Integrated Risk Management Planning Guidance Note 4: 
A risk assessment based approach to managing a fire safety inspection programme
Integrated Risk Management Planning Guidance
Note 4

A risk assessment based approach to managing a fire safety inspection programme
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a fire safety inspection programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection process and enforcement decisions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating risk prevention, protection and response arrangements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex A: Table 1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex B: Example of a relative risk score calculation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex C: Table 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex D: Table 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex E: FiReControl data strategy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrated Risk Management Planning Guidance Note 4: 
A risk assessment based approach to managing a fire safety inspection programme

1. Introduction

1.1 This revised guidance is intended to help fire and rescue authorities (FRAs) to:

- determine a fire safety inspection\(^1\) programme for non-domestic premises that is based on an assessment of the risk posed by generic types of premises and individual buildings
- apply a risk based approach to the fire safety inspection process and
- ensure that fire safety inspection programmes contribute to Integrated Risk Management Planning (IRMP) and the associated preventative, protective and response arrangements

1.2 This guidance replaces IRMP Guidance Note 4, issued by the ODPM under cover of Fire Service Circular 2/2004. It is intended to offer a high-level framework for developing and managing a risk-based inspection programme which takes account of both the introduction of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (the Fire Safety Order) in October 2006 and the updated ‘Other Building Fire Frequencies’ data underpinning the Fire Service Emergency Cover (FSEC) Toolkit. It is up to individual FRAs to decide whether and how to use this guidance when drawing up an appropriate inspection programme for their area.

\(^1\) The term ‘inspection’ has been used here for continuity with previous guidance notes. However, the term ‘audit’ may also be used and can be considered interchangeable within this document. CFOA use the term ‘audit’.
1.3 In addition, CFOA Circular 2008/1016, issued on 4 August 2008, provides fire and rescue services (FRSs) with a revised data collection form and guidance on the management of the inspection process. The revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form is intended to help FRSs assess the extent of compliance with the Fire Safety Order and thus inform the need for, and level of, enforcement action on a consistent basis. CLG worked with the CFOA Fire Safety Audit Working Group to ensure that the revised audit form aligns with the FSEC Toolkit. As a result, the new CFOA Audit Form also serves to:

- inform individual FRA’s risk based inspection programmes and
- add relevant information to each FRA’s risk management policies

1.4 This revised IRMP Guidance Note 4 links closely to the revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form (CFOA Circular 2008/1016) and cross references it where appropriate.

2. Background

2.1 The Fire and Rescue Service National Framework 2008-11 requires each FRA to have a management strategy and a risk based inspection programme to enforce the provisions of the Fire Safety Order. This must form part of each FRA’s IRMP.

2.2 The fire safety inspection programme should enable an FRA to show that it is meeting its enforcement responsibilities in respect of the Fire Safety Order. The Order makes a risk assessment approach central to determining the necessary level of fire precautions in all premises other than a single private dwelling. The statutory responsibility for ensuring an adequate level of fire safety lies with the ‘responsible person’ for individual premises – usually the employer, owner or occupier.

2.3 FRAs have a statutory duty to enforce the compliance requirements of the Fire Safety Order in the majority of these premises although HSE, the Crown Premises Inspection Group of the Chief Fire and Rescue Adviser and local authorities also have enforcement responsibilities in some specific types of premises.

2.4 The development of a fire safety inspection programme allows each FRA to demonstrate that it is delivering its enforcement responsibilities and focusing its resources on those premises that represent the greatest risk to life in the event of fire. This involves prioritising inspections and enforcement action according to the level of risk within individual premises.

2.5 However, FRAs will wish to note that, under IRMP, an assessment of risk in a building, and its inclusion in a fire safety inspection programme can be made for a number of reasons, other than the delivery of an
FRA’s statutory responsibilities under the Fire Safety Order. These could include, at a national or local level:

- the strategic importance of a particular property or business
- the potential loss of heritage
- the potential for environmental damage and
- the need to assess likely fire fighting operations

2.7 Information gathered from the development and ongoing management of a risk-assessed fire safety inspection programme will contribute to the overall evaluation of risk as part of an FRA’s responsibility for developing and maintaining the currency of its IRMP.

3. Developing a fire safety inspection programme

3.1 A fire safety inspection programme should be underpinned by a determination of the level of risk presented by premises. The targeting of inspections should be determined by their priority when set against other premises which may present a greater or lesser risk.

3.2 The focus of the Fire Safety Order, and FRAs inspection activity to ensure compliance with its provisions, aims to minimise risk to life in an individual premises. Whilst it is recognised that the use of ‘societal risk’ is not always an appropriate measure for assessing risk in an individual premises, this guidance note is based on ‘societal risk’ risk definitions to ensure consistency with FSEC as the planning tool for integrated risk management planning at the local level. This guidance note therefore considers risk in those terms and all quantified risks in this document have been scored on the basis of ‘societal’ life risk².

3.3 Risk is defined as the probability (frequency) that an incident will occur multiplied by the impact (consequence) that it will have. Hence, a low frequency may not mean a low risk, if the consequence is high. Similarly, high frequencies do not necessarily mean high risk. For example, whilst skip fires are common (high frequency) they do not generally cause injuries (low consequence) and so do not generally represent a high life risk. Equally, large hospital fires are relatively uncommon (low frequency) but may lead to severe life loss (high consequence) so represent a higher life risk.

3.4 Terms used in this document about risk are:

i) Relative risk score: the score for an individual building that reflects the risk of a societal life risk fire taking place in that building. This could be assessed by carrying out a site visit. The relative risk score is represented in FSEC (see Annex A, Table 1) by a value that is

² Societal life risk is defined in the FSEC toolkit as the risk of 5 or more fatalities occurring in any one incident in an “other building”. See Annex A, Table 1 for the list of FSEC “Other Building” occupancy types.
between approximately 2 and 8 (the higher the relative risk score, the higher the societal life fire risk). This range covers the relative risk scores that can be achieved by all non-domestic occupancy types. However, for each individual building occupancy type there is a much smaller possible range for the relative risk score, for example, for schools, this can range from approximately 3 to 5 (see Annex A, Table 1). So, the relative risk score not only provides information on the level of life risk the building exhibits in relation to all buildings of that occupancy type, but it can also be used in comparing its risk in relation to all non-domestic buildings of any occupancy type.

The relative risk score is derived from the average fire frequency and then techniques such as ‘event tree’ analysis which allows quantification of the effects of variables such as fire safety measures. It can vary from occupancy type to occupancy type due to the variation in frequency of societal life risk fire (see Annex A, Table 1, “average societal life risk fire rates”). In addition, the relative risk score can vary from building to building within the same occupancy type due to the varying fire and life safety related circumstances within each building. In FSEC (see Annex A, Table 1) these circumstances are represented by life risk scores (ranging from >10+ to <-10).

An example of how relative risk scores are calculated in FSEC is given in Annex B.

ii) Generic level of relative risk: the average risk of a societal life risk fire taking place in a building of a particular occupancy type. It is a ‘generic level’ because it is based on national data for that occupancy type. Generic levels of relative risk are useful to provide a benchmark for premises which are not individually known to the FRS and also to provide a high level comparison of risk between different occupancy types. In FSEC (see Annex A, Table 1) the generic levels of relative risk are represented by the mid-point of the relative risk values given in the “medium” column and represent an FSEC life risk score of zero.

iii) Relative risk band: a range of relative risk scores banded together for ease of identifying levels of risk, for example as high, medium or low. In Annex A, Table 1, the relative risk bands for each of the 17 other buildings occupancy types defined in FSEC are given in the five columns labelled from very low to very high. For instance, the relative risk band for medium risk offices ranges from 3.77 to 3.17, whilst for medium risk hospitals it ranges from 6.13 to 5.53.

3.5 Part of the benefit of developing an integrated, risk-based fire safety inspection programme is that it can underpin and deliver fully integrated risk management planning. FRAs are likely to have risk information in different databases, each meeting different requirements within the
organisation. The advice given in this guidance note on developing inspection programmes aims to help FRAs to maximise the benefit of their data by ensuring that it can be shared.

3.6 This guidance note offers advice on developing a risk based inspection programme using the **relative risk score**. This score was developed for the FSEC toolkit, which is a robust, third-party validated risk assessment and resource deployment tool. The individual life scores for buildings assessed in FSEC can be exported and used as direct and compatible inputs for the relative risk score. Source data for FSEC can also be collected using Part C of the revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form (CFOA Circular 2008/1016).

3.7 Regardless of the tools they use, FRAs should be able to demonstrate how their levels of risk have been determined and justify the robustness of their methodology.

**Calculation of relative risk score**

3.8 National data (including information from FDR1 reports) have been used to give the annual average frequency of societal life risk fire for each “other building” occupancy type defined in FSEC - see column 2 in Table 1 at Annex A. These can then be used to provide **generic levels of relative risk** for the different occupancy types – the ‘medium’ column – assuming an average amount of fire safety management and systems for the building occupancy type.

3.9 The **relative risk score** (calculated either in the FSEC Toolkit or through CFOA’s Audit Form) takes into account this national data and data from other sources. This includes evidence-based, empirical evaluations of the risk in buildings in terms of:

- the frequency of societal life risk fires nationally by occupancy type, taken from FDR1 reports; and, based on national and international data
- the effectiveness of passive and active fire precautions
- the impact of fire safety management and
- the societal life risk presented by the occupancy type, e.g. less mobile occupants

3.10 The **relative risk score** in individual buildings can then be calculated based on the extent to which an individual building moves away from the **generic level of relative risk** for that occupancy, taking account of fire safety management and other building issues listed above. For example, if the building has good fire safety management, both the societal life risk fire frequency and the impact of fire are likely to be less than average for the occupancy type and so the **relative risk score** will be lower than the **generic level of relative risk** for the occupancy type.
3.11 These relative risk scores can be used directly, or they can be banded together, to inform inspection frequencies. The revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form provides a pictorial representation of the relative risk scores of buildings across all occupancy types and puts them into relative risk bands identified by colour codes:

- Well Above Average (Red)
- Above Average (Orange)
- Average (Yellow)
- Below Average (Blue)
- Well Below Average (Green)

As an example, Annex C, Table 2 shows these bands as they relate to the FSEC information contained in Annex A, Table 1.

3.12 The numerical values in the tables in Annex A and C below are intended to provide general guidance on generic levels of relative risk, relative risk scores and relative risk bands. These are based on the values used in the FSEC toolkit and they represent comparable relative risk scores and relative risk bands across all premises. These should only be used as a guide in determining overall priorities for inspection. They should not be used to dictate the action to be taken by inspecting officers in respect of individual premises.

Other influences on a programme

3.13 While the relative risk score can give a first guide to the fire safety inspection programme, other factors can provide more information on an individual building such as:

- historical information, including reports on any fires attended at the local level
- visits to gather operational intelligence
- particular local trends or socio-economic factors
- information on outcomes of risk assessments from employers, owners and/or occupiers, and information from other bodies with enforcement responsibilities such as HSE (for COMAH sites), local authorities (for HMOs) and the Environment Agency (for IPC sites) and
- premises which are part of the critical infrastructure (FRAs should discuss this with their Local Resilience Forums)

These factors can be used, for example, to add extra premises into the inspection programme, as shown in the examples below. They cannot, however, be used to amend the relative risk score because at the moment the data does not exist to quantify their effects robustly. In future, and where sound data can support it, it may be possible to include some or all of these further factors in the relative risk score.
3.14 **Professional judgement:** professional judgement based on experience and expertise is a key element in determining the level of risk and needs to be taken into account (and recorded) as part of the overall process. Examples of where the application of professional judgement may influence the outcome of a relative risk score assessment are:

**Example 1:** A very low risk hospital will have approximately the same relative risk score as a very high risk office based on the national average data. However, when going to an individual premise, the inspecting officer may find that the hospital is well managed and they need do little more than set a date for a further inspection which will be determined by its priority when set against other premises in the FRA's area. When inspecting the office, however, the officer may be faced with circumstances that present a high risk and they may need to take immediate enforcement action.

**Example 2:** It may not be reasonable to equate the societal life risk presented by a typical hotel, guest house or similar, with that of a comparable building providing care accommodation or used as a hostel, HMO or similar because factors such as the nature of the occupants or the management regime means the societal life risk varies considerably. It is important that factors such as the management regime and the nature of the occupants are taken into account.

3.15 **Inspection frequencies:** This guidance does not suggest fixed frequencies for inspection based on particular levels of risk. However, inspection frequencies can be informed in 3 main ways from this document:

- by the **generic level of relative risk**, particularly for premises which are currently unknown to the FRA but also to provide a high level comparison of risk between different occupancy types
- by the **relative risk score** for an individual premises, which is known to the FRA and has been assessed using a suitable tool
- by the **relative risk band**, which is composed of **relative risks scores** for individual premises grouped together for ease of management

Some FRAs may wish to allocate particular time periods according to the risk, others may wish to rank premises according to a number of factors which may include, as well as one of the three above, factors such as those noted in 3.13. One outcome of determining priorities and appropriate inspection frequencies on a risk basis may be that some premises in the lower risk categories will not be subject to regular inspection. If this is the case, FRAs may want to consider a system to monitor these on a sampling basis.
4. Inspection process and enforcement decisions

4.1 Decisions on the education and provision of information to the ‘responsible persons’ or the serving of an alteration, enforcement or prohibition notice should be based on a suitable and sufficient fire safety inspection of an individual premises, carried out by the enforcing authority. Decisions should be consistent with the principles of enforcement set out in the Health and Safety Executive’s *Enforcement Policy Statement and the Regulators’ Compliance Code*, both of which seek to ensure that enforcement action is proportionate, transparent and consistent. Proportionality includes taking account of the risk posed by the deficiency, which is influenced by a number of factors including the nature and level of the deficiency, the vulnerability and number of occupants.

4.2 The fire safety inspection should consider the extent to which fire safety processes, procedures and arrangements eliminate or reduce risk as far as is reasonably practical. The inspection process should reflect the principles of proportionality and be risk based. The Fire Safety Order specifies the safety critical articles that the inspection should consider.

4.3 Section 3 of CFOA’s revised *Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form* provides an inspection process designed to assess the extent to which the requirements of the Fire Safety Order are being complied with by the responsible person and to ensure the inspection outcome is risk-based. FRAs are not required to use this inspection process or enforcement model, if another system exists, or is developed, which is appropriate to their circumstances. However, CFOA’s inspection process includes a number of key features including:

- assessing compliance with each of the relevant articles in the Fire Safety Order (i.e. Articles 8 – 22)
- assigning each article with a weighting to reflect the relative importance of each article, specifically their judged contribution to fire safety
- varying the weightings for each article according to the generic type of building, with higher weightings assigned to higher risk types of buildings

4.4 FRAs using CFOA’s inspection process and enforcement model may wish to use it to reflect local priorities by taking into account particular risks and local priorities such as the number of occupants in a building, or any exceptional fire precautions. If so, it is important that they can continue to demonstrate clearly that their enforcement decisions are proportionate, consistent and transparent as well as based on a valid assessment of fire precautions and risk.
4.5 Section 4 of CFOA’s revised Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form outlines an Enforcement Management Model (EMM) drawn from the HSE’s EMM. The model uses the inspection results, predicated on the professional judgement of inspecting officers, to indicate an Initial Enforcement Expectation (IEE). It aims to promote consistent and transparent inspection processes which deliver enforcement decisions proportionate to risk and offers guidance on the consideration of responsible person and strategic factors.

5. Integrating risk prevention, protection and response arrangements

5.1 The inspection programme should support IRMP in a number of ways, including through the provision of a measure of fire safety and the acquisition of information to enable risk assessment of non-domestic buildings and determine an initial operational response.

Local risk management

5.2 This guidance note illustrates how an inspection programme based on consistently defined levels of risk will not only enable an FRA to determine its inspection priorities, but also to demonstrate, in a measurable way, its contribution to the management of the fire risk in its area.

Other buildings

5.3 The risk scores assigned using the site assessment section (Section 5 Part A Site Assessment) of the revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit Form offers a specification and related forms to enable the collection of information needed to complete the Other Buildings module of the FSEC Toolkit. FRAs should be aware that basic information (based on Valuation Office data) on ‘Other Buildings’ was provided to the FRS as part of the original FSEC roll-out. The extra data collected in the CFOA form can be used to supplement the basic data (which should now have been supplemented by FRAs as part of their IRMP risk and resource planning responsibilities).

5.4 The table in Annex D shows the default data that is provided with the FSEC Toolkit for each site assessment. Recorded results can be compared from one year to the next. Any reduction in the risk score would indicate improved risk management and should enable the FRA to take an informed decision on the inspection frequency to these buildings and those with increasing or above average risk.

5.5 The inspection programme can also support a risk-based review of the resources required to respond to fires in ‘Other Buildings’, including
initial attendance resources. It does this through a determination of, for
each area, the number of 'Other Buildings', their
occupancy/size/number of occupants, fire safety precautions and
standards of fire safety management as well as operational information
such as elements of the structure that pose a hazard to fire fighters.
The IRMP process can then consider the level, type and location of
response resources to be allocated to respond to the risk in each area.

FiReControl

5.6 Section 7 Part D of the Operational Site Specific Risk Information
(SSRI) of the revised CFOA Fire Safety Guidance Notes and Audit
Form provides a template to enable FRAs to collate the relevant site
specific risk information required by the initial attendance. Whilst FRAs
are not constrained to the information collection processes provided by
CFOA’s guidance whatever system is chosen should demonstrate
clearly how the data needs of FiReControl are being met. Annex E lists
the FiReControl information requirements for an initial response.
Annex A

Table 1: FSEC Societal Life Risk Fire Frequencies and Relative Risk Scores– June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Type</th>
<th>Average FSEC Societal life risk fire rate per 1,000,000 Buildings per year</th>
<th>Relative Risk Bands</th>
<th>FSEC Life Risk Score</th>
<th>Relative Risk Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Prisons (A)</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>&gt;6.83</td>
<td>6.78-6.31</td>
<td>6.13-5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels (E)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>&gt;6.22</td>
<td>6.18-5.70</td>
<td>5.52-4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care homes (B)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>&gt;6.11</td>
<td>6.06-5.59</td>
<td>5.41-4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMO’s (C)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>&gt;6.03</td>
<td>5.98-5.50</td>
<td>5.33-4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses converted to flats (G)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>&gt;6.03</td>
<td>5.98-5.50</td>
<td>5.33-4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose built Flats (D)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>&gt;6.03</td>
<td>5.98-5.50</td>
<td>5.33-4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels (F)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>&gt;5.89</td>
<td>5.84-5.36</td>
<td>5.19-4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops (N)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&gt;5.80</td>
<td>5.75-5.27</td>
<td>5.10-4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation (H)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&gt;5.31</td>
<td>5.27-4.79</td>
<td>4.62-4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (M)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;5.05</td>
<td>5.00-4.52</td>
<td>4.35-3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education (J)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;5.05</td>
<td>5.00-4.52</td>
<td>4.35-3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings (K)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;5.05</td>
<td>5.00-4.52</td>
<td>4.35-3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other buildings open to the public (P)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;5.05</td>
<td>5.00-4.52</td>
<td>4.35-3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Premises (L)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;5.02</td>
<td>4.97-4.49</td>
<td>4.32-3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories/Warehouses (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;4.62</td>
<td>4.57-4.10</td>
<td>3.92-3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workplaces (T)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;4.62</td>
<td>4.57-4.10</td>
<td>3.92-3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;4.47</td>
<td>4.42-3.95</td>
<td>3.77-3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The societal life risk fire rates in this table differ from those used in the FSEC toolkit:
1. In FSEC, the societal life risk fire rates quoted in the risk definitions are rounded values so are slightly different to those above.
2. The societal life risk fire rates quoted in this table for some occupancy types (shops, offices etc) are double those used in FSEC - this is because FSEC divides the fire frequency by 2 for buildings only occupied during the day.
3. Prisons were previously included in “Other sleeping accommodation” but are now included in the “Hospitals” category as the fire frequency in prisons is more similar to that of hospitals. The figures for these two categories have therefore changed.
Youth Offending Institutes and Immigration Detention Centres should also be included in this category.

4. The gaps in the relative risk scores between risk levels (e.g., for Hospitals, the relative risk score ranges from 6.78 to 6.31 for high risk and 6.13 to 5.53 in medium risk – there is an apparent gap here with no risk level for relative risk scores between 6.31 and 6.13) is a consequence of the way in which these relative risk scores are calculated and is not an error. Correct calculation of relative risk, with whole (integer) numbers for the FSEC life risk score will not produce results outside of the ranges given above.

5. The societal life risk scores achievable by a property in FSEC ranges from +12 to -34.
Annex B
Example of a Relative Risk Score Calculation

Using a hospital as an example, the following shows how relative risk score are calculated in FSEC:

**Average societal life risk fire frequency** = 676 per 1,000,000 hospitals per year (See Annex A, Table 1, 2nd column)

**Societal life risk score** = 10 (this value would be taken from the building’s site assessment in FSEC)

Relative risk score = 3 + log_{10}(Average societal life risk fire frequency) + log_{10}(Societal life risk score)

Relative risk score = 3 + log_{10}(676) + log_{10}(10) = 6.83

Notes:

1. For buildings that have societal risk scores that are equal to -1 or 0, the buildings societal life risk score is modified to 1 for this calculation.
2. For buildings that have societal risk scores of -2 or less, then the calculation is modified to:-

   Relative risk score = 3 + log_{10}(Average societal life risk fire frequency) + log_{10}(-1/Societal life risk score)
### Table 2: FSEC Relative Risk Level Matrix – June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Type</th>
<th>Relative Risk Score Range</th>
<th>Well Above Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Well Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>6.91 4.30</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>6.30 3.69</td>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>Care Home</td>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>Care Home</td>
<td>Hostels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Home</td>
<td>6.19 3.58</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
<td>Care Home</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>6.10 3.49</td>
<td>Houses converted to</td>
<td>Houses converted to flats</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
<td>Houses converted to flats</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses converted to flats &gt;3 storeys</td>
<td>6.10 3.49</td>
<td>flats &gt;3 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMO &gt;3 storeys</td>
<td>6.10 3.49</td>
<td>Purpose built flats</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
<td>Purpose built flats &gt;4 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>5.97 3.36</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>5.88 3.27</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>5.40 2.79</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
<td>Other sleeping accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>5.12 2.51</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>5.12 2.51</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>5.12 2.51</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
<td>Other premises open to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>5.12 2.51</td>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
<td>5.08 2.47</td>
<td>Licenced Premises</td>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
<td>4.68 2.07</td>
<td>Factories and Warehouses</td>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
<td>4.68 2.07</td>
<td>Other Workplaces</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>4.56 1.95</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The societal life risk fire rates used in creating this table differ from those used in the FSEC toolkit and are those quoted in Annex A, Table 1:

1. In FSEC, the societal life risk fire rates quoted in the risk definitions are rounded values so are slightly different to those used for the above.
2. The societal life risk fire rates used to create this table for some occupancy types (shops, offices etc) are double those used in FSEC - this is because FSEC divides the fire frequency by 2 for buildings only occupied during the day.
3. Prisons were previously included in “Other sleeping accommodation” but are now included in the “Hospitals” category as the fire frequency in prisons is more similar to that of hospitals. The figures for these two categories have therefore changed. Youth Offending Institutes and Immigration Detention Centres should also be included in this category.
4. The societal life risk scores achievable by a property in FSEC ranges from +12 to -34.
Annex D

Table 3: Default Data provided with the FSEC Toolkit for each Site Assessment

The data described in this table was supplied to all FRSs in England, Scotland and Wales in 2004 with the roll-out of the FSEC toolkit data. The description here gives an idea of the default data that exists for a large number of buildings. It is expected that since 2004 the data will have been substantially amended and extended by local FRSs. FRSs are likely to hold further other buildings information in, for example, their fire safety databases. Ideally the data should be integrated to enable all FRS functions to share the same data source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Required</th>
<th>Default Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy type</td>
<td>Initially derived from Valuation Office data. Not all of the 17 FSEC occupancy types listed in Annex A Table 1 are collected by the Valuation Office. The missing occupancy types are: HMOs, care homes, houses converted to flats and purpose built flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>The address from Valuation Office data (or other source data) was assigned a grid reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Initial estimate based on footprint of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum probable loss of property</td>
<td>Initial estimate based on footprint of building. Capped at 1000m².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of storeys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire warning systems</td>
<td>Standard for occupancy type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprinklers</td>
<td>None fitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke control systems</td>
<td>None fitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of fire safety</td>
<td>Average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The type of people who live or work in the building or those who visit it</td>
<td>Usual mix of people, including those with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of people at risk in the most highly occupied compartment during weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Defaults based on occupancy type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex E

FiReControl Data Strategy: information requirements for initial response

Name, address and grid reference of site
Trade, business or use
Life risk by day/night and occupancy type
Hazards/risks to fire fighters and that effect operational planning, and associated risk controls
Operational considerations
Environmental considerations
Construction description
Fixed installations, e.g. sprinklers
Fire fighting medium
Contacts
Pre-determined attendance
CAD plan if available