

THAMES VALLEY FIRE CONTROL SERVICE



SUBJECT	TVFCS Performance Monitoring Report Q4 - 2025/26
PRESENTED TO:	TVFCS Joint Committee
DATE OF MEETING	13 July 2026
LEAD OFFICER	Area Commander Paul Scanes
EXEMPT INFORMATION	None
ACTION	To Note

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 During July /August 2025, the TVFCS Joint Coordination Group (JCG) reviewed the key performance measures to improve and enhance the monitoring of the Service. These performance measures were presented to the September 2025 JCC.

1.2 The report now includes narrative boxes for each measure and therefore reduced the narrative in section 3 of this report.

1.3 Note that performance measures PS 1.3 Average time taken in seconds to alert Stations (All Incidents - excluding call challenge) and PS 1.6 Challenged calls resulting in no requirement to attend are continuing to prove difficult to report on. JCG are still exploring alternative ways to evaluate these areas.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the TVFCS Q4 Performance Monitoring Report for 2025/26 is noted.

3. REPORT

3.1 This report demonstrates Service performance for Q4, between January and March 2026.

3.2 Thames Valley Fire Control Service – Performance Monitoring Dashboards

- Detailed measures by category:
 - **Great Place to Work – People**
 - **Public Safety – Effectiveness**
 - **Public Value – Efficiency**

Ref: GP 1.1 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	B	>100%
	2025/26	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	40	40	40	39	G	>94.9%
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	R	<90%
Cumulative	Target	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	What is good	
	2025/26	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	Nearest target	
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		

Description	This measure is the total number of people in roles v's budgeted establishment
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP1.1

We would normally expect the headcount for TVFCS to be slightly higher than the establishment figure, as a result of flexible working within the TVFCS staff group. Where possible, TVFCS will support staff who have requested flexible working arrangements, which includes reduced hours. This can result in a number of TVFCS staff working reduced contractual hours, equating to a single full time post. A number of leavers towards the end of the year has caused a short term drop in headcount, however recruitment activity has taken place and new starters have now been employed to fill all vacant posts.

Ref: GP 1.2 % 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%	B		
	2025/26	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	G	<1%	
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	R	A	1.1% -2.5%
														R	>2.5%
Cumulative	Target	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	What is good		
	2025/26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.44%	2.44%	2.44%	2.44%	7.54%	Lower is better		
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A			

Description	This measure is the number of employees who leave the Service, expressed as a percentage of total workforce.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP1.2

The TVFCS planning assumption is that we will experience an average of 5% staff turnover per year. This assumption is based on historic data, and is reviewed with the RBFRS HR team annually. In years where staff have left TVFCS, a report is produced by the RBFRS HR team and TVFCS management team for the TVFCS JCG providing information on the causal factors for leaving TVFCS as stated by leavers in exit interviews and paperwork and providing demographic information relating to leavers. TVFCS staff turnover has been at a lower level than forecast for the last 2 years, however we have now seen some leavers towards the end of the year. Analysis of leaver data does not indicate any trends, or common reasons why staff choose to leave TVFCS, with the reasons for leaving varying with each leaver.

Ref: GP 1.3 % Long-term Absence

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Monthly	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	B	<1%
	2025/26	2.26%	7.92%	7.92%	3.40%	2.10%	0.00%	2.59%	2.49%	3.15%	4.31%	2.65%	G	1.1%-3%
	Status	G	A	A	A	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	A	R
Cumulative	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	What is good	
	2025/26	2.26%	5.09%	6.03%	5.38%	4.72%	3.93%	3.74%	3.59%	3.54%	3.61%	3.53%	Lower is better	
	Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		

Description	This measure is the percentage of people absent for over 28 days, expressed as a percentage of total workforce
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP1.3

Long term absence in TVFCS is defined as sickness absence which exceeds 28 days in duration. The most common causes of long term sickness absence during the 2025/26 financial year have been musculo/skeletal issues, which have not been work related and mental health, which has had a variety of causes.

Ref: GP 1.4 % Short-term Absence

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Monthly	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	B	<1%
	2025/26	3.40%	2.26%	4.37%	4.04%	0.97%	5.34%	6.14%	3.15%	2.65%	5.47%	2.49%	G	1.01%-3%
	Status	A	G	A	A	B	A	A	A	G	A	G	A	R
Cumulative	Target	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	<3%	What is good	
	2025/26	3.40%	2.83%	3.34%	3.52%	3.01%	3.40%	3.79%	3.71%	3.59%	3.78%	3.66%	Lower is better	
	Status	A	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		

Description	This measure is the percentage of people absent for fewer than 28 days, expressed as a percentage of total workforce
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP1.4

Short term sickness absence in TVFCS is defined as periods of absence with a duration of less than 28 days. We would normally expect to see spikes in short term absence during the colder months, when transmissible infectious illness is more prevalent in the wider population. This is reflected in the data shown.

Ref: GP 1.5 Number of Overtime shifts utilised

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Monthly	Target												B	N/A
	2025/26	12	14	24	18	10	14	20	20	17	16	29	G	N/A
	Status												A	N/A
Cumulative	Target												R	N/A
	2025/26	12	26	50	68	78	92	112	132	149	165	210	What is good	
	Status												Monitor only	

Description	This measure is the number of overtime shifts (full shifts and/or prt shifts) worked during the month
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP 1.5

The number of overtime shifts required to maintain agreed service levels is impacted by a combination of a number of varied factors. Higher levels of sickness absence, or a temporary shortfall in establishment can be expected to result in an increased requirement for overtime to maintain staffing levels. The actual number of shifts required to cover absences will also be affected by how many staff have booked leave in the affected period, as it is easier to absorb sickness absence during periods where fewer staff have taken leave. TVFCS also utilises overtime to increase staffing when significantly increased demand is forecast, for example when severe weather warnings are in place for wind and rainfall.

Ref: GP 1.6 Number of occasions falling below resourcing model

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Monthly	Target												B	
	2025/26	2	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	7	G	
	Status												A	
Cumulative	Target												R	
	2025/26	2	2	3	4	4	5	9	12	14	15	23	What is good	
	Status												Lower is better	

Description	This measure is the number of occasions where TVFCS crewing fell below the resourcing model
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Against target
Reference	GP 1.6

This measure is also impacted by the same factors which affect the number of overtime shifts used. Overtime within TVFCS is voluntary, and it can be challenging to cover shifts at weekends and on public holidays, which are when the majority of the occasions where staffing has fallen below the resourcing model.

Public Safety – Effectiveness

Ref: PS 1.1 Emergency calls answered

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly Last Year	2918	3018	3294	3783	3916	3262	3248	2893	2944	2750	2601	2736
2025/26	3382		3826	3489		3100	3886	3038	3027	3002	2690	
Status	A		G	G		G	A	G	G	G	G	
Cumulative Last Year	2918	5936	9230	13013	16929	20191	23439	26332	29276	32026	34627	37363
2025/26	3382											
Status	G											

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

What is good
Within 10% of previous five year average

Description	This measure monitors the number of 999 calls into the control room.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	Vision
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Previous year average
Reference	1.1

Narrative: Available data continues to show an increase in call volume compared with 2024/25. It appears that this is principally related to the notably drier and warmer weather conditions experienced nationally during Summer 2025, but has continued through the autumn and winter months. Due to technical issues experienced within TVFCS in May and August, accurate call volume data is unavailable for these months. During May and August, TVFCS were using the fallback Integrated Communication Control System (ICCS). This fallback system provides identical functionality to Control room users as the primary system, but does not allow the same data capture. A further issue was experienced with the system used to log incoming call data during March, which, whilst it did not require Control staff to use fallback systems, did prevent accurate incoming call data from being captured.

Ref: PS 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%	92%
2025/26	95.55%		94.22%	86.49%		93.58%	95.97%	95.54%	98.16%	95.44%	96.77%	
Status	B		B	A		B	B	B	B	B	B	
Cumulative Target	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%
2025/26	95.55%											
Status	B											

B	93%-100%
G	92%-92.9%
A	91.9%-81%
R	80.9%-0%

What is good
Quicker is better

Description	This measure uses the time taken from when the Fire Control Room system receives an emergency incoming call alert to the moment they are answered by a TVFCS Operator
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	Vision
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Target
Reference	1.2

Narrative: TVFCS performed strongly against this measure in most months, with only July dipping slightly below the target figure. More detailed analysis indicates that this was a result of the higher numbers of calls received to outdoor fires during the month. Outdoor fires take longer for Control staff to process than incidents located in buildings, and typically create larger numbers of repeat calls. These spikes in demand can outstrip the inherent call handling capacity within TVFCS causing some delays in answering. There are some gaps in data, which have the same cause as reported in measure PS 1.1. The performance data within this months (RAG status greyed out), represents the performance only against the calls where data is captured.

Ref: PS 1.3 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
	2025/26											
	Status											
Cumulative	Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2025/26											
	Status											

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

Description	This measure is the average number of seconds elapsed between an emergency call being answered and control staff operating equipment at a station notifying crews that they are required to mobilise. It does not include occasions when the control operator applies call challenge.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	Vision
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Target
Reference	1.3

What is good
Higher is better

Narrative: We have encountered difficulties in reporting against this measure. Identifying where calls have been 'challenged' by Fire Control staff requires a manual intervention by Control staff during call handling. We are not comfortable that this is providing us with reliable data. The TVFCS JCG are exploring alternative ways of evaluating this area of performance.

Ref: PS 1.4 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
	Avg Seconds	72	74	74	73	72	72	74	81	73	78	78
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Cumulative	Target	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
	Avg Seconds	68	76	77	81	80	79	73	73	74	74	74
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

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

Description	This measure is the average number of seconds elapsed between an emergency call being answered and control staff operating equipment at a station notifying crews that they are required to mobilise when responding to building fires.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	Vision
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Target
Reference	1.4

What is good
Lower is better

Narrative: TVFCS perform strongly against this key measure of performance. Typically, fires in buildings are more straightforward for Control staff when identifying and confirming the location of the incident, which assist in achieving high levels of performance

Ref: PS 1.5 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
Monthly Avg Seconds	108	105	109	94	110	100	108	107	95	117	109	125
Monthly Status	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	R	A	R
Cumulative Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Cumulative Avg Seconds	108	107	107	104	105	104	105	105	104	105	106	107
Cumulative Status	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

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

What is good
Lower is better

Description	This measure is the average number of seconds elapsed between an emergency call being answered and control staff operating equipment at a station notifying crews that they are required to mobilise when responding to road traffic collisions with people trapped.
-------------	--

Owner	Joint Coordination Group
-------	--------------------------

Data source	Vision
-------------	--------

Pattern	Monthly
---------	---------

Comparison	Target
------------	--------

Reference	1.5
-----------	-----

Narrative: This measure continues to be challenging, due to the way that the majority of calls to road traffic collisions are reported (most are reported by members of the public to the Police or Ambulance service and then exchanged between services), which prevents TVFCS staff from using the Geo-location tools provided by the 999 system. A requirement has been included in the specification for the replacement TVFCS Command & Control system for functionality which will allow TVFCS staff to use other, 3rd party, geolocation systems which are more commonly used by other services that have not fully adopted the EISEC/AML functionality available through the 999 system.

Ref: PS 1.6 Calls where no attendance is made

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly Prev 5 year												
Monthly 2025/26												
Monthly Status												
Cumulative Previous year												
Cumulative 2025/26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Status												

B	
G	
A	
R	

What is good
Monitor only

Description	This measure shows the number of incoming 999 calls which do not result in a mobilisation of resources, excluding 'repeat' calls to the same incident and calls made as part of training or exercising scenarios.
-------------	---

Owner	Joint Coordination Group
-------	--------------------------

Data source	Vision
-------------	--------

Pattern	Monthly
---------	---------

Comparison	Previous year
------------	---------------

Reference	1.6
-----------	-----

It has proved challenging to identify a robust and consistent way of capturing this data. The TVFCS Management team are working with colleagues in the FRS Data and Performance teams to provide data which fairly represents the impact that the application of 'call challenging' by Fire Control staff has to reduce the unnecessary mobilisation of operational resources to incidents.

Public Value – Efficiency

Ref:PV 1.1 - 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%
2025/26	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Cumulative												
Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
2025/26	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Status	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

B	100%
G	> 97.9%
A	> 95.9%
R	< 96%

What is good
Higher is better

Description	Work in progress - This measure highlights the Helpdesk tickets logged with our Command and Control system supplier that are resolved within the contractual SLA.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Target
Reference	PV1.1

Narrative: All faults logged within the reporting period have been resolved by the supplier within the time stipulated in the SLA.

Ref:PV 1.2 - Service Desk tickets logged

	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Monthly												
Prev 3 year												
2025/26	21	14	20	37	27	19	24	27	10	9	19	7
Status	A	G	A	R	R	A	A	R	G	B	A	B
Cumulative												
Target												
2025/26	21	18	18	23	24	23	23	24	22	31	50	57
Status	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	R	R	R

B	<10
G	10-15
A	16-25
R	>25

What is good
Monitor

Description	This measure highlights the Helpdesk tickets logged with our Command and Control system supplier
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Previous three years
Reference	PV1.2

The TVFCS Command & Control system developed a number of technical issues between June and September, which resulted in a higher number of tickets being logged than would normally be expected. Increases in the number of tickets logged can also be seen in the months immediately after significant upgrade work has taken place. It is expected that, in order to comply with increasing central government security requirements for systems, TVFCS will be required to upgrade software more frequently in the future.

Ref:PV 1.3 - System Uptime

Monthly		Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
	2025/26	100	100	100	100	100	99.6	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	B	B	B	B	B	B
Cumulative	Target	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
	2025/26	100	100	100	100	100	99.93	99.94	99.95	99.96	99.96	99.96	99.97
	Status	B	B	B	B	B	G	B	B	B	B	B	B

B	100%
G	> 97.9%
A	> 95.9%
R	< 96%
What is good	
Higher is better	

Description	This measure demonstrates the percentage of time the command and control system is available to users.
Owner	Joint Coordination Group
Data source	TVFCS
Pattern	Monthly
Comparison	Target
Reference	PV1.3

Narrative: Despite a number of technical problems being experienced, the TVFCS Command & Control system was available to users for the majority of the reporting period. The dip in performance during September relates to a single event during September, where a failed change by the supplier during technical work in TVFCS caused the system to be unavailable for short period. Fallback business continuity arrangements were applied during this outage to maintain service provision.

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 Joint Coordinating Group.

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

<https://bucksfire.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/TVFCS-JOINT-COMMITTEE-AGENDA-PACK-16-MARCH-2026.pdf>

12 APPENDICES

12.1 None

13 CONTACT DETAILS

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