

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE



SUBJECT	TVFCS PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT Q3 2024/25
PRESENTED TO:	TVFCS JOINT COMMITTEE
DATE OF MEETING	17 MARCH 2025
LEAD OFFICER	AREA COMMANDER PAUL SCANES
EXEMPT INFORMATION	NONE
ACTION	FOR NOTING

1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 During 2022/23, the TVFCS Joint Coordination Group (JCG) developed a new range of key performance measures to improve and enhance the monitoring of the Service. The suite of measures were discussed and developed at the Joint Committee's December 2022 workshop meeting, and continue to be established as a comprehensive and robust monitoring process.
- 1.2 It is worth noting the report contains different types of target and methods of comparison. Some targets are aspirational, some are there to ensure minimum standards are met and others are there to identify exceptions within trends, allowing us to identify possible needs for change/reaction.
- 1.3 The range of performance measures are reviewed annually by the JCG in accordance with the requirements of the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA). Notably from July 2024 onwards, the measures include the average call handling time for different incident types, which is a development from the previous target-based approach. Additionally, development of the Control Room Mobilising System during 2023/24 has enabled the JCG to capture better information relating to call challenge. This will feature in future reports.

- 1.4 It is important to note that many indicators used within each measure represent change within the Service and do not always represent good or bad performance.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the TVFCS Q3 Performance Monitoring Report for 2024/25 be **NOTED**.

3. REPORT

- 3.1 This report demonstrates Service performance for Quarter 3, between October and December 2024.
- 3.2 The number of emergency calls received are consistent with expected demand compared with the previous 5 years. It should be noted that the figures for December are artificially lower. This is a result of the final stages of the implementation of the TVFCS technology refresh, which necessitated TVFCS staff using fallback systems for call handling for a 10-day period. These fallback systems do not have same call logging functionality as the primary TVFCS systems.
- 3.3 The Service can report that the average call handling to building fires being faster than the target of 90 seconds throughout the quarter. Calls to vehicle fires have taken slightly longer than the target in October and December. Calls to fires in the open and Road Traffic Collisions (RTCs) take longer to pinpoint and therefore are not regularly meeting the 90 second target, although in December performance against mobilisation to RTCs was unusually good.
- 3.4 The Service has consistently performed well in answering emergency calls within five seconds, with performance routinely exceeding the 92 second target set by the JCG.
- 3.5 The monthly average number of calls handled per FTE during the period is relatively consistent, with the lower total in December also being attributable to the use of fallback systems during the technology refresh.
- 3.6 TVFCS have worked with all three FRSs to deliver a revised and aligned approach to challenging calls to Automatic Fire Alarms (AFAs). This approach has worked well and is reflected in higher numbers of calls being challenged with no requirement to attend.
- 3.7 Fire Survival Guidance (FSG) was given to the public on two occasions during the period. During Q3, TVFCS has been working with all three FRSs to develop systems to meet the recommendations of the Grenfell Tower Inquiry in relation to the management of incidents where multiple callers require FSG. This arrangement is now live and being assured through testing and exercising.

- 3.8 The employee headcount has remained above target, and staff turnover is zero so far this year.
- 3.9 TVFCS staff are progressing with the completion of a number of newly introduced mandatory training packages, and it is anticipated that the target will be reached by the end of Q4.
- 3.10 The one reportable data breach relates to a potential data breach where access to restricted data was accidentally made available to unauthorised employees. This has been rectified and safeguards put in place.
- 3.11 Following higher than expected levels of staff turnover experienced in the two years immediately following the lifting of restrictions relating to the Covid19 pandemic, TVFCS reviewed its approach to recruitment and retention, which led to a number of changes. These changes appear to be effective, with TVFCS staff turnover having reduced significantly.
- 3.12 The number of service desk tickets being logged with the C&C system supplier is higher than desired. The JCG are engaging with the supplier, NEC, to effect an improvement in the support arrangements for this critical system.

Thames Valley Fire Control Service – Performance Monitoring Dashboard

Thames Valley Fire Control Service - Performance Monitoring Dashboard 2024/25

Last Updated:	17/10/2024					
Updated by:	Simon Harris					

Public Safety - Effectiveness							Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
Ref		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	
PS1.1	Emergency calls answered	Within 10%	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	G	DS2000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.2	Emergency calls answered within 5 seconds	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 92%	B	B	DS2000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.3	Emergency calls answered within 10 seconds	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 97%	G	G	DS2000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.4	Calls handled per FTE	Monitoring only	Monthly	61	A	B	DS2000 call Logger - Simon gets data
PS1.5	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	TBC	TBC	
PS1.6	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Building fires)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	B	B	
PS1.7	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in vehicles)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	A	A	
PS1.8	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in the open)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	A	A	
PS1.9	Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Road Traffic Collisions - Persons Trapped)	Quicker is better	Monthly	Target 90 seconds	B	B	
PS1.10	Challenged calls resulting in no requirement to attend	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	TBC	TBC	
PS1.11	Call Handling Target - Stations alerted within 90 seconds (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)	Higher is better	Monthly	Target 80%	B	B	
PS1.12	Fire Survival Guidance given	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	G	B	Master SQL DB - Existing report, but we need to check my definitions
PS1.13	Safeguarding interventions	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	B	No report available. Manual data collection by SI
PS1.14	Threats of Arson dealt with	Monitoring only	Monthly	Previous 5 year average	B	B	Wilson - "No query, could be automated, but no problem to collect manually" Data held by Arson Champion - Easy for Simon time access

Great Place to Work - People							Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
Ref		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	
GP1.1	Headcount Vs Establishment	Nearest target	Monthly	Target 29 FTE	B	B	HRPES HR
GP1.2	Staff turnover	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <1%	B	B	HRPES HR
GP1.3	Absence - Long term	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <3%	A	A	HRPES HR
GP1.4	Absence - Short term	Lower is better	Monthly	Target <3%	A	G	HRPES HR
GP1.5	Employee experience	Higher is better	Two yearly	Target 65%	B	B	HRPES have yearly staff survey - overall engagement
GP1.6	Appraisal (Personal Development) completion	Higher is better	Annually	Target 95%	B	B	HRPES HR
GP1.7	Mandatory Training completion	Higher is better	Annually	Target 95%	B	B	HRPES HR
GP1.8	Case Management completed within timeframe	Higher is better	Monthly	Target 85%	B	B	HRPES HR
GP1.9	Workplace accidents/injuries	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	HRPES HR&S
GP1.10	Near misses and hazard reporting	Monitoring only	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	A	A	HRPES HR&S
GP1.11	RIDDOR reportable incidents	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	HRPES HR&S
GP1.12	Verbal or physical attacks on staff	Lower is better	Quarterly	Previous 3 year average	G	G	HRPES HR&S No records currently

Public Value - Efficiency							Data Source and comments for Craig/Simon
Ref		What is Good	Frequency	Comparison	Current Performance	Cumulative Performance	
PV1.1	Reportable data breaches	Lower is better	Annually	Target of zero	B	B	Would need to capture data from TV FRS
PV1.2	Service Desk response	Higher is better	Monthly	Target >95%	B	A	CCS Service Reporting
PV1.3	Service Desk tickets logged	Within 10%	Monthly	Previous 3 year average	A	B	CCS Service Reporting
PV1.4	System uptime	Higher is better	Monthly	Target >98%	B	B	CCS Service Reporting

Key:

B	Better than expected
G	As expected
A	Worse than expected
R	Considerably worse than expected

Monitoring purposes only

B	Better than expected
G	As expected
A	Worse than expected
R	Considerably worse than expected

Detailed measures by category:

Public Safety – Effectiveness

Ref: 1.1 Emergency calls answered

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Monthly	Prev 5 year	2918	3047	3294	3783	3916	3262	3248	2893	2944	2750	2601	2736	B <10%
	2024	2801	2989	3424	3489	3435	3923	3318	3142	1919				G Within 10%
	Status	G	G	G	G	B	R	G	G	B				A >10%
Cumulative	Prev 5 year	2918	5965	9259	13042	16958	20220	23468	26361	29305	32055	34656	37392	R >20%
	2024	2801	5790	9214	12703	16138	20061	23379	26521	28440				What is good
	Status	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G				Within 10% of previous five year average

Ref: 1.2 Emergency calls answered within 5 seconds

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	
Monthly	Target	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	B 93%-100%
	2024	97.08%	97.76%	95.21%	95.17%	95.24%	92.03%	96.79%	94.24%	95.90%			G 92%-92.9%
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	B	B	B			A 91.9%-81%
Cumulative	Target	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	R 80.9%-0%
	2024	97.08%	97.42%	96.68%	96.31%	96.09%	95.42%	95.61%	95.44%	95.49%			What is good
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			Higher is better

Ref: 1.3 Emergency calls answered within 10 seconds

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	
Monthly	Target	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	B 98%-100%
	2024	99.00%	99.03%	97.49%	99.44%	97.14%	95.52%	98.20%	96.96%	97.23%			G 97%-97.9%
	Status	B	B	G	B	G	R	B	A	G			A 96.9%-86%
Cumulative	Target	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	R 85.9%-0%
	2024	99.00%	99.02%	98.51%	98.74%	98.42%	97.94%	97.97%	97.85%	97.78%			What is good
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	G	G	G			Higher is better

Ref 1.4 - Calls per FTE Control Operator

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	
Monthly	Target	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	B >61
	2024	78	83	95	97	95	109	92	87	53			G 61
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A			A 60-50
Cumulative	Target												R <49
	2024	78	80	85	88	90	93	93	92	88			What is good
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			Monitor

Ref: 1.5 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2024												
	Status												
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2024												
	Status												

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-100
R	>100

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.6 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Building fires)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	68	84	78	92	76	102	81	83	75			
	Status	B	B	B	A	B	A	B	B	B			
Cumulative	Target	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
	Avg Seconds	68	76	77	81	80	79	83	83	82			
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.7 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in vehicles)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	92	102	90	99	88	93	91	86	97			
	Status	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	B	A			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	92	97	95	96	94	94	106	93	93			
	Status	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.8 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Fires in the open)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	90	98	91	97	102	105	105	93	98			
	Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	90	94	93	94	96	97	112	98	98			
	Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.9 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (Road Traffic Collisions - Persons trapped)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	109	109	118	124	102	120	106	101	49			
	Status	A	A	R	R	A	R	A	A	B			
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	Avg Seconds	109	109	112	115	112	114	127	111	104			
	Status	A	A	R	R	R	R	R	R	A			

B	<90
G	90-90.9
A	91-109.9
R	>110

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.10 Challenged calls resulting in no requirement to attend

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year												
	2024	36	31	48	118	150	250	249	299	275			
	Status												
Cumulative	Prev 5 year												
	2024	36	67	115	233	383	633	882	1181	1456			
	Status												

B	
G	
A	
R	

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.11 Call Handling Target - Stations alerted within 90 seconds (All Incidents - excluding call challenge)

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
	2024	67.7	63.4	63.8	66.6	63.9	62.3	63.9	69	69			
	Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R			
Cumulative	Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
	2024	67.7	65.6	65.0	65.4	65.1	64.6	64.5	65.1	65.5			
	Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R			

B	81%-100%
G	80%-80.9%
A	79.9%-70%
R	69.9%-0%

What is good
Higher is better

Ref: 1.12 Fire Survival Guidance given

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2024	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2		
	Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	B	B	G		
Cumulative	Prev 5 year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2024	1	1	3	3	4	4	4	4	6		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		

B	0
G	1-3
A	4-5
R	>5

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.13 Safeguarding referrals made

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year	10	14	11	14	10	11	11	15	15	15	14
	2024	17	13	19	19	19	12	22	30	11		
	Status	R	G	R	R	R	G	R	R	B		
Cumulative	Prev 5 year	10	24	35	49	59	70	81	96	111	126	140
	2024	17	30	49	68	87	99	121	151	162	162	162
	Status	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R		

B	<10%
G	Within 10%
A	>10%
R	>20%

What is good
Monitor

Ref: 1.14 Threats of Arson dealt with

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Prev 5 year	11	11	15	15	17	18	18	20	17	11	10
	2024	13	10	15	9	15	10	16	12	10		
	Status	A	G	G	B	B	B	B	B	B		
Cumulative	Prev 5 year	11	22	37	52	69	87	105	125	142	153	163
	2024	13	23	38	47	62	72	88	100	110	110	110
	Status	A	G	G	G	B	B	B	B	B		

B	<10%
G	Within 10%
A	>10%
R	>20%

What is good
Monitor

Great Place to Work – People

Ref: GP1.1 Headcount Vs Establishment

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
	2024	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		
Cumulative	Target	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
	2024	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		

B	>100%
G	>94.9%
A	<95%
R	<90%

What is good
Nearest target

Ref: GP1.2 % Staff turnover

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly	Target	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
	2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		
Cumulative	Target	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
	2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		

B	
G	<1%
A	1.1% -2.5%
R	>2.5%

What is good
Lower is better

Ref: GP1.9 Number of workplace related accidents/injuries

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4									B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0										G	<1
	2024	0	0	0										A	1
	Status	G	G	G										R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0										What is good	
	2024	0	0	0										Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G											

Ref: GP1.10 Number of near miss/hazard reports

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4									B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0										G	<1
	2024	0	0	1										A	1
	Status	G	G	A										R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0.3	0	0										What is good	
	2024	0	0	1										Monitor	
	Status	G	G	A											

Ref: GP1.11 RIDDOR reportable injuries

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4									B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0									G	<1
	2024	0	0	0										A	1
	Status	G	G	G										R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0									What is good	
	2024	0	0	0										Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G											

Ref: GP1.12 Verbal or physical attacks on staff

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4									B	
Quarterly	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0									G	<1
	2024	0	0	0										A	1
	Status	G	G	G										R	>1
Cumulative	Prev 3 year	0	0	0	0									What is good	
	2024	0	0	0										Lower is better	
	Status	G	G	G											

Public Value – Efficiency

PV.1.1 - Number of reportable data breaches

		18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25						B	
Annual	Target													G	0
	Actual	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						A	
	Status	G	G	G	G	G	G	R						R	>0

B	
G	0
A	
R	>0
What is good	
Less is better	

PV.1.2 - Service Desk Response

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar			
Monthly	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	B	100%	
	2023	100	91	100	96	96	100	96	100	100				G	> 97.9%	
	Status	B	R	B	A	A	B	A	B	B				A	> 95.9%	
															R	< 96%
Cumulative	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	What is good		
	2023	100	96	97	97	97	97	97	97	98	88	80	73	Higher is better		
	Status	B	R	A	A	A	A	A	A	A						

PV.1.3 - Service Desk tickets logged

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar			
Monthly	Prev 3 year													B	<10	
	2023	15	21	19	45	26	25	26	14	24				G	10-15	
	Status	G	A	A	R	R	A	R	G	A				A	16-25	
															R	>25
Cumulative	Target													What is good		
	2023	15	36	55	100	126	151	177	191	215	215	215	0	Monitor		
	Status	G	A	A	R	R	R	R	A	R						

PV.1.4- System Uptime

		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar			
Monthly	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	B	100%	
	2023	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100				G	> 97.9%	
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B				A	> 95.9%	
															R	< 96%
Cumulative	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	What is good		
	2022	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100				Higher is better		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B						

4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE TVFCS PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

4.1 This report complies with clause 4 of the IAA – ‘Principles of Collaboration’.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None identified at this time.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None identified at this time.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None identified at this time .

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

8.1 None identified at this time.

9. CONTRIBUTION TO SERVICE AIMS

9.1 As stated in the TVFCS IAA schedule 2: ‘Primary objectives’:

- 9.2 To satisfy the core functions of the Fire Authorities as defined in the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004
- 9.3 To satisfy the statutory duty of all the Fire Authorities as category one responders as defined in the Civil Contingencies Act 2004
- 9.4 To improve the resilience of the control room function
- 9.5 To provide the capability for future expansion of TVFCS with other agencies or clients.

10. PRINCIPAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1 Monitoring Officer BMKFA, RBFA
- 10.2 Joint Coordinating Group.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

<https://bucksfire.gov.uk/documents/2022/12/tvfcs-joint-committee-agenda-and-reports-15-december-2022.pdf/>

[Agenda for Thames Valley Fire Control Service Joint Committee on Thursday, 12th December, 2024, 2.00 pm | Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service](#)

12. APPENDICES

- 12.1 None.

13. CONTACT DETAILS

- 13.1 Area Commander Paul Scanes pscanes@bucksfire.gov.uk 07765041960