



## RESPONSE BY THE PCC TO HMIC INSPECTIONS OF CLEVELAND POLICE

### INSPECTION DETAILS

Title of Inspection

**Making the Connections - A thematic inspection of police force compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the National Ballistics Intelligence Service (NABIS) and Police Forces.**

Date Inspection Published

**June 2013**

Type of Inspection:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleveland Specific | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Follow Up          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thematic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Partner Inspection |  |

Is Cleveland Police quoted in the Report?

- Yes  No

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

HMIC carried out an inspection of police force compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the National Ballistics Intelligence Service (NABIS) and the Police Forces and Partner Law Enforcement Agencies of England and Wales ('the MOU'). The inspection comprised fieldwork in ten forces, but did not include Cleveland Police.

The MOU places an obligation on police forces to ensure that all relevant ballistics items are registered within set timescales. It also requires forces to register and submit appropriate ballistic items for examination; to ensure the database is updated with relevant information and intelligence; and to put measures in place to ensure compliance with the MOU.

The inspection looked at governance and management structures; how Forces manage ballistic items; their use of the NABIS database; and their handling of intelligence products from NABIS.

The report concludes that, while the 10 forces inspected recognised the value of NABIS as the only national service to link firearms-related criminality through ballistic examination, there needs to be greater clarity on the role of the Service, and on what information forces should record on the NABIS database.

## RECOMMENDATIONS & FORCE REPONSE

Report Recommendation	Force Response
<p>ACPO should ensure the MOU provides clarity about the service NABIS should provide as well as the responsibility that forces have in complying with it.</p>	<p><i>Not Applicable</i></p>
<p>In order to maximise the effectiveness of NABIS, all forces should ensure their systems and processes are in line with these measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Forces should explicitly include NABIS within a strategic approach to firearms-related criminality. NABIS strategic intelligence and forensic information about linked incidents should be used alongside local intelligence, including any intelligence available from the management of lawfully held weapons.</li> <li>▪ Force OSPoCs should be managers who can ensure intelligence and investigative links are being made. Based on the experience of this inspection, it is better if the management of forces' NABIS processes rests in their intelligence or dedicated firearms crime investigation departments.</li> <li>▪ Through robust quality assurance mechanisms, forces should regularly monitor the end-to-end NABIS process to ensure compliance with the MOU. This should include managerial oversight and accountability for compliance.</li> <li>▪ Force systems and processes must be sufficiently robust to ensure that any ballistic item coming into police possession (irrespective of the point of entry) is considered against the MOU. There need to be sufficient measures (e.g. automated alerts or daily review of force systems) to ensure that ballistic items are not overlooked.</li> <li>▪ Forces should limit the number of staff who can input data onto the NABIS database, as this reduces the number of people that need to be trained and would give greater consistency in the quality of submissions.</li> <li>▪ Forces should exploit, through their systems and processes, forensic opportunities from the recovery of ballistic items. This may provide evidence or intelligence leads for those investigating firearms criminality.</li> </ul>	<p>The Force has considered the report and the Head of Crime will ensure that Cleveland Police systems and processes, as they relate to Ballistics Intelligence align with the memorandum of understanding and the relevant staff are aware.</p>

Force Response Provided By: Deputy Chief Constable Iain Spittal

## **PCC RESPONSE TO INSPECTION**

Comment by the PCC:

As this is a specific report relating to police ballistics operations, I am satisfied with the Deputy Chief Constable's response that the recommendations will be used to assist with firearms and their use in policing activity going forward.

By assessing all reports issued by HMIC, lessons can be learnt and best practice embedded, even if Cleveland Police is not the Force under scrutiny.

The PCC will monitor the implementation of recommendations via quarterly updates of the Risk, Audit & Inspection Monitoring Board.