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The full Discussion Document explains how the rural and urban fire services currently operate and proposes options for the future. The options are designed to improve support for firefighters, better meet community needs, and bring management and governance arrangements up to date.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The Fire Services Review responds to the recommendations of the 2012 Fire Review Panel (Swain Report). It also includes issues that were outside the terms of reference of that report.This review has focused on support for the workforce, including volunteers; community needs; the structure and funding of urban and rural fire services; and coordination within fire services and with other emergency services. |  | **Find out more**See pages 4-7 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| The Review sets out the vision for the fire services:* flexible and adaptable;
* coordinated with strong leadership;
* able to provide a consistent service;
* efficient and able to become more so over time.
 |  | **Find out more**See pages 8-9 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| We need all fire services to perform at a high level to protect the economy, property and lives.  |  | **Find out more**See pages 9-11 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| While the fire services are working well in many ways, the Review has found three significant problems:* expectations of the fire services have changed and will continue to change;
* there is a lack of coordination and variable leadership; and
* there is investment that is inconsistent with community needs.
 |  | **Find out more**See pages 12-13 and Appendix C of the Discussion Document |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| These problems have a number of consequences: * health and safety issues for rural fire;
* volunteer shortages in some parts of the country;
* it is a challenge to support the workforce;
* some responsibilities are mixed or unclear;
* fire services face challenges to be effective; and
* fire services face challenges to be efficient.
 |  | **Find out more**See Appendix C of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| The Discussion Document sets out three options to improve support for firefighters, better meet community needs, and bring governance arrangements up to date. Each option is described as a separate model so they can be easily compared. But the options can also be put together in other ways. The Discussion Document is open for feedback on what elements of the options might work well, or how they could be improved.The options are:* Option 1 – Enhanced status quo;
* Option 2 – Coordinated service delivery; and
* Option 3 – One national fire service.
 |  | **Find out more**See pages 14-30 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| A brief overview of the options is set out in the diagram below. The Discussion Document has detailed descriptions of the options, and explains how they might impact on various groups.The Discussion Document also explains some of the risks with each option, the steps needed to make the option work, and a likely timeline. |  | **Find out more**See pages 14-30 of the Discussion Document |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The cost of making the changes to the fire services will depend on which option is chosen. After consultation, an option will be chosen and more detailed financial modelling will produce a more precise cost. |  | **Find out more**See page 31 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| The review has found three problems with the insurance-based source of the Commission’s funding:* the fire service levy does not reflect risk of fire;
* the fire service levy does not reflect the range of activities the NZFS provides; and
* the fire service levy can be confusing to calculate and difficult to forecast.
 |  | **Find out more**See pages 32-33 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| The Discussion Document has set out two options to improve the funding of the Commission. There are different ways the funding options could be put together. We want to hear your views on what parts of the funding options might work well, or how the funding options could be improved. |  | **Find out more**See pages 34-39 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| A brief overview of the funding options for the Commission is set out in the diagram below. |  | **Find out more**See pages 34-39 of the Discussion Document |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The Discussion Document looks at ways to ensure the Commission is working well. This includes ensuring the process for reviewing the fire service levy fits into the processes for monitoring the Commission’s performance. |  | **Find out more**See pages 40-42 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| Please make a submission. The Discussion Document sets out a list of questions to consider when writing your submission. You do not have to answer all the questions. Make a submission at [www.dia.govt.nz/fireservicesreview](http://www.dia.govt.nz/fireservicesreview) or in writing to the Fire Services Review, Department of Internal Affairs, PO Box 805, Wellington 6140 by 10 July.  |  | **Find out more**See pages 43-44 of the Discussion Document |
|  |  |  |
| The attachments to the Discussion Document give more information about:* stakeholders who have given input;
* the Commission’s Vision 2020;
* the fire services’ problems and their consequences;
* draft governance structure for Option 2: Coordinated service delivery;
* income sources for rural fire;
* best practice for compliance;
* options for organisational structures for Option 3: One national fire service;
* discarded options for funding the Commission; and
* a glossary of terms used in the Discussion Document.
 |  | **Find out more**See pages 45-66 of the Discussion Document |