

Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service
Equality Impact Assessment Form

Title of policy/report/project:	Home Fire Safety Strategic Delivery
Department:	Community Prevention
Date:	24th April 2012
<p>1: What is the aim or purpose of the policy/report/project</p> <p><i>This should identify “the legitimate aim” of the policy/report/project (there may be more than one)</i></p>	
<p>The review of the Home Fire Safety Strategic Delivery is to ensure that the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service (MFRS) continue to contribute to the reduction in accidental dwelling fires, deaths and injuries. This will be achieved by intelligence led targeting informing MFRS where to concentrate its resources in order to focus on the most vulnerable within our communities.</p> <p>The strategy will also consider that MFRS pilot the offer of an alternative delivery service for low risk individuals that includes the provision of smoke detectors and their installation using a cost recovery model whilst continuing to provide free home safety advice.</p>	
<p>2: Who will be affected by the policy/report/project?</p> <p><i>This should identify the persons/organisations who may need to be consulted about the policy /report/project and its outcomes (There may be more than one)</i></p>	
<p>The strategy will potentially affect individuals considered to be a low risk by the MFRS. The risk factors will be determined by the use of current data and information available to the MFRS. Low risk individuals will be contacted by Fire Service Direct (FSD) who will conduct a telephone risk assessment which will determine if the individual’s circumstances have changed.</p>	

3. Monitoring

Summarise the findings of any monitoring data you have considered regarding this policy/report/project. This could include data which shows whether it is having the desired outcomes and also its impact on members of different equality groups.

What monitoring data have you considered?	What did it show?
a) Use of historical data	During 2011 – 2012, MFRS delivered approximately 31,000 (37%) HFSC visits in low risk areas of Merseyside.

4: Research

Summarise the findings of any research you have considered regarding this policy/report/project. This could include quantitative data and qualitative information; anything you have obtained from other sources e.g. CFOA/CLG guidance, other FRSs, etc

What research have you considered?	What did it show?
a) Consultation meetings with other FRS	MFRS has been delivering HFSC since 1999 and this strategy has evolved on a regular basis. Information gathering meetings were arranged with Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service (22.02.12) Kent Fire & Rescue Service (21.03.12) and London Fire Brigade (22.03.12). These organisations have already or are adopting a risk based approach and do not offer a revisit service once they have attended a property. All Fire & Rescue Services above have recorded a reduction in accidental dwelling fires, which has reached a plateau over recent years.

5. Consultation

Summarise the opinions of any consultation. Who was consulted and how? (This should include reference to people and organisations identified in section 2 above) Outline any plans to inform consultees of the results of the consultation

What Consultation have you undertaken?	What did it say?
a) Formulation of HFSC Project Board; and	The HFSC Project Board was formulated to lead on the strategic review of Home Fire Safety delivery; this group

<p>b) IRMP Consultation Events</p>	<p>consisted of Heads of Departments for Legal, ICT, Finance, Equality & Diversity and Community Prevention.</p> <p>The HFSC Project Board agreed that consultation should undertaken at the District IRMP meetings listed below:</p> <p>Saturday 12th May – Wirral Monday 14th May – Knowlsey Tuesday 15th May – Liverpool Wednesday 16th May St Helens Thursday 17th May – Sefton</p>
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. Conclusions

Taking into account the results of the monitoring, research and consultation, set out how the policy/report/project impacts or could impact on people from the following protected groups? (Include positive and/or negative impacts)

(a) Age

Data held by MFRS covering the period of 1st April 2011 – 31st March 2012 shows that 51% of low risk HFSC visits were conducted in households with at least 1 resident over the age of 65. This demonstrates that almost half of the HFSC visits focussed on vulnerable and high risk elderly residents in Merseyside. Low risk residents over the age of 65 will be offered a telephone risk assessments from Fire Service Direct to monitor any changes in circumstances.

(b) Disability including mental, physical and sensory conditions)

Data held by MFRS covering the period of 1st April 2011 – 31st March 2012 shows that 47% of low risk HFSC visits were conducted in households with at least 1 resident with a disability. This demonstrates over half of the HFSC visits focussed on vulnerable and high risk residents in Merseyside. Low risk residents with a disability will be offered a telephone risk assessment from Fire Service Direct to monitor any changes in circumstances.

(c) Race (include: nationality, national or ethnic origin and/or colour)

Data held by MFRS covering the period from 1st April 2011 – 31st March 2012 shows that low risk HFSC visits were predominately conducted in households described as White (British/Irish/Other) 82%, Asian (British Bangladeshi/Indian/Pakistani/Other) 0.8%, Black (British African/Caribbean/Other) 0.3%, Mixed (White & Asian/Black African/Black Caribbean) 0.1%, Chinese 0.6% and Other/Declined 16%. It should be noted that out of a total of over 83,000 HFSC visits conducted, 11,074 people refused or declined to state their ethnic origin.

The figures demonstrate that over half of the HFSC visits focussed on vulnerable and high risk residents in Merseyside. All low risk residents in Merseyside will be offered a telephone risk assessment from Fire Service Direct to monitor any changes in circumstances.

(d) Religion or Belief

Data held by MFRS covering the period of 1st April 2011 – 31st March 2012 shows that HFSC visits were conducted predominately in Christian households. The next highest faiths were Muslim, Jewish and Hindu.

44% of low risk HFSC visits in Christian households were conducted in low risk areas, similarly for Muslim (0.05%), Jewish (0.1%), Hindu (0.1%) and Other/Declined (55%). This demonstrates that more than half of the HFSC visits focussed on high risk residents in Merseyside. All low risk residents in Merseyside will be offered a telephone risk assessment to monitor any changes in circumstances.

(e) Sex (include gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership and pregnancy or maternity)

MFRS does not record data on gender reassignment, civil partnership or pregnancy; however in response incidents such as domestic violence/hate crime etc, MFRS would respond and implement interventions proportionate to the risk identified.

(f) Sexual Orientation

MFRS would respond to incidents and requests around hate crime or domestic violence etc. would be addressed on an individual basis and implement preventative measures and interventions proportionate to the risk identified.

(g) Socio-economic disadvantage

The HFSC visits takes into account numerous lifestyle risk factors, such as smoking, alcohol, drugs, lone parents, inappropriate cooking (chip pan etc.), excessive fire loading as well as age, young children and disability/mobility issues.

Intelligence gathered from HFSC visits and available shared data from partners allow MFRS to rate HFSC visits as high, medium or low on either an individual basis or by Super Output Area (SOA). Interrogation of the systems can identify vulnerable and high risk individuals, irrespective of whether they live in a high, medium or low risk area.

All low risk residents in Merseyside will be offered a telephone risk assessment to monitor any changes in circumstances.

7. Decisions

If the policy/report/project will have a negative impact on members of one or more of the protected groups, explain how it will change or why it is to continue in the same way.

If no changes are proposed, the policy/report/project needs to be objectively justified as being an appropriate and necessary means of achieving the legitimate aim set out in 1 above.

8. Equality Improvement Plan

List any changes to our policies or procedures that need to be included in the Equality Action Plan/Service Plan.

9. Equality & Diversity Sign Off

The completed EIA form must be signed off by the Diversity Manager before it is submitted to Strategic Management Group or Authority.

Signed off by:

Ustar Miah

Date:

27.4.2012

Action Planned	Responsibility of	Completed by
IRMP Consultations: Wirral (12.05.12) Knowsley (14.05.12) Liverpool (15.05.12) St Helens (16.05.12) Sefton (17.05.12)	Kevin Johnson Kevin Johnson Kevin Johnson Kevin Johnson Kevin Johnson	

For any advice, support or guidance about completing this form please contact the DiversityTeam@merseyfire.gov.uk or on 0151 296 4237

The completed form along with the related policy/report/project document should be emailed to the Diversity Team at: DiversityTeam@merseyfire.gov.uk