

Gloucestershire County Council

Review of public consultation held by Office of Police and Crime Commissioner on governance arrangements for Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service

Brian Parry | 13 March 2019

This brief report has been prepared by The Consultation Institute (tCI) on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), to review the extent to which a recent public consultation undertaken by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire (OPCCG) meets the Institute's standards for public consultation, and to identify where the approach might be considered as falling below an acceptable standard.

This report has been drafted on the basis of a desk review of documents supplied by GCC (listed at the end of this paper). The opinion provided in this document is not legal advice and should not be considered as such; our assessment is designed to highlight to GCC where the delivery of this public consultation might raise concerns in terms of meeting acceptable practice.

1. Summary of findings

This review has highlighted a number of areas of concern in relation to the delivery of a public consultation by OPCCG on the future governance arrangements for GFRS. In summary, the issues identified include:

- **Lack of clear consultation mandate:** the Outline Business Case (OBC) does not appear to contain a clear explanation of the role and purpose of the public consultation, nor does it explain to the reader who is consulting, for what purpose and how the findings of the consultation will influence any final decision that is made. If OPCCG had prepared the OBC on the basis of a consultation mandate (using the template developed by tCI) many of these requirements would have been met and the OBC would have contained a much clearer explanation of the role and purpose of the consultation;
- **Timing concerns:** timescales for this consultation were 6 weeks and 2 days, which are significantly shorter than the standard 12-week period which is recommended for public sector consultations. Whilst flexibility is now permitted in terms of the duration for a consultation based on the range and type of stakeholders to be engaged, contentious policy decisions should usually aim for the 12 week period rather than a shorter timescale to allow for all stakeholders to respond. There are also concerns about the limited time available for paper questionnaire response, and the short timescales for direct staff engagement. All these factors raise concerns about the potential risk of key audiences not being given sufficient time to respond to the consultation;
- **Limited pre-consultative engagement with key affected stakeholders:** the OBC was prepared by updating the previous analysis by PA Consulting, however there is no evidence that key stakeholders and impacted audiences were invited to participate in this pre-consultative process, despite a 14-month gap between the original PA Consulting analysis being published and the updated OBC being launched. Pre-consultative

engagement with key stakeholders is an important process in terms of understanding important issues and formulating options for consideration as part of a consultation. The lack of engagement with GCC as a key stakeholder in this process is a concern as evidenced by the number and range of factual inaccuracies raised by GCC once the consultation was launched;

- **Limited stakeholder analysis and prioritisation:** whilst stakeholder identification was undertaken, there is limited evidence of any prioritisation of stakeholder relationships to identify which audiences might be most impacted and therefore most critical to engage as part of the consultation. We note that staff were considered an important stakeholder group in terms of planning, however timescales for arranging direct engagement meetings by OPCCG with GFRS staff were not given priority and arranged towards the end of the consultation period;
- **Documentation concerns:** there appear to be potential issues regarding the accuracy and impartiality of data presented in the OBC. GCC noted a range of concerns about the accuracy of data and descriptions in the OBC, and also raised a concern that OPCCG was selective in presenting information on other areas that have been undertaking governance reviews. The analysis and appraisal of options was not presented using the numerical scoring model prescribed by APACE, rather is based solely on a qualitative assessment, and this makes it difficult for the reader to easily understand and scrutinise the options scoring and appraisal process. Both issues could lead to a potential challenge on the basis of inaccurate or biased information having been presented by OPCCG in the main consultation document;
- **Questionnaire design:** there are a number of concerns about the structure and presentation of questionnaires used in the consultation both in terms of the lack of consistency across engagement channels and how the proposals are described with limited review of any associated benefits/risks. There are also concerns regarding the type and phrasing of questions used. None of the questionnaires offered the opportunity to rate all potential governance models, nor gave the opportunity to raise concerns/issues with other aspects of the OBC, including for instance operational or financial assumptions, the scoring of options or the benefits, or other matters which the respondent believes to be important. There is no evidence of how the proposals were presented during on-street survey, however the online and paper questionnaires have different and inconsistent descriptions;
- **Data analysis:** OPCCG did not contract an independent third party to undertake the overall analysis and reporting of the responses received. This is not considered best practise when dealing with a contentious policy decision, where having a high level of integrity and independence in the reporting process are considered of paramount importance. Supporting documents published by OPCCG do include stakeholder responses in full and this is in line with best practice, however the on-street survey findings are not reported in full through an independent report from the market research agency. There is no separate analysis of the direct engagement with staff, and a negation of the Fire Brigades Union's response despite being seen as a key representative body. Public response data has also been combined from two different sources (online survey and on-street

survey) in the final analysis in the LBC to present an overall summary of the public's view on the preferred option. This is not considered good practice in terms of data analysis, as data collected using different methodologies should not be combined or interpreted as they are not directly comparable;

- **Conscientious consideration of consultation findings:** a summary of the key issues raised by audience is contained in Section 2.9 of the final Local Business Case (LBC), however this does not seem to reflect the depth of detail regarding issues that is available from the supporting documents. At the same time, these issues are not directly addressed in the strategic conclusions (Section 2.10) which demonstrates a lack of evidence that conscientious consideration of the feedback has been undertaken. This represents a potential Gunning Principle 4 risk as the LBC does not address how the concerns raised by stakeholders have been considered and addressed within the preferred proposal and decision-making process.

2. Background and context

OPCCG first considered the Case for Change in the governance of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS) in 2017 when PA Consulting was commissioned to analyse the potential options and determine if there was a basis for recommending change. Having reviewed the analysis published in September 2017, OPCCG decided not to proceed with public consultation (the next phase in developing a business case for change) in light of the local political opposition to any change in governance of GFRS.

In August 2018, OPCCG announced its intention to re-open the case for changing the governance of GFRS and the plans for public consultation to be held on proposed new governance arrangements. This followed a number of local issues, including allegations of inappropriate behaviour by the Chief Fire Officer via whistleblowing and concerns regarding the governance of GFRS. The Chief Fire Officer resigned in July 2018 and an internal audit investigation was undertaken leading to recommendations of stronger governance and cultural change at GFRS.

OPCCG staff prepared an updated Outline Business Case (OBC) and options analysis in line with APACE¹ guidelines, using data from the previous PA Consulting analysis and incorporating information on recent developments. It is understood that GCC was not invited to provide input to the updated OBC prior to the start of the public consultation on 7th November 2018. The public consultation ran to 21st December 2018 (6 weeks and 2 days duration) inviting views on how governance of GFRS should operate.

Current governance arrangements are that the Fire Authority in Gloucestershire is composed of all Elected Members of GCC, with a Cabinet member taking lead day-to-day responsibility for GFRS oversight.

¹ Association of Policing and Crime Chief Executives: Police and Fire Business Case; Guidance for OPCC Chief Executives

OPCCG engaged specialist communications and market research resource to support the public consultation process, and published a communication and stakeholder plan for the consultation. Specialist market research services were used to augment the online survey and ensure that the views of the general public from across the Gloucestershire area were incorporated into the consultation findings.

Following the end of the public consultation, the OBC was revised and published by OPCCG together with supporting documents and a decision paper (dated 14 February 2019). The decision paper recommends that the OBC should be submitted to the Home Secretary with the recommendation for a change to a Governance based model whereby OPCCG assumes governance responsibility for both Gloucestershire Constabulary (GC) and GFRS.

3. Public consultation standards

tCI is a UK-based not for profit organisation founded in 2003 to provide thought leadership and set standards for good public consultation.

The Institute offers membership and a range of services designed to enable organisations deliver public consultation to an appropriate standard as outlined within the public consultation charter and services such as quality assured public consultations.

4. Information base

For the purposes of this review, we have assessed the documents received against the standards we would expect to see when quality assuring a consultation and have identified where we believe the documents and information supplied may not have been at an acceptable standard.

Certain information was not available, and this has limited our ability to assess the effectiveness of some elements of the consultation. Information we have not been able to review includes:

- The summary OBC published by OPCCG as part of the consultation exercise (we have only seen the main OBC which runs to 152 pages);
- The research brief used for The Research Box when conducting the on-street research survey with the public, nor the stimulus material or questionnaire used to collect the views of the public;
- The full survey report prepared by The Research Box from the on-street survey.

5. Issues identified

5.1 Consultation mandate

tCI recommends that any organisation undertaking a public consultation should develop a clear consultation mandate from the outset. This should state who is consulting and for what purpose, who are the impacted audiences (so that any consultation activity can be prioritised around such audiences in terms of understanding their views and opinions), and who/how a final decision will be taken and for what purpose.

The OBC as published fails to include the following:

- A clear explanation of what the consultation process is seeking to achieve and how the data will be used. We note that the first mention of ‘public consultation’ is on the bottom of Page 3 of the OBC, after inviting people to share their views on how GFRS should be governed, but with no explicit explanation of how this public consultation is being used to inform an important recommendation to be made to the Home Secretary on the governance of GFRS;
- No explanation of how the views given in the consultation might influence any final decision;
- No explanation of who makes the final decision on what is recommended to the Home Secretary, nor any explanation of how the change of governance structure is agreed.

tCI recommends that consultees should always be made aware of who is asking them for their views and for what purpose. In this case, it does not appear to have been clearly stated why OPCCG is asking people for their views or how these views will be used to influence the decision that is taken.

The lack of clear mandate appears to have also influenced the questions which were asked. This issue will be considered in more detail later in this note, however, right from the start of the OBC (page 3) there does not appear to be a clear structure for the questions which are to be asked within the public consultation, rather a catch-all ‘please share your views’ invitation is offered. This general invitation to comment on the governance arrangements does not flow through to the public questionnaires which have been used, as they contain a closed question about whether you agree or disagree with the preferred (governance) option, and provide limited opportunity to comment about any other aspects of the OBC.

5.2 Consultation plan and timescales

A communication and stakeholder engagement plan was developed (Supporting Document 01) and we understand that specialist marketing and communications support was engaged (Crest Advisory UK Ltd) to support the consultation. The plan contains an acceptable outline of proposed activities and the factors which should be taken in to account when delivering a public consultation. The document refers to the APACE guidelines on public consultation associated with a review of governance arrangements for Fire and Rescue Services, and these

[APACE] guidelines refer to the Gunning Principles which are the key tests for ensuring that a public consultation meets legal requirements.

Whilst the Gunning Principles are referenced in communication and stakeholder engagement plan, there does appear to be some issues in terms of meeting their requirements in terms of timing (Gunning Principle 3) and in terms of proposals being at a formative stage (Gunning Principle 1). We have noted the following:

- (i) **Overall timescales:** the public consultation was held from 7th Nov 2018 to 21 Dec 2018, which is 6 weeks and 2 days. This is significantly less than the standard 12 weeks that is recommended for public consultation, and whilst the guidelines regarding timescales have become more flexible, it is normal practice still when dealing with a contentious policy issue to offer a timescale that is closer to the original 12-week timeframe to allow any impacted audiences to provide their views. Given the contentious nature of these proposals, it would not seem appropriate to shorten the timescales to just over six weeks. We understand from the documentation that the shorter timescale was required to meet the deadline for submission of the business case to the Home Secretary ahead of the next PCC elections, however this is unlikely to be a strong enough argument for not providing sufficient time for people with more time to respond to a public consultation of such importance.
- (ii) **Document availability and timescales:** we note from the chronology of engagement activity (Supporting Document 02) that paper copies of the OBC, summary business case and paper questionnaire were supplied to public libraries on 10th Dec 2018, even though the consultation closed on 21st Dec 2018. This offered an audience, which may not have had access to online channels, just 12 days to make a submission to the consultation, and this would not usually be considered sufficient time.
- (iii) **Staff engagement:** we noted that the consultation plan makes reference to meeting GFRS Staff in local fire stations during week commencing 26th November 2018, however there is no evidence of a request for access to GFRS staff being made until 4th December 2018. This request was denied by the Acting Chief Fire Officer on 10th December 2018, with a recommendation that representative bodies be used to provide the views of staff. A request from staff to meet directly with OPCCG at non-GFRS locations was received on 12th Dec 2018, meetings were organised on 14th December and 19th December 2018. We note that no staff attended the meeting on 14th December 2018 as it was co-located at Gloucestershire Constabulary Headquarters and ad-hoc feedback has suggested staff felt intimidated to attend a meeting at this venue. There is no information available as to how many staff attended the meeting on 19th December. The late timing and limited ability for staff to meet and give their views could be considered an important issue in terms of whether staff were able to make their views known about the proposals. Staff are identified as an important stakeholder and the APACE guidelines recommends there should be direct engagement, so this could be considered a potential timing issue.
- (iv) **Pre-consultation input to the updated OBC:** we note that GCC was not given an opportunity to engage with OPCCG and provide input to the updated OBC before the

public consultation was launched, and this is somewhat surprising given that GCC is an important (if not critical) stakeholder to the current governance process. Gunning Principle 1 argues that consultation should be undertaken when proposals are still at a formative stage, and it would seem that the views of GCC were not incorporated in to the updated OBC prior to launch. Given that the OBC was published 14 months after the initial PA consulting review and a number of assumptions and issues may have altered during this timeframe, it would seem strange that GCC was not invited by OPCCG to be part of any pre-consultative review of the updated OBC before launch.

5.3 Stakeholder identification and mapping

Linked to the communication and stakeholder engagement plan is the issue of stakeholder identification and mapping. This is an important exercise in terms of planning for public consultation as it allows the consultor to identify those stakeholders who are most likely to be impacted by the proposed changes, and to identify which stakeholders are most interested and influential in the policy area.

The communication and stakeholder engagement plan does contain a list of stakeholders to be engaged, however there is no mapping or prioritisation, which tCI usually recommends should be undertaken to ensure that the consultation prioritises activity on the most impacted and important audiences. On this basis, OPCCG does not appear to have prioritised any audiences over another, despite some audiences having a far greater role and influence over GFRS governance than others.

It is also interesting to note that the APACE guidelines on arrangements for consultation² makes specific reference to considering the views of employees who may be affected by the proposals, including fire and rescue personnel and police staff. As mentioned previously, we note that direct access to GFRS staff was not supported, however OPCCG were encouraged to utilise staff representative bodies and did arrange meetings on 14th and 19 December 2019. There is however no specific feedback provided by OPCCG on the views of staff collected at these meetings, and this would appear to be an omission in terms of considering the views of a key stakeholder audience.

We note that the views of staff employed within GFRS and Gloucestershire Constabulary (GC) are broken out in the online survey responses, where there was a strong response recorded in favour of the proposed changes, however, the views of the Fire Brigade Union are discounted by OPCCG, because they have a national policy position of objecting to the proposed governance changes, even though they are a key representative body for staff.

tCI would normally expect to see stronger efforts made to encourage staff to make their views known directly, and to have a clearer analysis of the views of staff in the consultation findings (given the significant impact which these proposals will have on this audience).

5.4 Options development and appraisal

² Association of Policing and Crime Chief Executives: Police and Fire Business Case; Guidance for OPCC Chief Executives; Section 4

The OBC provides a comprehensive analysis of the current situation, the reasons for proposing a change of governance arrangements, the different governance options that are available, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

The options appraisal process (section 3.3) follows the APACE methodology, however it does so at a qualitative rather than quantitative level. Given that the APACE guidance offers a defined scoring methodology it seems strange why the different models of governance have not been scored numerically against the agreed criteria, and a comparative summary prepared of the scoring given. This would have demonstrated more clearly why the Governance Model is the OPCCG's preferred option.

A summary table and numerical scoring would also have allowed the reader to understand more clearly the basis on which the preferred option was selected and provided a stronger opportunity for the scoring of options to be scrutinised. Such scrutiny of options appraisal is important in public consultation as the Leeds Infirmary Children's Cardiac Surgery judicial review³ demonstrated, where not disclosing clearly the basis on which options have been scored was a central feature as to why the judicial review was upheld.

tCI would recommend that options development appraisal should be a clear and transparent process, which allows scrutiny and supports feedback to be made by respondents. Neither the presentation of the options nor the questions asked in this consultation allows for such scrutiny and feedback to be provided, and could be considered an issue in terms of the proposals not being at a formative stage (Gunning Principle 1) and in terms of providing sufficient information for intelligent consideration of the proposals (Gunning Principle 2).

5.5 Documentation

Having reviewed the documentation made available for the consultation, we would make the following observations:

- (i) There is no clear invitation to participate in a public consultation, other than in the forward by the PCC (page 3), nor a description of the decision-making process and how a recommendation to the Home Secretary will be influenced by the consultation findings;
- (ii) There is no separate questionnaire provided to enable responses to be given;
- (iii) There is an allegation from GCC of selective presentation of existing data on governance changes across the country – Hertfordshire has abandoned proposals to change and North Yorkshire is subject to judicial review;
- (iv) There are a number of other factual inaccuracies in the OBC raised by GCC, which could have been avoided if GCC had been invited to work with OPCCG on the updated business case. As it stands, the OBC could be considered as an inaccurate description of the current situation and based on inaccurate information (potential issue under Gunning Principle 2).

³ R(ex parte Save our Surgery Ltd) v Joint Committee of Primary care Trusts [2013]

We understand there was a summary OBC document, but have not been able to access this to determine the extent to which this also summarised the key arguments for a non-technical reader, and so we cannot comment on this

Supporting the overall OBC, we have seen copies of a paper questionnaire and reviewed the summary of findings from online and on-street surveys. We understand that the paper questionnaire was sent to public libraries on 10th December 2018 but have no evidence to suggest this was available sooner or as part of the OBC when published. tCI recommends that a separate questionnaire should be published alongside the consultation document to enable the reader to see the questions being asked and to enable respondent characteristics data to be captured. This does not appear to have been the case here, and means that in many instances that stakeholders will have responded without a clear understanding of the issues open to influence.

Whilst it has been possible to review the paper-based survey questions (Supporting Document 08) the same has not been possible for questionnaires used in the online or on-street surveys. We have also not been able to review the on-street discussion guide, and so cannot comment on how the proposals were described to respondents before they were asked for their opinion on the preferred option.

tCI recommends that for online and self-completion questionnaires it is important that sufficient explanation is provided within the questionnaire as to the role and purpose of the consultation, with the pertinent data and facts made available to enable a considered response to be provided. This advice is provided because many people may never read any further information than that provided in the questionnaire ahead of completion. It is therefore essential that sufficient information is presented within the questionnaire as part of the introduction and where different topics are explored.

From a review of the online and paper-based questionnaires we have concluded the following:

- (i) The introduction to the consultation, the current situation and proposed changes do not appear to be consistently described across different questionnaires. This means that inconsistent information was presented to respondents and can lead to a diverge of understanding regarding the proposals and benefits/risks involved;
- (ii) The different governance models do not appear to be adequately described in terms of benefits and disadvantages of each option, although we note that a link to the main OBC was provided in the online introduction for further information. We cannot comment on the on-street questionnaire as this is not available;
- (iii) Important information about the proposals was not included or incorrectly described in the online introduction (for instance the online introduction described ‘savings could be re-invested in front line services’, when in fact the OBC makes clear that the preferred model is not cost neutral in the early years and only offers savings on a future discounted basis);
- (iv) The first question is not appropriately worded and does not offer the respondent the opportunity to express an opinion between the different governance options

available. Rather it is phrased as a closed question, which forces the respondent to answer a binary question on the preferred option only.

- (v) There is no mechanism for respondents to raise any other concerns or issues they may wish to make regarding wider issues in the OBC (for instance operational or financial assumptions, the scoring of options or the benefits, or other matters which the respondent believes to be important).

On this basis, tCI would recommend that the questionnaires should have been altered significantly to enable greater consistency across the different response channels, and to enable the respondent to give their opinion about all the options available.

5.6 Analysis and reporting

Analysis of the consultation responses appears to have been undertaken directly by OPCCG staff with the exception of the on-street survey where analysis was undertaken by The Research Box. Whilst OPCCG has been transparent in publishing all responses received from other stakeholders and through paper questionnaires, which is to be commended, the lack of an independent third party to summarise and report back the main findings from across the different elements of the consultation is not considered good practice when dealing with a contentious policy decision. tCI guidance is wherever possible to use of an independent third party to analyse and report back on the consultation findings – this ensure integrity and independence in the reporting process and avoids any perceptions of bias in the analysis and reporting of findings.

We note that no independent report was published from the on-street survey rather a summary of findings was published by OPCCG. As stated above, tCI always recommends that where an independent third party has undertaken a survey or similar activity that a separate report of the findings from this activity should be prepared by the agency concerned and published in full. It is interesting to note that had such a report been published from The Research Box, it would have been possible to review and comment on the discussion guide and questionnaire used, as the research instruments would have been published in line with Market Research Society guidelines. As such we do not know how the proposals or issues were presented to respondents during the on-street survey, and so cannot comment further on this.

There is no summary of the responses received from GCC (supporting Document 03) and other stakeholder feedback (Supporting Document 04) to enable the reader to more easily understand the main issues raised by each audience.

A summary of the key issues raised by different audiences is contained in the final Local Business Case (LBC) in Section 2.9, where OPCCG summarises the main concerns raised in brief paragraphs. Having reviewed the supporting documents, there is clearly more detail and information available than has been described in this section of the LBC (for instance why GCC and other stakeholders have disagreed with the OPCCG proposal). This raises a concern that the LBC does not describe the concerns raised in sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand the full extent of the views held or the reasons for these issues being raised. You should not have to read all the supporting documents to obtain a reasonable level of

understanding of the issues, and this suggests that the final LBC should contain a more detailed analysis of the issues raised.

We note that in the key summary of views received (Section 2.9 of the LBC) there is no reference made to the qualitative views of GFRS staff (see reference below to survey data), which is strange given the level of impact which this audience will experience from the proposed changes, and also the request for a specific off-site meeting to discuss the proposals. OPCCG instead rely on representative organisations which are described as 'generally in support' of the changes and negates the views of the Fire Brigades Union because of their national policy stance to the proposed model. It would have been more appropriate to include the views of staff directly and to explain which representative bodies support or do not support the proposals and why.

There has also been selective reporting of the public survey data which is not consistent with the more detailed findings in the supporting documentation, and the conflation of survey data collected from online and on-street surveys to represent the overall view of the public. Conflating data which has been collected using different methodologies is not recommended nor consistent with accepted market research and data analysis practice. We shall consider this and other specific data analysis issues below:

- (i) Paragraph 2.9.9 of the LBC refers to the views of respondents who work for GFRS or GC in support of the proposals, but fails to note that support amongst people who do not work for either organisation was significantly lower;
- (ii) Paragraph 2.9.10 of the LBC mentions support from members of public for the preferred option by combining the data sets from the online and on-street surveys and removing any respondent who was 'not sure'. Combining data from two different research methodologies is not in line with accepted market research practice – the data collected through the on-street survey involved a more detailed interaction with the respondent during which the proposals were explained (although we have not seen the description used), and this data cannot be combined with data from an online survey where the description of the proposals is likely to be different and there is no opportunity to interact with a researcher. Furthermore, it is not considered good practice to remove 'not sure' respondents from survey findings, rather to present the data set in its entirety. By combining the two data sets in this manner the reader would not realise that in the on-street survey there was a more negative response to the proposals compared to the online survey.

5.7 Conscientious consideration of findings

Having undertaken a public consultation and reported on the findings, it is important that there is conscientious consideration of the responses received, before the consultor moves towards taking a final decision (Gunning Principle 4).

The final LBC demonstrates limited evidence that OPCCG has considered and addressed the issues and concerns raised by key stakeholders from the consultation. Having reviewed Section 2.9 of the OBC, the main concerns would appear to be around:

- the loss of democratic accountability;
- the loss of wider benefits to the local community from linking GFRS to social care and community activities;
- concerns regarding financial modelling and value for money in the analysis presented;
- the mixed support for the proposals both from other local stakeholders and the general public.

The subsequent section of the OBC (Section 2.10 Conclusion – there is a strategic case for change) does not address any of these concerns or suggest how the OPCCG has considered each of these issues. We would normally expect to see some reference to each issue, whether the consultor accepts or rejects the issue raised, has amended the proposals accordingly, or has decided to proceed.

The LBC as reviewed does not therefore demonstrate clearly how OPCCG has considered each of the issues raised and explained the basis on which it is proceeding to a decision, which suggests that contentious consideration of the findings may not have been undertaken.

Documents reviewed

1. OPCCG Outline Business Case (Nov 2018) The case for change
2. OPCCG Local Business Case (Feb 2019): The case for changing Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue governance
3. Fire and Police Governance Review (PA Consulting, Sept 2017)
4. OPCCG Response to PA Consulting Report
5. OPCCG Supporting Document 01: Communication and Stakeholder plan
6. OPCCG Supporting Document 2: Chronology of media and engagement activity
7. OPCCG Supporting Document 03: Correspondence between Gloucestershire County Council/ GFRS Fire Authority (including PCC/OPCC Feedback)
8. OPCCG Supporting Document 04: Stakeholder feedback
9. OPCCG Supporting Document 05: Correspondence received from the public
10. OPCCG Supporting Document 06: Results on online survey carried out by OPCCG
11. OPCCG Supporting Document 07: Results of on-street survey (carried out by The Research Box)
12. OPCCG Supporting Document 08: Paper based survey responses
13. OPCCG Supporting Document 09: Equality Impact Assessment
14. OPCCG Supporting Document 10: Risk register
15. OPCCG Supporting Document 11: Overview of expenditure
16. OPCCG Decision paper
17. APACE Guidance for OPCC Chief Executives on Police and Fire Business Case