the three scenarios contained in Section 4, Scenario Evaluation, and how it is expressed in those charts?
  6. How such work was fed into any model used including the Process Evolution Call Centre Profiler and how this profiler works?

### Section 3 Data Analysis

7. Section 3 Data Analysis states that the data underpinning the analysis was obtained from a mixture of sources and goes on to list those sources.
8. Can you list in detail the data that you used from:
  - Operational Systems
  - Ad hoc spreadsheets
9. Can you state which roles (not names) the key staff members you interviewed hold within MF&RS and provide in detail the information you obtained from the interviews with them?
10. Can you state if you were provided with copies of any incident logs from the two years covered by the report and if so how many incident logs did you examine as part of the data collection exercise?
11. If so, can you state what information you extracted from the incident logs and if this was used in assessing the amount of workload undertaken by the control room and if so how this is expressed in the report?
12. Can you state what data you were provided relating solely to the number of radio messages, both incoming and outgoing, handled by the control room during the period covered by the report?

13. Can you state if the data provided in relation to radio messages related to both incident and non-incident related radio transmissions?
14. Can you state how this data was expressed i.e. was it a list of the number of radio messages and their duration of each message for each hour of each day?
15. Can you state what data you were provided with relating to 'standby moves', that is the movement of appliances from one station to another in order to maintain fire cover and how this data is expressed in the report in particular in the graphs used to express workload and staffing levels?
16. You state on page 5 of the report that there were 181,958 additional records that are not included in the graph on that page. Can you confirm if they were included in the modelling exercise, if so where are they recorded and of not why they were disregarded for these purposes?

On page 10, there is a chart that purports to show a comparison of the total call volume against current resource level available from the current shift pattern. The Fire Brigades Union confirm that this chart is incorrect, there has never been 10 staff available at all times, the number of staff has varied across the 4 watches (shift groups) with each watch having less than the 10 staff displayed in the chart.

Your statement then that the current shift pattern provides 'blanket cover' is therefore incorrect.

This is further exemplified by the omission from this graph of the part-time staff employed to provide extra staff during the evenings between 1700 hrs and 2300 hrs.

17. Accordingly can you clarify why there is no mention of those part-time staff in this chart?
18. Can you also state why this chart does not display the actual minimum staff required on duty measured against workload, rather than the theoretical number of staff that may be available for duty, notwithstanding absences?
19. All the charts in the report match staffing levels to calls; can you state how the non-call tasks mentioned in response to a question from Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service are included in the charts?
20. On page 11, there is a table that shows the average duration of each call type; is this the same as the 'wrap time' mentioned in your response to a question posed by Merseyside Fire Service?
21. If it is different, can you provide examples of each type of call that includes a 'wrap time'; can you break down the 'wrap time' into its component parts, so that the associated tasks that make up this 'wrap time' are displayed and the time allowed for each associated task included in the 'wrap time'?
22. Was a 'wrap time' calculated for each type of call, or was it just for emergency calls?

23. Did you calculate a 'wrap time' for each individual call, or was it an average 'wrap time' for each type of call and in either case how was this done?
24. You further state in your response that this was 'incorporated into the model as part of the overall time to process a call'. What else was incorporated in the 'overall time' to process a call and can you provide an example of this 'overall time' broken down into its components and explain how it was calculated, including the time allocated for each component.
25. Can you also state what other information was incorporated into the model you used and how the model works?

#### Section 4 Scenario Evaluation

26. Can you confirm how the staff utilisation figures are calculated in each of the three scenarios?
27. Can you confirm if all the staffs in the three scenarios are expected to handle calls?
28. The staffing levels in scenarios 2 and 3 allow for only 1 member of staff rostered for duty to be off duty at any one time, say for leave etc. How would further absences be covered?
29. Could you confirm whether there would be a cost to MF&RS to meet with officials of the Fire Brigades Union on this matter and given that we have met previously, if there would be a cost could you confirm the cost?

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



L Skarratts  
Brigade Secretary