



Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Cleveland Police Headquarters
Ladgate Lane
Middlesbrough
TS8 9EH

Email: pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk
Website: <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk>

Police and Crime Commissioner:
Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer:

Barry Coppinger
Simon Dennis BA, Solicitor

Tel: 01642 301653
Tel: 01642 301653

PCC Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

Date: Wednesday 25 October 2017

Time: 10.00am – 1.00pm

Venue: PCC's Conference Room

Agenda

		Presented by
1.	Apologies For Absence	
2.	Declaration of conflict of interest/disclosable pecuniary interest	
3.	Notes of the previous meeting – 26 July 2017	
4.	Investigatory Powers Tribunal - Update	Cleveland Police
5.	Transforming PSD - Update	John Armstrong
6.	Community Safety Hub – Update	Liz Byrne (written submission)
7.	Audit and Inspections Update – National Child Protection Inspection September 2017	Anne-Marie Salwey
8.	PCC Scrutiny questions	Cleveland Police
9.	Any Other Business	
10.	Date of next meeting – 29 November 10am	



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

Wednesday 26 July 2017

11.00pm

PCC Conference Room, Police Headquarters, Ladgate Lane

Present

Barry Coppinger - Police and Crime Commissioner

Simon Dennis - Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, OPCC

Louise Drummond – Head of Performance, Quality and Review, Cleveland Police

Jo Gleeson – Chief Finance Officer, Cleveland Police

Judith Nellist – Commissioners Officer for Scrutiny and Policy, OPCC

Simon Nickless -Deputy Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

Michael Porter – Chief Finance Officer, OPCC

Elise Pout, Standards and Scrutiny Manager, OPCC

1. Apologies for absence

No apologies were received.

2. Declarations of Conflict of Interest/Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

None declared.

3. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the following meeting were approved for publication.

- i. 12 June 2017

4. Financial Information

a) Cleveland Police – Corporate Financial Monitoring Report to 31 March 2017.

b) Cleveland Police – Corporate Financial Monitoring Report – Post Statement of Accounts to 31 March 2017.

The above reports were taken together as the reports contained similar information; the first report was prepared before the close of the accounts, the second following the close of accounts.

The main major items of slippage/underspend related to

Community Safety Hub

Significant slippage/underspend across several ICT schemes

Fleet replacement programme

Black Box Replacement

Fleet Write off budget

It was noted that the Chief Finance Officer was now having regular meetings with the Head of ICT to account for the delivery of the ICT programmes.

The main adjustment between the first and second reports was the increased spend of £1.5m to cover the potential costs of employee related remuneration claims and the increase of £1.5m as a consequence of the review of the provisions held to cover the potential insurance liabilities.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

c) PCC – Budget Monitoring – Outturn Report for 2016/17.

This report incorporated all budgets not under the delegation of the Chief Constable. There had been a small overspend on the PCC budget as a result of some unexpected costs.

A £3m overspend was reported, however it was noted that the costs would not be on a recurrent basis, extra spend was for one off items, dealt with by the re-phasing of the capital programme which had offset some of the challenges from the year which had facilitated a balanced budget.

The custody contract had been re-tendered; the funds saved would be used to replenish the capital reserves. It was noted that the General Fund is where it was expected to be and there was a slight underspend predicted.

It was noted that it was important to ensure accurate assumptions about claims in order to give some foundation for future financial planning. Linked to the refinement of the approach Cleveland Police took regarding dispute resolution and mitigation.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

d) Cleveland Police – Corporate Financial Monitoring Report to 30 June 2017.

The report forecast up to 2018 and a small overspend of £300k was predicted. The in-year insurance costs had increased by over £200k due to recent Ogden Ruling.

In the first quarter of the financial year there had been unprecedented demand on police services, including, for example, extra patrols to reassure the public following recent terror attacks. Whilst funding was available for officers sent to other areas to bolster force resilience, there was no extra funding forthcoming for extra reassurance patrols in the area, which had incurred extra costs for Cleveland Police in overtime payments in order to provide that increased police presence.

The PCC made reference to the proportion of the NPAS funding allocated to Cleveland Police and gave details of how, through his role on the NPAS Board he had ensured that a more equitable amount was being paid by Cleveland.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

e) PCC – 2017/18 Budget Monitoring – Report to end of June 2017

The report detailed that the office of the PCC's budget of £850k was expected to spend all funds allocated to it during 2017/18.

The Corporate Services budget of £8,950k was expected to have a slight underspend of £100k due to the delay in borrowing.

The PCC had allocated budget of £3,345k to support Community Safety and PCC initiatives including the Victim and Witness Services and Neighbourhood Policing.

It was noted that although the budget position was tight it was being managed effectively; although the result of pay awards was awaited and would have implications for the budget.

The position was similar to other forces, Cleveland Police was not unique in its position but the budget was being effectively managed. It was noted that it was external factors that would cause a risk to balancing the budget. There was a trend that was being seen nationally that there were forces that were predicting a slight underspend but what was unclear was how much of forces' budgets were being supported by reserves.

Action – That a further submission is made to the Minister for Policing based on revamped paper that the Chief Constable and the PCC had presented earlier in the year.

f) PCC – Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) 2018/19 to 2021/22 and Capital Plans 2018/19 to 2021/22 update.

The report detailed the potential impacts of the national budget, the general election and the Queen's speech. The LTFP was reliant on a number of assumptions and estimates about the future. There were a significant number of 'unknowns' outside the control of the organisation and as such a number of risks.

In 2016-17 Police and Crime Commissioners were told to plan for a 'flat cash' budget. Effectively the government grant would be aligned to precept and should give the same level of cash that had been received in previous years. That still being the case the biggest reduction that Cleveland would receive would be -0.88% which had been factored into the LTFP. There should be a position where the government grant was increasing by the same level as pay awards therefore a number of assumptions had been made which allowed for the reconfiguration of the long term financial plan without asking for further savings (should those assumptions hold).

The funding formula was yet to be announced, there was no allowance within the LTFP for any impact on the funding available to Cleveland as a result of the implementation of any New Funding Formula.

In terms of the Precept, the assumption, for planning purposes, was that would continue to increase at a rate of 1.99% per annum.

One of the biggest challenges was the possible impact of pay awards. It was noted that any pay awards of more than 1% would create additional pressures on the LTFP, anything higher than 1% would need additional funding from the government.

The report detailed that General Reserves were currently at £4.8m, with the caveat that this was not a significant sum.

Discussions took place about initiatives which Cleveland Police were asked to take part in. Initially Cleveland Police takes part in a collective contribution to start-up costs; however this should be based on ability to pay. There are also transformational schemes that come with extra funding at the beginning, the difficulty came when that finishes – clear consideration needed to be given to workforce planning and supported funding for the future. There was a need to build in to budgets those longer term running costs of projects initially funded out of one-off pots of funding.

The addition of Fire and Rescue Services to the HMIC's remit and the potential cost to police forces was discussed. Subsequent to the meeting it was confirmed by the Association of Policing & Crime Chief Executives (APACE²E) that they had been advised on 27 July 2017 that funding for fire inspectorate work will not come from money otherwise allocated to fire or policing.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

g) Cleveland Police – Long Term Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2020/21 Savings Requirements Update.

The report was presented to reassure the PCC that considerable work has been undertaken to enable Cleveland Police to find the savings. Which for 2017/18 was 520,000 for 2018/19 was 2,505,000 and for 2019/20 was 3,105,000.

All managers have been kept informed of their involvement in making savings and they have seen this as an opportunity to review functions and make them leaner, people also came forward with new ways of working which are sent to the 20/20 Board for approval.

Savings were being made through a number of ways which the report highlighted as follows:

- A series of rapid improvement 'deep dive' reviews;
- Rationalisation of management structures;
- Cessation of fixed term contracts;
- Targeted reduction across non-pay lines;
- Delivery of the Estates Blueprints; and
- Fleet.

Action – Where any issues emerge which are of a public facing nature Barry would like to be involved to ensure he can liaise with partners or the public.

That regular details of the savings made and where they can be reinvested are presented to the PCC through the scrutiny process.

5. PCC Scrutiny Questions

Tackling Knife Crime

Cleveland Police were asked to provide an update on the success of Operation Sceptre in May and provide an outline of the current position with regard to knife crime in Cleveland.

It was noted that this was a complex issue as knives feature in every household. There had been 393 incidences to 2017 which as an increase of 59 from the previous year.

Compared nationally with 20% - Cleveland Police were considering whether this was growing phenomenon or whether it was because knife crime was being recorded differently. However it was noted that Cleveland was the 7th highest nationally and the highest within the Most Similar Forces rankings for knife crime.

Cleveland Police took part in Operation Sceptre, a week of action targeting knife crime in which 172 knives were seized.

The importance of engagement work with schools was highlighted in which a strong message as given out about the consequences of carrying a knife.

It was noted that this was not currently a high priority issue but that it was an area of focus. However it was being considered through the strategic risk assessment that was undertaken by Cleveland and Durham Special Operations Unit (CDSOU)

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

North East Regional Special Operations Unit (NERSOU)

Cleveland Police were asked to provide an update on asset recovery referrals (from Cleveland Police to NERSOU) seizures and the performance of financial investigation? Have the recent changes made in NERSOU made a difference?

Due to confidentiality on -going investigations were not discussed. Although there was one case where it was reported that £644K had been received to date.

It was noted that asset referrals were dependent on the nature of the crime that was targeted. Drugs investigations, for example, would generate some returns however focus involved human trafficking and modern day slavery for which those cases would not.

It was noted that there was a Regional Asset Recovery Team (RART) of which the Economic Crime Unit and Organised crime unit had a positive engagement with and there were some proven successes and some further ones in the pipeline.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

Apprentice Targets/Mandatory Gender Pay Gap Reporting

The public sector apprenticeship targets regulations 2017 came into force on 31 March. It set a target for public services with at least 250 staff to employ an average of at least 2.3% of staff in England as new apprentices over the period 2017-2021, with the target coming into effect from 1 April until 31 March 2021. By 2018 every organisation with more than 250 employees in the private, public and voluntary sector must report its pay gap annually. The PCC asked for an update on Cleveland Police's position with relation to the position on these 2 issues.

It was noted that 2020/21 would see the area of apprenticeships expand. Cleveland Police were developing good relationships with academia and it was hoped that good practice would emerge. Links would be made into the Police and Crime plan as an area of activity.

With regard to a gender pay gap – in reality Cleveland Police didn't have one. Positions are advertised at a certain grade. It was noted that Cleveland Police have to ensure that they continue to publicise/communicate what they were doing. The Chief Finance Officer had contacted ACAS to ask for information and advice in that area and a small group, led by the Head of HR, was liaising with payroll function to undertake like-for-like comparisons and work was underway to ensure comparators were available and the work would be published before 31 March 2018.

Actions Arising – Revisit this area as development takes place.

Cost Recovery, National Counter Terrorism Policing

The PCC asked Cleveland Police if they could outline the current position, whether Cleveland Police could recover any costs and if so, when it would become available?

As detailed previously in the meeting mutual aid costs can be recovered. There are a national set of costs and Cleveland Police's claims would be in line with that.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

Medical Assessment of Police Applicants

This question was raised with the PCC during a Your Force Your Voice consultation meeting. Could Cleveland Police outline their medical policy on the medical assessments of potential candidates, particularly in relation to asthma. Is there a particular threshold which stops a person with asthma being able to join Cleveland Police or does Cleveland Police have some discretion in this area?

It was noted that there was a need for a certificate of fitness to qualify, PCSOs go through the occupational health unit, and officers go through Cleveland Police Medical advisor and the criteria was based on national recruitment standards.

In regard to asthma a lung function test would be undertaken, which again was based on national standards and identified allergies such as hay fever, asthma and medication taken. There was an annual follow up or a review where a series of tests are done.

Actions Arising – That the information was noted.

6. **Any other business – None**
7. **Date of next meeting – 25 October 2017**



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

25 October 2017

Investigatory Powers Tribunal – Update

Purpose of the Report

1. At the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meeting on 31 January 2017 the PCC sought assurance that the systems and processes in place were lawful and appropriate following the Investigatory Powers Tribunal (IPT). The IPT had found that Cleveland Police had acted unlawfully in respect of several authorisations for the acquisition of communications data granted under the provisions of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. At that meeting the PCC agreed to his full support to working with the Force to deal rigorously with the issues which arose from the IPT, including receiving regular updates from the Force.

Information Required

RIPA

2. A general update is required to cover:
 - a) What improvements that have been made to the Force's processes in this area and if so what has been the effect of those changes;
 - b) Covert Human Intelligence Sources (CHIS) – How many CHISs are there and how many of those are registered sex offenders;
 - c) What succession planning is taking place to ensure the smooth handover of the service when the current incumbent retires; and
 - d) The PCC commissioned a specialist legal services provider, Weightmans LLP, to audit every case over the past six years involving the use of RIPA by Professional Standards. An update is sought on how this audit is progressing.

Legal Services

3. Subsequent judgement of the IPT, received on 9 August, criticised the legal basis for which the Force progressed the case and an internal review was instigated (the findings of which will be submitted to the PCC at an appropriate time). However in the meantime the PCC is seeking assurance from the force about this area of work and would like an updated position statement.

Actions Arising

4. Note the information received.



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

25 October 2017

Transforming PSD - Update

Purpose of the Report

1. To ask for an update position regarding the Transformation of Professional Standards.

Information Required

2. Regular updates on the transformation of PSD have been programmed in to the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance Meetings, information is requested on the following:
 - a. Any relevant developments in this area since the last update to this meeting on 12 June.
 - b. Details of the PSD Reference Group which took place on 7 September.
 - c. Details of the next milestones and their timescales.

Actions Arising

3. To receive regular information on the Transforming PSD Programme.



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

25 October 2017

Community Safety Hub - Update

Purpose of the Report

1. To ask for details on the latest position regarding the Community Safety Hub project.

Information Required

2. Regular updates about the on-going work on the Community Safety Hub project have been programmed in to the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance work programme. At this meeting the PCC would like a detailed update on the following areas:
 - a. Financial Update
 - b. Progress against targets
 - c. Programme control/quality management
 - d. Risk update and actions
 - e. Partnership working and added value update
 - f. Community engagement

Actions Arising

3. To receive on going information about the implementation of the project.



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

25 October 2017

Audit and Inspections - Update

Purpose of the Report

1. Updates from Inspection Reports are a standard item on the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meeting agenda in order to ensure that the PCC is kept up to date with any issues/actions arising from such inspections.
2. Her Majesty's Inspection of Constabulary Fire and Rescue Service (HMICFRS) recently published a report on 21 September regarding a national inspection of child protection. HMICFRS inspectors found that the force was committed to protecting children and this was reflected in the police and crime plan. This strong commitment was seen in chief constable, the chief officer team and the PCC.
3. However, HMICFRS discovered some weaknesses in the force's approach to child protection

Information Required

4. As a result of the inspection the PCC would like, in the first instance, an assurance that the areas for concern that were highlighted for immediate action have been dealt with and what the force's plans are to deal with the recommendations.

Actions Arising

5. That further updates are provided to the PCC as appropriate.



Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting

25 October 2017

Questions

Crime Levels

1. At the Police and Crime Panel on 4 July, Members had questions about the policy relating to how resources were allocated in different policing areas. Members noted that crime levels in Hartlepool and Stockton are very different to crime levels in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland, and had concerns that the North/South policing model had been responsible for this. It was explained to the Panel that this was an operational decision for the Chief Constable and he did use a resource model that helped with this. The Commissioner indicated he would raise this issue through his scrutiny process and would then provide an update to the Panel. The PCC therefore seeks a position statement on this subject that he could take back to the Panel.

Track My Crime

2. 'Track my crime' could the force provide an update on whether or not they plan to sign up to 'Track my Crime' and if not why?

Use of Drones

3. Could the Force provide a position statement on the use of drones and if there are plans to develop their use in the future?