Kent Resilience Team (KRT) Business Case

An integrated team to deliver resilience capability in Kent

1. Purpose
1.1 This business case provides the justification to establish the Kent Resilience Team (KRT) - a new integrated team to deliver enhanced resilience capability (including emergency planning and business continuity) in Kent. It is based on the estimated costs and the anticipated benefits to Kent County Council, Kent Fire & Rescue Service and Kent Police by transforming the way we deliver our statutory responsibilities under the Civil Contingencies Act (2004) to improve outcomes for Kent’s communities.

1.2 This business case has been approved by the multi-agency Project Steering Group and senior officers within each respective organisation. It provides decision makers with the ability to assess the overall viability of the project and makes a clear financial case for change. This evidence will enable appropriate management and elected member decisions to be made by each respective organisation to progress to the implementation phase of the project, in order to establish the KRT from April 2014.

2. Project Background
2.1 In April 2013 a project to explore a new delivery model was initiated, in light of the significant financial challenges facing all three partner organisations. There is a collective desire to transform our service delivery to achieve better outcomes for the people of Kent and improve the effectiveness of the multi-agency partnership the Kent Resilience Forum (KRF).

2.2 Following the development of a concept by the Project Working Group in July 2013, it was agreed to scope in more detail a co-located integrated team comprised of staff from Kent County Council, Kent Fire & Rescue Service and Kent Police. This would provide a new model for delivering statutory responsibilities on behalf of all three Category 1 responders whilst retaining individual statutory accountability. It would also provide capacity to deliver partnership and business support for the Kent Resilience Forum.

2.3 In September 2013, the Project Steering Group agreed to formalise the project. In order to deliver the anticipated benefits with pace and urgency, it was agreed to progress to implementation as soon as possible – establishing the KRT from April 2014, with the team fully operational by April 2015, delivering significant financial savings in both 2014/15 and 2015/16.

2.4 The Corporate Director for Customer and Communities, the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Constable have confirmed their initial support for this proposal. Briefings have been provided for the KCC Cabinet Member, Fire Authority Chairman and Police & Crime Commissioner. In order to meet the challenging timescales, the intention is to use this business case as the
basis for proceeding to formal decision making by all three partner organisations by December 2013.

3. “As Is” - Current Delivery Model & Resources

Current Delivery Model

3.1 The current emergency planning (EP) function in Kent is delivered in-house across three separate organisations (Kent County Council, Kent Fire & Rescue Service and Kent Police) the Category 1 Responders with statutory responsibilities in the ‘Civil Contingencies Act’ (2004) and wider legislative EP framework (Appendix 1). Although they work closely together, each individual partner maintains its own statutory responsibility with separate operational service delivery arrangements to discharge these duties. Each has its own management and business support resource. The teams are currently located in separate accommodation at different sites across Maidstone in Kent.

3.2 Partnership working arrangements are maintained through the Kent Resilience Forum (KRF) (Appendix 2). The KRF is a partnership of all the organisations that have a role to play in the response to a major emergency. The partners all provide an annual financial contribution for shared management and administrative support to the KRF. Many partners now feel that the KRF could benefit from a renewed focus on key priorities, and that the collective resources to support it could be targeted more efficiently and effectively, at lower cost.

3.3 Kent County Council (KCC)
The KCC Emergency Planning Unit fulfils KCC’s statutory requirements under the Civil Contingencies Act, which sets out 7 core duties for KCC in addition to the wider EP legislative framework for local authorities. The team is responsible for the ‘Kent Major Emergency Plan’ for dealing with major incidents, which the local authority is statutorily obliged to draw up, maintain and review. The team manages specific plans including ‘Control of Major Accident Hazard regulations’, and ‘Dungeness Off-Site Emergency Plan’. It hosts the Joint Emergency Planning Centre located in Invicta House, which is a co-ordination and communication hub for the county in the event of an incident. The team currently provides emergency planning and business continuity services to 9 District Councils through Service Level Agreements, generating an annual income of £139,000. It also provides the internal Emergency Planning and Business Continuity arrangements within KCC which are excluded from the scope of this project.

3.4 Kent Fire & Rescue Service (KFRS)
KFRS currently fulfils the day to day management of civil protection, emergency planning management and business continuity statutory duties, embedded as part of the wider Operational Planning team based at the KFRS HQ in Tovil. This team also includes functions which are excluded from the scope of this project including water services, technical rescue, a variety of management projects and other specific duties under the ‘Fire Services Act’ (2004).

3.5 Kent Police (KP)
KP deliver their specific statutory duties as part of a wider unit which is embedded into the Operations Planning Department within the Tactical Operations directorate. The only specific resource within the scope of this project within Kent Police is the ‘Business Support Management Unit’ (BCMU) which provides the business management, planning and secretariat support for the KRF. Although the staff are hosted by KP the unit is fully funded by contributions from the KRF partners. The remainder of the Operational Planning department remains excluded from the project scope.

Current Costs & Human Resources

3.6 Kent County Council
The KCC Team currently has 14 FTE, with a shared Head of Community Safety & Emergency Planning, as part of an integrated unit within the Service Improvement division. The 2013/14 gross expenditure of the service is £778,500, including £573,400 staffing costs (74% of budget).

3.7 Kent Fire & Rescue Service
The Operational Planning team has 7 FTE including both uniformed and business support staff undertaking a wide range of duties. Of these 7 FTE, 2 FTE are considered by KFRS to be in scope of the project (5 FTE not in scope). There are also 35 FTE under the management of staff within Operational Planning but these staff are within their own individual teams and therefore do not form part of the project. Based on the 2 FTE within scope, the 2013/14 gross expenditure of the service is £127,210, including £105,206 staffing costs (83% of budget).

3.8 Kent Police
Kent Police host the 3 FTE ‘Business Support Management Unit (BCMU). Based on the Kent Police upper grade limits, this is approximately £87,534 annual staffing costs, within the total KRF budget of £135,409 (including £109,909 2013/14 budget and £25,500 wider activities budget). The countywide agencies in the KRF (KCC, KFRS, KP, Health) all share 65% of the funding responsibility (a 16.25% share of £22,004 p/a) with the remaining agencies contributing an equal 2.33% of the budget (£3,159.55 p/a). Medway Council contributes a 4.66% share (£6319.10). The partner contribution rates are reviewed by the KRF every 3 years.

3.9 Total Current Costs
Taking these available costs into account, the current gross expenditure spend on emergency planning in Kent by the three partners is £1,041,119, including £766,140 staffing for the current 19 FTE (see table below). The structure charts with roles and staffing costs for each partner are set out in Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Non Staffing</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Service Income</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
<th>Govt Grants</th>
<th>Net Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>573,400</td>
<td>205,100</td>
<td>778,500</td>
<td>-169,000</td>
<td>609,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>609,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFRS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105,206</td>
<td>22,004</td>
<td>127,210</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87,534</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>135,409</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>766,140</td>
<td>252,604</td>
<td>1,041,119</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making the Case - Current Issues & Opportunities
3.10 The currently delivery model raises a number of issues and opportunities that could be addressed by moving to a new delivery model, including:

- All partner agencies have a strategic agenda for transformational change – as a result of the recent Spending Review, ‘Knight Review’ of the Fire & Rescue Service, the move towards public sector integration as part of Whole Place Community Budgets, and KCC’s ‘Facing the Challenge’ paper. This business case is fully aligned with those strategic objectives.
- Each partner taking individual savings in isolation could gradually erode the quality of the service offer, compromise the effective delivery of statutory duties and risk losing added value activity. By working together, the partners are more likely to achieve significant savings, whilst protecting the viability and sustainability of frontline service delivery to the public.
- Teams working in separate locations can lead to decreased effectiveness in communication and information sharing, and reduce opportunities for joint task and co-ordination. It also increases corporate overheads for each service (HR, Property etc).
• It has been identified by partners there is room for improvement in the effectiveness, continuity and focus of support for the KRF. Partners currently have to contact three agencies to seek advice and expertise, risking double-handling of enquiries and conflicting advice.

• Managing the service in three separate organisations increases potential for duplication and overlap, and increases costs in areas such as business support, strategy, policy, operational protocols and training.

4. “To Be” - The Vision

4.1 The vision is to create a full integrated, co-located team (‘Kent Resilience Team’) hosted by Kent Fire & Rescue Service. The team will become a countywide centre of excellence, expertise and engagement. The core purpose of the KRT will be to ensure the collective delivery of relevant duties under the ‘Civil Contingencies Act’ (2004), and other statutory legislation on behalf of the Kent Resilience Forum. Each participating organisation will retain their individual statutory accountability, but day-to-day management and delivery of statutory duties will be co-ordinated by the KRT.

4.2 Establishing the KRT is not only an opportunity to provide a more cost-effective solution for all partners, it also has the potential to achieve a number of quality improvements including:

• Improved effectiveness of partnership working and more targeted, timely and better co-ordinated support to the Kent Resilience Forum, and its associated sub groups.

• Improving the quality, consistency and robustness of policies and procedures on key issues such as risk assessments and business continuity management.

• Saving time for partners by providing a single point of contact for expertise, support and useful templates to improve the quality of individual partner emergency and business continuity planning.

• Improving communication and co-ordination when supporting multi-agency responses to major incidents.

• Providing a single point of expertise for the county, for example advice on business continuity, warning and informing, training and exercising.

4.3 The vision is for the KRT to mature and evolve in three stages:

• **Stage 1 – April 2014:** KCC, KFRS and KP second staff to form the integrated team from April 2014. Staff with the right skills and experience will be selected to second into the team, with the majority of existing posts ‘slotting’ into the new team. The KRT will begin delivery of a jointly agreed Service Specification, set out in a 3 year Service Level Agreement (with regular review clauses). It has been agreed that staff will be co-located at KFRS HQ in Tovil, to realise benefits of new ways of working as quickly as possible. Each individual partner pays for the posts they contribute to the model and retains their individual statutory accountability. Each partner is responsible for individually reviewing any remaining resource left to support business continuity in each respective agency, in order to explore additional efficiency and productivity savings.

• **Stage 2 – 2014/15:** The integrated team matures and evolves operational delivery to continue to realise the proposed benefits. This allows time for ‘proof of concept’ and to revise and tweak the model or specification if required. Further financial savings are realised as the KRT resource requirements are reviewed to ensure they remain fit for purpose to deal with both ‘steady state’ and ‘emergency incidents’. The KRT jointly delivers the Service Level Agreements for emergency planning and business continuity to District Councils, which are transferred from KCC, ensuring District clients have access to a wider pool of expertise from the KRT. All partners negotiate a shared, pooled budget for the KRT. The KRT provides improved efficiency and effectiveness in supporting the KRF.
At this point, consideration will be given to the appropriate timing for any formal transfer of staff as the team becomes fully operational.

- **Stage 3 – 2015/16**: The integrated service continues to grow and develop, continuing to realise financial savings in 2015/16. The KRT has the enhanced reputation to attract other partners as Medway Council, Health, South East Coast Ambulance Service, the Environment Agency and District Councils into the arrangement. Other KRF partners choose to second staff into the KRT, or hot desk to share accommodation on a regular basis to benefit from the centre of expertise and provide additional, flexible capacity for the KRT. The KRT has become the single point of engagement and advice for other public, private and VCS sector partners for the county. As more partners see the potential benefits of joining the KRT, the delivery model is reviewed to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

4.4 Based on this vision, an outline service specification of the core responsibilities of the KRT has been developed by the Project Working Group, and approved by the Project Steering Group. This is included in **Appendix 4**, for information.

5. **Options Considered**

5.1 A number of potential options for a delivery model to best achieve this vision were considered. To refine these options, the Project Steering Group made a series of informed assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There is a limited competitive market with few alternative providers of sufficient scale to be capable of delivering the service requirements (outsourcing is unlikely to be a viable option).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The nature of the statutory requirements give a lack of flexibility in how these statutory duties can be discharged or devolved (any delivery of statutory functions is likely to be limited to between ‘local authorities’ – i.e. the three Category 1 responders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The aim is for improved outcomes for Kent’s communities, rather than generating income/surplus (business models with broader trading potential e.g. community interest companies or TECKAL companies are unlikely to be necessary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We need to progress to implementation quickly (options with complex and time-consuming HR, Legal or Procurement issues are unlikely to be suitable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One partner organisation is likely to have sufficient scale, expertise &amp; resources to become a lead/host organisation (more likely to explore options that delegate elements of operational delivery to another core partner).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 This led to four broad options for consideration. A high level options appraisal, describing the benefits and challenges of each option is available on request:

5.3 **Option 1: Do Nothing**

Continue existing collaboration and partnership working, with small-scale service improvements. Maintain current delivery functions within separate partner organisations, in separate locations, with limited opportunities to deliver management or business support savings from an integrated service. Each partner organisation continues to deliver its own efficiency savings in isolation. Strategies and budgets are not fully aligned. The Steering Group rejected this as a sustainable option, given the scale of the financial pressures on all partners to deliver savings, and felt this was counter to the strategic direction towards integration, transformation and asset collaboration.

5.4 **Option 2: Shared Service Partnership**
A shared service partnership would create an integrated team, aligning or pooling resources (such as staff and budgets) between partners. There is potential for each organisation to retain their individual accountability for statutory provision, but to delegate day-to-day delivery, operational management functions to another public sector partner through a Service Level Agreement without a competitive procurement exercise. There are tried-and-tested powers for this under Section 101 of the ‘Local Government Act’ (1972), Section 19 of the ‘Local Government Act’ (2000), and the ‘Civil Contingencies Act’ (2004). The Steering Group agreed this was the most viable and recommended option, as a natural evolution of existing partnership collaboration.

5.5 Option 3: Creating an independent legal entity
Create an independent, “arms-length” legal entity to deliver the service, whilst retaining statutory responsibility within each partner organisation. This would need to be a contractual relationship between the new entity and the partners, supported by a service specification and would need to involve a competitive procurement exercise and the TUPE of staff. This could give increased independence for operational responsibility and increased ability to diversify revenue streams and generate income. This could take a variety of legal forms such as a social enterprise, public service mutual, charitable trust or community interest company. The Steering Group rejected this option due to the complex implementation issues, loss of partner influence and control in strategic decision making, political and reputation risks.

5.6 Option 4: Outsourcing/Commissioning
Outsource some or all of the operational service delivery to another organisation – such as a community interest company. The Steering Group rejected this as a viable option due to the lack of flexibility in discharging statutory responsibilities, and their existing knowledge that there is limited market of providers of the potential scale and sustainability that would be required. However it was acknowledged that as the KRT matures; outsourcing some specific delivery functions (such as community resilience) could be reconsidered, but this would not be part of the initial project scope.

6. Benefits
6.1 The expected benefits that will be delivered by the KRT include:

- Reduced costs and delivery of efficiency savings:
  - Enhanced productivity and effectiveness of staff through joint task and co-ordination on key priorities
  - Partnership productivity gains through a more focused KRF
  - Reduced duplication and resource spent developing strategies, plans and procedures, and monitoring performance
  - Senior Management savings
  - Business support (administration) savings
  - Property savings through co-location

- A more responsive, lean and flexible business model that enhances quality of service delivery to the public
- Proactive and intelligence led information sharing amongst partners
- Streamlined decision making and governance processes in order to respond to operational requirements more quickly and effectively
- More collective and coherent partnership support to the KRF as a result of integrated and co-located teams

7. “To Be” - Costs & Resources
7.1 The Project Working Group has undertaken work to develop an outline service specification (Appendix 4) for the KRT. This specification was developed ‘bottom up’, starting with the
minimum needed to fulfil statutory requirements, then considering further added value activity. The group has followed the principle of ‘form follows function’. It has been important not to be tied to the existing current resources, roles or structures, but to start with the core functions the new team needs to deliver, and the minimum resource requirement to achieve this.

7.2 **Recommended Resources Model for the KRT**
The Project Steering Group has agreed the optimum resourcing structure for the KRT to deliver its minimum core statutory responsibilities, whilst retaining dedicated partnership support for the KRF. The proposed model is lean in terms of management and administrative support, with the majority of the roles focused on direct delivery of emergency planning responsibilities. There is also the option for KRF partners to provide further flexible capacity (through additional secondments or flexible working arrangements) as the KRT progresses.

7.3 The Project Steering Group has estimated the KRT will need **12 FTE**. This demonstrates considerable capacity to achieve financial savings from the existing 19 FTE resource (**a reduction of 7 FTE**). The senior management structure would be provided by KFRS as the host organisation.

7.4 The diagram below sets out the estimated level of resource required within the KRT.

7.5 The table below sets out the proposed breakdown of functions within the KRT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Example Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| KRT Management                    | 1 FTE | • Provide the senior management and leadership to co-ordinate the activities of the KRT, on behalf of the KRF.  
• **Overall responsibility for delivery of service specification** |
| KRT Administrative Support        | 1 FTE | • Kent Resilience Team co-ordination and administration. Other responsibilities such as maintaining and storing risk management, budget and finance management and information governance documents.  
• **Service Specification References: 8, 21** |
| Kent Resilience Forum Support     | 1 FTE | • Kent Resilience Forum co-ordination and administration— including maintaining the website, producing the KRF business plan, co-ordinating seminars and supporting any KRF sub groups.  
• Includes community resilience ‘warning & informing’ duties to:  
• Be point of contact for members of the public to request advice relating to community resilience; communicate public warning and informing arrangements to KRF members. |
• Maintain multi-agency generic plans for all risks identified through the Risk Assessment and Emergency Planning and Capabilities groups.
• Service Specification References: 1-5, 16, 20 29-31

The Emergency Planning function will be able to provide additional capacity to support management responsibilities.
7 FTE – dedicated EP posts
• Deliver Service Level Agreements to provide Emergency Planning and Business Continuity services to District/Borough Councils.
• Produce, maintain, test & exercise multi-agency plans (for which KRT members are responsible) and provide Humanitarian Welfare in emergencies.
• Provide training and exercising to the KRF members.
• Co-ordinate, complete, continually review all risk assessments.
• Provide, maintain & publish the Kent Community Risk Register.
• Provide 24 / 7 Duty Resilience Officer function & immediate support in an emergency.
• Discharge defined SLA responsibilities to each KRT member in respect of a multi-agency incident.
• Service Specification References: 6, 7, 9-13, 15, 20-28, 32, 33, 35-41

1 FTE – dedicated Business Continuity post
• Work closely with the Emergency Planning function to jointly deliver Service Level Agreements to provide Business Continuity services to District/Borough Councils.
• Provide specialist business continuity advice and expertise for the county.
• Take a lead in developing multi-agency interest and expertise in Business Continuity.
• Improve the quality of Business Continuity planning and management across the KRF.
• Service Specification References: 17, 18, 19, 34

1 FTE – dedicated Fire Service Emergency Planning post
• Provide Fire & Rescue information, knowledge and experience to the KRT.
• To ensure that the Fire & Rescue issues are included in all KRT produced work.
• Supporting the overall delivery of service specification, with specific Fire Service knowledge and experience

TOTAL 12 FTE

7.6 Cost Comparisons
To decide which model is most cost effective and best able to deliver financial savings, a cost comparison between the ‘as is’ costs and ‘to be’ costs is required. The information below sets out the average costs between all three partners, based on the highest point in the pay grade for the proposed functions. This enables a comparison to be made between the relative costs of functions – for example comparing support costs (i.e. management, administrative & partnership function) and delivery costs (i.e. direct delivery of emergency planning responsibilities).

7.7 Although these staffing costs are based on salary averages and therefore only indicative (i.e. may not include all corporate overheads or standby/overtime costs), they give a sense of the expected level of resources that will be required to provide the KRT in a new delivery model from April 2014.

‘As Is’ – Current Delivery Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Comparisons</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Average Staffing Costs</th>
<th>% Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘As Is’ – Current Delivery Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>215,468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39,295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRF Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                      | 12 FTE |                         |         |
The cost comparison shows that the recommended resourcing option for the KRT presents a 39% saving (£257,887) compared to current costs. It substantially reduces support costs spend (by streamlining functions such as management, administration and partnership support) from 43% of the current budget, to 22% of the new KRT costs. Conversely, the new KRT improves the ratio of the total budget spent on direct delivery from 57% to 78%.

### Resource commitment from 3 partner agencies

The Project Steering Group has considered the estimated resource contribution from each of the partners to be seconded into the KRT from April 2014. To meet the challenging implementation timescale, the majority of existing roles are likely to ‘slot’ across into the KRT, with any remaining roles based on the principle that the people with the right skills and experience for the new job roles will be selected to join the KRT through an agreed selection process.

The Project Steering Group has been mindful that the first year of developing the KRT will be a ‘proof of concept’ year, with a need to regularly review the resourcing model to ensure the KRT has the optimum level of resource to deliver effectively and efficiently. As such, Kent County Council have offered to provide an additional two posts during this crucial initial development period. This may offer an opportunity for further savings over time, once the KRT delivery arrangements mature, particularly if other KRF partners choose to contribute additional capacity to the KRT as the benefits of integrated working are proven.

The outline level of resource committed by the Project Steering Group includes:

- **Funding for 2 FTE posts from KFRS** – Station Manager and Emergency Planning & Contingencies posts.
- **Funding for 3 FTE posts from Kent Police** – all the current KRF partnership funding that supports the current BMSU function will be committed, although it is likely only 1 FTE post will actually transfer in practice to deliver the 1 FTE KRF Support post in the new KRT structure.
- **Funding for 10 posts from KCC** – this will provide additional capacity to give the newly established KRT flexibility if resourcing issues such as long term sickness, annual leave or vacancies arise. Over time this could be reviewed to reduce to a minimum requirement of 8 FTE.
- This provides flexibility and sustainability with funding for up to 15 FTE, with actual staffing levels of 13 FTE to fulfil the minimum service specification of 12 FTE.
7.12 Each individual partner will remain responsible for realising savings from both establishing the KRT, and any efficiencies from reviewing the remaining resource to support each organisation’s own business continuity function.

7.13 For Kent County Council, there is a savings target confirmed for both the Emergency Planning and Community Safety Functions of £400k over 2 years (2014/15 and 2015/16). Although the split and phasing of savings between the two services is still being negotiated, for the KCC Emergency Planning function it is likely a minimum of £25k should be saved in 2014/15, and £175k in 2015/16. Based on the cost comparisons above, KCC should meet these savings targets from establishing the KRT.

7.14 This resource commitment is based on the secondment model. Over time, it may be appropriate to consider if a more formal transfer of staff into the host organisation is necessary to fully realise all the financial benefits. This could be achieved under the Cabinet Officer Public Transfer Protocol (instead of TUPE, which initial legal advice has concluded is highly unlikely to apply in this instance).

8. Governance

8.1 The partnership governance for the KRT will be through the existing Kent Resilience Forum and its associated sub groups, with direction and oversight provided by the KRF Strategic Group.

8.2 To provide democratic oversight and transparency of the KRT, it is proposed that the KCC Cabinet Member (or Deputy Cabinet Member) is co-opted onto the Kent & Medway Fire & Rescue Fire Authority Planning and Performance Committee which will receive regular reports on the KRT’s progress.

8.3 In addition, a small steering group of senior elected members and officers from each authority will be established, which can receive regular updates, providing an additional oversight and assurance role to hold officers to account for delivery against the service specification. This group will provide an important role in ensuring that individual statutory accountabilities for each partner are upheld.

8.4 Within Kent Police, the senior link with the KRT will be through the Chief Constable, who has operational decision making responsibilities for any Kent Police resource contribution to the KRT. Regular briefings will be provided to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

9. Risks

9.1 A project risk register is maintained and reviewed regularly by the Project Manager with any significant risks that are not well mitigated being drawn to the attention of the Steering Group. This is available on request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals unaffordable</td>
<td>Close attention to cost of proposals throughout the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of support/negative reaction from one of more partner</td>
<td>Sound communication with stakeholders at political and officer level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to communicate and consult with the right people at the right time</td>
<td>Early adoption of and adherence to a communication plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff disquiet or objection</td>
<td>Regular communication with staff throughout and early engagement with unions and staff associations by all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient time to prepare for</td>
<td>Careful and early planning together with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implementation from April 2014 | early engagement with legal and HR
Legal or HR problems prevent implementation on time | Early and continued engagement with Legal and HR advisers in all agencies
Insufficient resources made available to complete on time | Early and continued engagement with all agencies to develop understanding of resource needs

10. **Next Steps**
10.1 The business case will progress to further decision making stages in each individual organisation, including:

- KCC Corporate Management Team – 8th October
- KCC Corporate Director & Cabinet Member for approval – following CMT
- KFRS Management Team – TBC - mid October
- KRF Strategic Group – 18th October
- Kent Joint Chiefs – 6th November
- Kent Police ACC Sign Off – 4th December
- Communities Cabinet Committee – 17th December
- Kent & Medway Fire & Rescue Authority – 19th December
- KCC Key Decision – 23rd December
- KRF Executive Group – 8th January

10.2 Following formal decision making, the intention is to move into the implementation phase of the project, establishing the KRT from April 2014. The Project Steering Group are confident that a co-located, secondment arrangement can be achieved within this timescale. The Steering Group will maintain responsibility for delivery within time and budget, with oversight and assurance governance provided by the KCC Cabinet Member, Kent & Medway Fire & Rescue Authority Chairman and the Kent Resilience Forum.

11. **Recommendation**
11.1 Corporate Management Team are asked to approve the draft business case to proceed to the next decision making stage in each individual organisation.

12. **Background Documents**

Appendix 1: Statutory Responsibilities
Appendix 2: Kent Resilience Forum Governance
Appendix 3: Current Delivery Model – Structures and Costs
Appendix 4: KRT Service Specification
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**Project Steering Group**
- Steve Demetriou (KFRS)
- Stuart Beaumont (KCC)
- Steve Jeffery (KFRS)
- Stuart Kehily (KP)

**Project Working Group**
- Chris Else (KFRS and Group leader)
- Liz Sanderson (KCC)
- Steve Terry (KCC)
- Mark Salisbury (KCC)
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