



22nd July 2010

C McConnell  
0151 236 4748

To: **The Members of the North West Joint Committee**

Dear Sir/Madam

The Annual Meeting of the North West Joint Committee will be held on **Friday, 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010** at the Ramada Hotel, Manchester Road, Bolton BL6 5RU commencing at **1.00 p.m.**

Please note that there will also be a meeting of the Chairmen and Chief Executives commencing 10.00am.

An agenda for the meeting is enclosed.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "P. Johnson".

Paul Johnson  
Chief Executive to the Joint Committee





# **NORTH WEST REGIONAL COLLABORATION JOINT COMMITTEE**

## **AGENDA**

**30<sup>th</sup> July 2010**

**Meeting to be held at the Ramada  
Hotel, Bolton commencing 1.00pm**



# NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

30<sup>th</sup> July 2010

## AGENDA

### PART I

#### Apologies

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Appointment of Chairman and Administrative arrangements for the Joint Committee</b>	<b>1.</b>
Report of the Chief Executive of Merseyside Police Authority	
<b>2. Declarations of Interests</b>	
<b>3. Minutes</b>	<b>13.</b>
(a) To receive as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the North West Joint Committee Meeting held on 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2010.	
(b) To receive as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the North West Joint Committee Meeting held on 17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010.	
<b>4. Presentation from NPIA Collaboration Support Centre</b>	
Presentation and discussion on challenges faced with collaboration and the support from the Centre	
<b><u>REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE</u></b>	
<b>5. Forward Plan of the Joint Committee</b>	<b>25.</b>
Update from the Chief Executive of Merseyside Police Authority	
<b>6. Police Procurement North West</b>	<b>35.</b>
Report of the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority	

**7. Home Office Strategy – Future of Policing 43.**

Report of the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority

**REPORTS OF THE CHIEF CONSTABLES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE**

**8. REGIONAL COLLABORATION UPDATE including: 75.**

**Appendix A -** Proposed Collaboration Principles and Priority Areas for Collaboration

**Appendix C -** Firearms Capability Matrix

Presentation on the work of the Regional Motorway Group

ISIS Update

**9. ANY OTHER ITEM(S) WHICH THE CHAIRPERSON DEEMS TO BE OF AN URGENT NATURE**

## **PART 2**

Under Section 100a (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, and having satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 10, the public may be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

<b><u>Item</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
	<b><u>REGIONAL COLLABORATION UPDATE</u></b>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>North West Serious and Organised Crime Task Force</b>	
	<b>Appendix B -</b> Serious & Organised Crime Update	<b>93.</b>
	<b>Appendix D -</b> North West Counter Terrorism Unit Update	<b>119.</b>



**NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE**

To: **The Chairman and Members of  
the North West Joint Committee**

Meeting: **30<sup>th</sup> July 2010**

**Appointment of Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Administrative  
Arrangements for the North West Joint Committee 2010/11**

**Report of the Chief Executive of Merseyside Police Authority**

**1. Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to seek the Joint Committee's nominations and approval for its Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2010/11. The report also sets out the administrative arrangements for the same period and the adoption of the Standing Orders.

**2. Recommendations**

- (i) that the Joint Committee nominates and approves a Chairman and Vice – Chairman for a period of one year;
- (ii) that the Joint Committee appoints a Secretary to the Joint Committee for a period of one year; and
- (iii) that the Joint Committee's Standing Orders be adopted for 2010/11.

**3. Background to the Report**

- 3.1 At its Annual Meeting in 2009 the North West Joint Committee adopted a set of Procedural Standing Orders in relation to the conduct of its business. The amended Standing Orders were approved and adopted at the Joint Committee meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009. These are attached to this report at Appendix A, with no proposed amendments, for continued adoption in 2010/11.

#### **4. Appointment of a Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

- 4.1 Standing Order 2 a) deals with the appointment of a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. It states that:

“The first business of the annual meeting of the JC shall be the appointment of a Chair and Vice-Chair from among the appointees of the 5 authorities”.

Members are therefore asked to nominate from its Membership a Chairman and Vice-Chairman for a period of one year.

#### **5. Administrative Arrangements**

- 5.1 Standing Order 3 provides direction in relation to the administrative support for the Joint Committee. In the same way that the Joint Committee shall appoint its Chairman and Vice-Chairman it shall also appoint annually a Secretary. Members will recall that the Secretary shall be from the same Authority as the Chairman, and Members are therefore asked to approve this arrangement for 2010/11.

- 5.2 Dates for meetings of the Joint Committee for 2010/11 are being arranged. Whilst these are still to be finalised the provisional dates are as follows:

15<sup>th</sup> November 2010

21<sup>st</sup> February 2011

9<sup>th</sup> May 2011

25<sup>th</sup> July or 15<sup>th</sup> August 2011 (Annual Meeting)

7<sup>th</sup> November 2011

- 5.3 At its last meeting Members received a presentation in relation to Titan, and it emerged that the collaboration had widened to incorporate North Wales. Members are asked to consider what, if any, arrangements there should be to invite North Wales or any other interested party to future meetings of the Joint Committee.

#### **6. Financial and Staffing Implications**

There are direct costs associated with the running of the North West Joint Committee. It is assumed that meetings will continue to be held in the current location. The costs associated with the regional meeting for 2009/10, for 4 meetings, amounted to £3216.00, which was shared equally amongst the constituent Authorities. It is envisaged that these cost sharing arrangements continue in the future

## **7. Risk Assessment**

- 7.1 The Coalition Government has made it clear that both Police Authorities and Forces must collaborate, and that collaboration will contribute to savings that must be made in the sector. However the desire for greater collaboration came about during the mergers debate when it was acknowledged that some forces lacked the capacity, and therefore the capability, to tackle crime that falls under the umbrella of protective services. Significant improvements have been made and regional collaboration is contributing to this.
- 7.2 There are risks, however, if this approach continues in an adhoc and piecemeal way. Governance arrangements with regard to collaborative working must be robust and clear audit trails of decisions should be available for monitoring and scrutiny.
- 7.3 There are inherent risks to Police Authorities if they do not take the opportunities that regional, and wider, collaboration present. These risks are mitigated through the governance structure of the Joint Committee.

## **8. Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment**

Any reports prepared for the Joint Committee will be equality impact assessed to ensure that any potential negative impacts are identified and addressed

## **9. Environmental Impact Assessment**

There are environmental issues relating to this report. The Joint Committee is comprised of the Chairs of the 5 North West Authorities with Chief Executives and Chief Constables also in attendance. Clearly there are travel implications but to date meetings have been held at a central location in Bolton, in order to minimise distance to be travelled.

## **10. Conclusion**

Members are asked to approve the Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship and the administrative arrangements for the Joint Committee.

**Paul Johnson**  
**Chief Executive/Treasurer to MPA**

Contact Officer: Carolyn McConnell  
Deputy Chief Executive of MPA  
0151 236 4748



**NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE**  
*for*  
**REGIONAL COLLABORATION**  
**STANDING ORDERS**

## **1. MEETINGS**

The annual meeting of the NW Joint Committee (JC) shall be held in each year on such date between June and the end of September (inclusive) as shall be agreed and as soon as practicable after the annual meetings of the Cheshire, Cumbria, Greater Manchester, Lancashire and Merseyside Police Authorities (the 5 Authorities) have each been held. In addition to the annual meeting, the JC will hold at least three ordinary meetings during each year.

Any two Authorities as members of the JC may call an extraordinary meeting of the JC by written notice to the Secretary to the JC specifying the business to be transacted at the special meeting. Only the business specified in the notice calling the extraordinary meeting may be dealt with at that meeting.

The JC will meet at such convenient venues in the north west of England and on such dates and at such times as the JC may decide.

## **2. CHAIR**

- a) The first business of the annual meeting of the JC shall be the appointment of a Chair and Vice Chair from among the appointees of the 5 Authorities. The Chair will serve for a period of one year and may if the JC so wishes be re-appointed for a second year. No Chair may serve for more than two consecutive years.
- b) On a casual vacancy occurring in the office of Chair or Vice-Chair, an appointment to fill the vacancy should be made at the next ordinary meeting of the JC held after the date in which the vacancy occurs.
- c) If both the Chair and Vice-Chair are absent from a meeting of the JC, the members present at that meeting shall elect a member to preside.

### **3. SECRETARY**

The JC shall annually appoint a Secretary who shall be from the same Authority as the Chair, to act as Secretary to the JC. The Chief Executives and Treasurers of the 5 Authorities and the Chief Constables of the 5 Forces (or their duly authorised nominees) are entitled to attend meetings of the JC as professional advisers and, except where a resolution is passed to exclude them, to remain in those meetings including on those occasions when the Press and Public are excluded.

### **4. QUORUM**

The quorum of the JC shall be one member from each constituent Authority except in situations where the business being transacted directly affects a lesser number of Authorities and where at least one member from the Authorities directly affected shall be present. Where a vote is required, it shall generally be by a show of hands. A vote may also take place by secret ballot where demanded by four members of the JC standing in their places.

Each member Authority of the JC present shall have one vote with decisions being taken on a simple majority of votes cast. Save and except that where a decision of the JC will directly affect and impact upon the discharge of one or more Authorities' functions (a legally-binding decision), only those Authorities actually affected will vote and be entitled to exercise one vote. Such vote will be carried only if all the Authorities directly affected by the legally binding decision are in agreement. Authorities not so directly affected by such decision shall not be entitled to vote.

The Chair will not have a second or casting vote on legally binding decisions.

Immediately after a vote is taken by a show of hands (other than a legally binding decision), if any member so requires, the minutes shall record whether that Authority voted for or against a question or motion or abstained from voting.

## **5. VOTING ON APPOINTMENTS**

Should there be more than one (seconded) nomination for any position to be filled by the JC, voting shall be by means of a secret ballot. Where there are more than two persons nominated for any position to be filled by the JC, and of the votes given, there is not a majority in favour of one person, the name of the person having the least number of votes shall be struck off the list and a fresh vote shall be taken until the majority of votes is given in favour of one person.

## **6. MINUTES**

At each meeting of the JC, the Chair shall put the question that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as a correct record. No discussion shall take place on the minutes except as to their accuracy and any question of accuracy shall be raised by motion. If no such question is raised, or if it is raised then as soon as it is disposed of, the Chair shall sign the minutes.

The minutes of every meeting of the JC shall be printed and the Secretary shall ensure that a copy is sent to the Chief Executives of the five other Authorities represented on the JC for distribution to members of those Authorities.

## **7. RULES OF DEBATE**

Motions and Amendments

- i) A motion or amendment shall not be discussed unless it has been proposed and seconded at the meeting of the JC at which the motion is to be considered, and it shall, if required by the Chair, be put in writing and handed to the Chair before it is further discussed or put to the meeting.

Secunder's Speech

- ii) A member when seconding a motion or amendment may, if he declares his intention to do so, reserve his speech until a later period of the debate.

### One Member to Speak at a Time

- iii) A member when speaking shall address the Chair. If two or more members wish to speak, the Chair shall call on one to do so.

### Amendments to Motions

- iv) An amendment shall be relevant to the motion and shall be either:
  - (a) to refer a matter to the constituent police authorities or to a sub committee or panel appointed by the JC for consideration;
  - (b) to leave our words;
  - (c) to leave our words and insert or add others;
  - (d) to insert or add words

provided that such amendment shall not introduce a new subject matter into the motion nor only have the effect of negating a motion before the JC.

- v) Only one amendment may be moved and discussed at a time and no further amendment shall be moved until the amendment under discussion has been disposed of, provided that the Chair may permit two or more amendments to be discussed (but not voted on) together if circumstances suggest that this course would facilitate the proper conduct of the JC's business.
- vi) If an amendment is lost, other amendments may be moved on the original motion. If an amendment is carried, the motion as amended shall take the place of the original motion and shall become the motion upon which any further amendment may be moved.
- vii) A member may, with the consent of the JC and his Secunder, signified without discussion, alter a motion which he has moved, provided that the alteration is one which could be made as an amendment thereto.

#### Withdrawal of Motion

- viii) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the Seconder and of the JC, which shall be signified without discussion, and no member may speak upon it after the mover has asked permission for its withdrawal, unless such permission shall have been refused.

#### Right of Reply

- ix) The mover of a motion has a right of reply at the close of a debate on the motion, immediately before it is put to the vote. If an amendment is moved, the mover of the original motion shall also have the right of reply at the close of the debate on the amendment. The mover of an amendment shall have no right of reply to the debate on his amendment.

#### Motions Which May Be Moved During a Debate

- x) When a motion is under debate, no other motion shall be moved except the following:
  - a) to amend the motion;
  - b) to adjourn the meeting of the JC
  - c) to adjourn the debate;
  - d) to proceed to the next business;
  - e) that the question be now put;
  - f) that a member be not further heard;
  - g) that a member does leave the meeting;
  - h) a motion to exclude the public

#### Point of Order

- xi) A member may speak on a point of order or by leave of the Chair in personal explanation and shall be entitled to be heard forthwith. A point of order shall related only to an alleged breach of Standing Order or Statutory Provision and the member shall specify the Standing Order or Statutory provision and the way in which he considers it as being broken. A personal explanation shall be confined to some material part of a former speech by him which may appear to have been misunderstood in the present debate.

Respect for the Chair

- xii) Members shall pay due respect to the Chair at all times during meetings.

**8. QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

- (a) At each meeting of the Joint Committee there shall be an opportunity (not exceeding 20 minutes) for any member of the public resident in the Committee's area to ask the Chair a question on any matter which is within the regional powers and duties of the Committee.
- (b) A question under this Standing Order may only be asked if written notice has been provided to the Office of the Joint Committee's designated Secretary at least three clear working days before the date of the meeting. All questions must include the questioner's name and full postal address.
- (c) No one person may ask more than one question and one additional oral question at any meeting.
- (d) If more than one question is submitted to a meeting the questions will be asked in the order in which they were received from the persons submitting. No questions shall be put more than 20 minutes after the commencement of the period allowed for questions unless the meeting otherwise agrees. Any questions not responded to at the meeting due to lack of time will receive a written response which will be copied to all Members, but not minuted.
- (e) All questions will be directed to the Chair who may reply orally at the meeting, in writing after the meeting or may decline to reply. If the person asking the question agrees the answer need not be read out at the meeting. If the questioner is not present at the meeting the Chair shall decide whether or not the question and answer will be read out.
- (f) A copy of all questions and written answers will be circulated at the meeting and appended to the Minutes of the meeting.
- (g) A member of the public who has put a written question may, with the consent of the Chair, ask one additional oral question on the same subject.
- (h) In responding to an additional oral question the Chair may either give a direct oral answer, a written answer to the questioner which will also be circulated to all Members of the Joint Committee or may decline to reply. Additional oral questions and answers will not be appended to the Minutes of the meeting.
- (i) There will be no discussion or debate on any question put by a member of the public or on the Chair's reply. Written questions, and additional oral questions, may be rejected and/or not answered when the Chair considers that they –

- (i) are not on any matter which is within the regional powers and duties of the Joint Committee;
  - (ii) relate to an operational matter, in which case they will be referred to the relevant Chief Constable for a written response;
  - (iii) are defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
  - (iv) are substantially the same as a question which has been put to a meeting of the Joint Committee in the past six months;
  - (v) would require the disclosure of exempt or confidential information; or
  - (vi) the person submitting the question is not resident within the Joint Committee's area.
- (j) The Chair will specify the reason for rejecting a question or not providing an answer to it.

## **9. DISORDERLY CONDUCT**

- a) If at a meeting any member or officer, in the opinion of the Chair, misconducts him or herself by persistently disregarding the ruling of the Chair, or behaving irregularly, improperly or offensively, or by wilfully obstructing the business of the Joint Committee, any member may move "that the member named be not further heard" and the motion is seconded shall be put and determined without discussion.
- b) If the member named continued his/her misconduct after a motion under a) above has been carried, the Chair may either move "that the member named do leave the meeting", or may adjourn the meeting for such period as he/she thinks fit.

## **10. DISTURBANCE BY PERSONS PRESENT OTHER THAN MEMBERS**

If any person present (other than a member) including an officer advising the JC interrupts the proceedings of any meeting, the Chair shall warn him/her. If he/she continues the interruption, the Chair shall order his/her removal from the meeting.

## **11. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND PANELS**

The JC may appoint such sub-committees or panels (with power to consider and make recommendations), for such purposes as they think fit. The JC may co-opt to such sub-committees or panels such other members from the Authorities as they consider essential to the efficient conduct of the business of the sub-committees or panels so appointed.

## **12. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

Every member and substitute member of the JC attending a meeting shall sign his/her name on the attendance sheet provided for that purpose. The Secretary to the JC shall after each meeting, send a record to the 5 Authorities of the attendance of their members and substitute members.

## **13. PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

Where a member of the JC has a personal or prejudicial interest in any matter under consideration by the JC, he/she must declare it and act in accordance with the adopted member code of conduct for the Police Authority which appointed him/her to the JC. In the case of prejudicial interests, he/she must withdraw from the room where the Joint Committee is considering the matter in question unless he/she has received a dispensation from his/her appointing Authority's Standards Committee or there is no discussion on the matter in which he/she has an interest.

## **14. CONSTITUTION OF JC**

These Standing Orders should be read in conjunction with the constitution of the JC.

## **15. INTERPRETATION**

The ruling of the Chair of the meeting on the construction or the application of these Standing Orders and on any question or order not provided for by the Standing Orders shall be final and shall not be challenged at the meeting.

## THE NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2010

at the Central Avenue Suite, Ramada Bolton Hotel, Bolton  
commencing at 12.45 pm

#### PRESENT

Cllr R Cole (CUMBRIA)  
Cllr M Doherty (LANCASHIRE)  
Cllr P Murphy (GREATER MANCHESTER)  
Mrs M Ollerenshaw (CHESHIRE)  
Cllr W Weightman (MERSEYSIDE) [Chairman]

Also present

#### CHESHIRE

Mr M Sellwood (Chief Executive)  
Mr D Bateman (Vice Chairman)  
Mr D Whatton (Chief Constable)

#### CUMBRIA

Mr C Alcock (Chief Executive)  
Mr C Mackey (Chief Constable)

#### GREATER MANCHESTER

Ms Sam Frenz (Head of Scrutiny and Engagement)  
Mr P Fahy (Chief Constable)

#### LANCASHIRE

Ms M Carruthers-Watt (Chief Executive)  
Mr Steve Finnigan (Chief Constable)

#### MERSEYSIDE

Mr P Johnson (Chief Executive/Treasurer)  
Mrs C McConnell (Deputy Chief Executive)  
Mr B Lawson (Deputy Chief Constable)

Apologies for absence were received from Mr G Roper, Vice Chairman, Lancashire Police Authority, Mr R Bernstein, Executive Director, Greater Manchester Police Authority, and Mr Jon Murphy, Chief Constable, Merseyside Police Service

#### 24. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

#### 25. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the North West Joint Committee Meeting, held on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009, were received as a correct record.

#### Matters Arising

With reference to Minute 17 it was confirmed that the Standing Orders have been amended and circulated.

**26. Chairman's Announcements**

Cllr Weightman announced that the Chief Executive of Cumbria Police Authority will be retiring at the end of March 2010. Cllr Weightman wished to place on record, on behalf of the Members of the Joint Committee, recognition of the contribution made by Clive Alcock to the work of the Committee, and invaluable advice he has provided.

Miranda Carruthers-Watt also extended her thanks on behalf of the Chief Executives for Clive's contribution, and in particular his efforts to establish a Northern Chief Executive's Group.

**27. Police Treatment Centres**

The Members of the Committee provided feedback in respect of their Authorities in relation to the request made at the previous Joint Committee for one-off capital funding to the Police Treatment Centres. There was support for a regional view to be presented and provided to the Charity.

A number of concerns in relation to the request had been echoed across each of the North West Authorities, which included the financial pressures facing police authorities in the next few years. A number of Authorities also reported that other police related charities have recently sought funding. A particularly important factor taken into consideration related to the fact that the charity is not open to police staff, especially given the increasing number and growing role of police staff.

Taking all these factors into consideration Members took the decision not to support the Police Treatment Centres' request.

**Resolved:-**

- (i) That the request for one-off funding be declined; and
- (ii) That the chairman of the North West Joint Committee write on behalf of the 5 Police Authorities setting out the consideration made and the decision taken.

**28. Forward Plan of the Joint Committee**

The report set out an updated Forward Plan for Members of the Joint Committee to consider.

The Chairman of the Joint Committee requested that colleagues take note of the deadlines for producing the reports in order that they can be considered at the draft report stage. He sought approval for the officers responsible for preparing the agenda to be able to have a dialogue with individual authors to ensure that the content of reports provides the information requested by the Joint Committee.

Cllr Weightman also informed the Members of the Joint Committee that he would, in future, be holding a briefing meeting in between the draft and final report deadlines. David Whatton informed the meeting that he will be taking over as ACPO lead on 1<sup>st</sup> April, and that this might initially lead to some slippage in the preparation of reports.

**Resolved:-**

That the Forward Plan be noted.

**29. Custody Visiting**

Mark Sellwood presented the report on the work that is being undertaken in the region in respect of Independent Custody Visiting. The region has established a Regional Custody Visiting Administrators Group, which has helped to identify and disseminate good practice but also to collaborate and standardise policies and procedures across the 5 North West Authorities.

Mr Sellwood also raised the recent letter that has been circulated to the North West Authorities in relation to rejoining the Independent Custody Visiting Association (ICVA). There was agreement that given the success of the regional meeting that there was no appetite to rejoin ICVA at this time.

**Resolved:-**

- (i) That the Chief Executive of Cheshire Police Authority should write to ICVA on behalf of the 5 North West Authorities stating their decision not to rejoin the Association.

**30. Challenges relating to Regional Collaboration**

Peter Fahy presented a discussion paper that set out the current position regarding collaboration issues. The paper reflected a number of the issues discussed at the last meeting and the frustration around the capacity to take forward large collaborative projects. Whilst the region can demonstrate some positive approaches this is a unique area with 2 large Metropolitan Forces, and this bring some specific challenges.

As previously discussed other regions have created a post specifically to co-ordinate projects, service the Joint Committee as well as seeking new areas for collaboration. There is a view by the Chief Officers that such a post would assist the North West Region and they have proposed the creation of a Chief Superintendent post, which would be reviewed after 12 months. There was a general view amongst Members that this should be supported. Given that the ACPO lead will be David Whatton it was agreed that the Chairman and Chief Executive from Cheshire Police Authority would be involved in developing the proposal and in the appointment of the postholder.

A more general discussion also took place in respect of collaboration and how the Joint Committee can measure the outcomes. The postholder will be able to assist in helping to develop this approach but also in considering wider collaboration that may only involve 2 Forces.

Miranda Carruthers-Watt also raised the issue of the Shared Services project, which had previously been reported via the Joint Committee. It was agreed to formally close the involvement with this project but to include the potential areas of collaboration in back office functions in a future report to the Joint Committee.

**Resolved:-**

- (i) That the Joint Committee approves the appointment of a Chief Superintendent subject to a review after a period of 12 months;
- (ii) That the Chairman and Chief Executive of Cheshire Police Authority be involved in the appointment of the postholder; and
- (iii) That the Joint Committee formally closes the Shared Services Project.

**31. Regional Collaboration Update**

Peter Fahy presented an update in relation to regional collaboration and specifically funding issues in respect of the Regional Crime Unit.

Following the previous report there was further discussion in relation to measuring value for money and the impact on performance. The Serious and Organised Crime Task Force (Titan) was discussed in detail. It was agreed that more information was required in order for decisions on further funding to be made in a timely way. ACC Andy Cooke from Lancashire is available to provide a presentation to each of the North West Authorities in respect of Titan.

The report also set out a number of other areas of collaboration including procurement. Concern has been raised with regard to procurement in relation to preparing a set of common standing orders. It was agreed that Lancashire and Merseyside Police Authorities would lead on this area of work.

Mark Sellwood also provided a verbal update with regard to legal services. There is a review at the end of July and a paper will be provided to the Joint Committee.

**Resolved:-**

- (i) That Lancashire and Merseyside Police Authorities prepare a set of common standing orders for use with procurement across the North West Authorities; and
- (ii) A report setting out the issues relating to Legal Services be submitted to the meeting of the Joint Committee in August.

**32. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

**RESOLVED** That in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 and having satisfied the requirements of paragraph 10, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following five items of business on the grounds that they involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

**33. Regional Collaboration Update**

An additional paper relating to Titan was circulated at the meeting. There was concern amongst Members that presentation of papers at the meeting make it difficult to make a positive contribution. It was agreed that CTIU will circulate this information to their Special Branch officers who will then be responsible for briefing their Chief Constables and Police Authority colleagues.

The report set out in more detail the work of Titan.

**Resolved:-**

That the Members of the Joint Committee be briefed on Part 2 information locally by Special Branch Officers.

Minutes 24 – 33 received as a correct record the 17<sup>th</sup> May 2010.

Chairman of the Joint Committee

(The meeting closed at 2.15 pm)



## THE NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 17<sup>th</sup> MAY 2010

at the Central Avenue Suite, Ramada Bolton Hotel, Bolton  
commencing at 1.00 pm

#### PRESENT

Cllr R Cole (CUMBRIA)  
Cllr M Doherty (LANCASHIRE)  
Cllr P Murphy (GREATER MANCHESTER)  
Mrs M Ollerenshaw (CHESHIRE)  
Cllr W Weightman (MERSEYSIDE) [Chairman]

Also present

#### CHESHIRE

Mr M Sellwood (Chief Executive)  
Mr A Arnold (Vice Chairman)  
Mr D Whatton (Chief Constable)  
Mr R Rees (Staff Officer to Chief Constable)

#### LANCASHIRE

Ms M Carruthers-Watt (Chief Executive)  
Mr Steve Finnigan (Chief Constable)  
Mr A Cook (Assistant Chief Constable)

#### CUMBRIA

Mr S Edwards (Acting Chief Executive)  
Mr C Mackey (Chief Constable)  
Mr S Hyde (Deputy Chief Constable)

#### MERSEYSIDE

Mr P Johnson (Chief Executive/Treasurer)  
Mrs C McConnell (Deputy Chief Executive)  
Mr B Lawson (Deputy Chief Constable)

#### GREATER MANCHESTER

Mr R Bernstein (Executive Director)  
Mr S Byrne (Deputy Chief Constable)

Also in attendance:

Mr L Johnson, Supt Harm Reduction, seconded to Titan

Apologies for absence were received from:

Mr G Roper, Vice Chair, Lancashire Police Authority  
Mrs G Oates, Vice Chair, Greater Manchester Police Authority  
Mr P Fahy, Chief Constable, Greater Manchester Police Service  
Mrs Diane Clark, Member, Merseyside Police Authority  
Mr J Murphy, Chief Constable, Merseyside Police Service

**34. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

**35. Minutes**

A corrupted copy of the minutes of the meeting of the North West Joint Committee meeting, held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2010 had been circulated with the Agenda. Arrangements for the correct set of minutes were made and these will be considered at the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

**36. Forward Plan of the Joint Committee**

The report set out an updated Forward Plan for Members of the Joint Committee to consider.

The Chairman of the Joint Committee encouraged Members to put forward areas of work or specific topics for future reports. It was agreed that an extended timetable of future meetings will be presented to the Annual Meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> July.

**Resolved:-**

That the dates for 2010/11 North West Joint Committee meetings be presented for consideration at the Annual meeting.

**37. APA Board and Policy Networks**

The report sought nominations from the Members of the Joint Committee to the APA Board and Policy Networks.

**Resolved:-**

That the representation of the North West at the APA Board and Policy Networks are as follows:-

APA Board	Paul Murphy
Citizen Focus & Partnerships	Raymond Cole
Strategic Policing	Margaret Ollerenshaw
Business & Corporate Policy	Bill Weightman
People	Malcolm Doherty

**38. Statutory Guidance for Police Collaboration**

The report updated Members of the Joint Committee on the details contained within the recently published Statutory Guidance for Police Collaboration. A Summary of the Guidance had been prepared, and accompanied the report.

In particular two issues were highlighted. The first related to the application of the Guidance, and whilst it is not mandatory it is clear that chief officers and police authorities should give it proper consideration. It was agreed that the issue of amendments to existing agreements could lead to an increase in bureaucracy, particularly if these are only minor changes.

It was agreed that a legal view be sought on this matter.

The second issue highlighted in the report related to a note on Direction and Control. The Guidance clarifies the position on officers and staff working outside their force area.

**Resolved:-**

That the Chief Executive of Merseyside Police Authority seek a legal view in relation to amendments to existing collaboration arrangements and the Statutory Guidance.

**39. The Use of Schedule 7 Terrorism Act 2000**

The report set out a proposal for a Police Authority led task and finish group to ensure that public consultation in respect of Schedule 7 be established in the North West. Craig Mackey reported that he has been asked to undertake some work in relation to this from ACPO.

The Chairman of the Committee advised that he is content for work to commence but would wish to have more detail as to the terms of reference for such a group, training involved, and time commitments.

**Resolved:-**

That the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority commence work in conjunction with Merseyside Police Authority.

**40. Police Procurement North West**

The report set out details of the progress with regard to Police Procurement across the North West, and in particular the achievement of common approaches to Contracts. Miranda Carruthers-Watt confirmed that she and Brian Simmons will be attending the next regional ACPO meeting in relation to this work, and will report a progress to the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

**Resolved:-**

That a report providing an update on progress in relation to procurement be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

**41. Regional Collaboration Update**

David Whatton presented an update to the Joint Committee on the various regional collaboration work.

A number of key issues were discussed as follows:-

**North West Collaboration Co-ordinator** – Interviews for the Chief Superintendent post will be held shortly. The panel will comprise CC David Whatton, ACC Helen King and Mrs Margaret Ollerenshaw. Expectations of the appointed officer will need to be addressed as well as being clear about the approach the Joint Committee wants to take in relation to future collaboration.

**Motorway Police Group** – There was a suggestion that presentations on this work should be made to police authorities. There was some concern shared amongst members that is still unclear as to what success looks like.

**Serious and Organised Crime Task Force** – Key points were set out including progress made on the five year Serious Organised Crime Strategy.

**National Information System Agenda** - David Whatton provided a verbal update at the meeting around the developments in respect of ISIS. There is now a five year plan for convergence to one system. A formal paper setting out the business case will be prepared for the next meeting.

**CCTV** – Discussion in relation to this issue centred on the lack of a regional view. It is an area that has been highlighted by the Coalition Government and will be discussed in more detail once firm proposals are known.

**Firearms** – The region has a strong history of working together in relation to firearms and armed response. The regional firearms group are looking to greater standardisation of equipment and training and a detailed eighteen month action plan is being prepared, which will be shared at the next meeting.

**Quest** – Following an update from each force area it became apparent that each force approaches business change in different ways. This means that it is sometimes difficult to see business processes across the region.

Members of the Joint Committee discussed the need for a regional strategy across these key areas and others. The new Chief Superintendent will have a role to play in the co-ordination of this, and the suggestion that the officer, once in post, meets the Chairs of Authorities was welcomed. The Chairman proposed that a meeting between the Authority Chairs and Chief Executives be arranged.

**Resolved:-**

- (i) That a presentation from the regional motorway police group is made to the next Joint Committee and to individual Police Authorities;
- (ii) A paper setting out the business case around ISIS be submitted to the next meeting;
- (iii) The action plan in respect of firearms equipment and training be submitted to the next meeting; and
- (iv) That a meeting of the Chairs of the five North West Authorities be arranged in order for them to develop a regional strategy in relation to collaboration.

**42. Local Government (Access To Information) Act 1985**

**Resolved:-**

That in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

**43. Titan Progress Update**

ACC Andy Cooke and Supt Lee Johnson provided a presentation on the work of Titan. The presentation highlighted some key examples of success, and the joined up approach between Titan, RART and RIU. The funding for the work was described as well as the performance regime to assess the benefits of the task force. However more information is required in relation to the budget for the work of Titan in order for future decisions to be taken.

Members voiced some concerns about being able to demonstrate success and added value, particularly when decisions around future funding will need to be made. Comparisons with SOCA were also discussed and whether Titan was fulfilling a role that SOCA should be doing in the region. ACC Cooke acknowledged that there needed to be a greater demonstration of success and that they were working on a coherent measurement framework. He welcomed police authority involvement in this. There was also acknowledgement that the term governance board was incorrectly applied in this situation.

The Chairman of the Committee thanked the officers for their presentation.

Minutes 34 - 43 received as a correct record the 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010.

Chairman of the Joint Committee

(The meeting closed at 3.08 pm)



# NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

## FORWARD PLAN

2009/10

## Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009

Reporting Activity	Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee
<p><b>Appointment of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee</b></p>	<p>Mr W Weightman be appointed as Chairman and Mr M Doherty as Vice-Chairman for a period of 12 months.</p> <p>That the Chairman will write to Mr R Watson, on behalf of the Joint Committee, expressing his gratitude for his significant contribution to Regional Collaboration.</p>
<p><b>Administrative arrangements of the North West Joint Committee</b></p>	<p>that the current venue should be used for future meetings of the Joint Committee, subject to the room being arranged to be more conducive for attendance by Members of the public;</p> <p>that the standing orders be approved;</p> <p>that the current arrangement for payment be maintained;</p> <p>that, whilst each Authority be responsible for publicising the meeting agenda and minutes, the possibility of developing a shared website be explored, and reported to the next meeting of the Joint Committee;</p> <p>that the administering Authority be responsible for co-ordinating media issues, and that the Chairman of the Committee acts as spokesperson on matters of policy;</p> <p>that the standard template be adopted for all reports to the Joint Committee, and be sent out in the name of the Chief Executive of the administering Authority;</p> <p>that a report be prepared for the next meeting of the Joint Committee setting out a Forward Plan of meetings and business to be discussed;</p> <p>that staff associations should be notified and made aware of the dates of the Joint</p>

	<p>Committee;</p> <p>that the Standing Orders be amended to allow for members of the public to speak at the meeting on regional issues only;</p> <p>that each Authority nominate a named substitute for the Chairman of their Authority, and for that nominated Member to be invited to all future meetings; and</p> <p>that proposals for a regional event be prepared</p>
<b>ICT Investment decisions – ISIS and IMPACT Programmes</b>	That the Joint Committee receives a further report identifying the position, potential implications, and cost savings for all Forces in the North West relating to ISIS and IMPACT programmes
<b>HMIC Report – a better deal for the public through Joint Working</b>	That once the status of the HMIC report is made clear and how their proposals are to be taken forward, a further report to be prepared and submitted to a meeting of the Joint Committee
<b>Delivering Effective Collaboration</b>	That the Chief Constables prepare a reporting timetable to the Joint Committee, and that the Motorway Policing Collaboration be the subject of the first report
<b>British Transport Police Stop/Search data</b>	That the Chief Constable of Cumbria prepare a report on the national reporting of stop/search data by British Transport Police
<b>APA Member Networks</b>	That the item was noted
<b>Accountability in Policing</b>	<p>That the Chief Executives prepare a response to Mr Blunkett’s report; and</p> <p>That a regional event be arranged for Members of the North West Police Authorities to be informed about and respond to the White Paper</p>
<b>Police Treatment Centres</b>	That the Joint Committee receive a presentation at a future meeting of the Joint Committee on the work undertaken at the Police Treatment Centres

<b>Vetting</b>	That the item was noted
<b>Independent Custody Visiting Association</b>	That an update report on the regional collaboration on custody visiting be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Committee
<b>Regional Collaboration Update</b>	That the Chief Constables undertake a review of areas of work and to consider future areas of collaboration.

**16<sup>th</sup> November 2009**

<b>Reporting Activity</b>	<b>Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee</b>
<b>Presentation from the Chief Executive of the Police Treatment Centres – Michael Baxter, QPM</b>	<p>That Mr Baxter will supply additional information relating to research undertaken by Glasgow Caledonian University; and</p> <p>That each Authority will use the information supplied by the Police Treatment Centres to take local decisions as to whether to make a grant amounting to £40 per officer to the Charity.</p>
<b>Amendments to the Standing Orders</b>	<p>That the Joint Committee approve the amendments to their existing Standing Orders as highlighted in Appendix 1 to the report;</p> <p>That the period of time allowed for all questions would be for a period of 20 minutes after the commencement of the period allowed for questions; and</p> <p>That all questions be directed through the Chairman of the Joint Committee.</p>
<b>Forward Plan of Meetings and Business of the Joint Committee</b>	That the Forward Plan be adopted and used to track the business of the Joint Committee
<b>ICT Investment Decisions ISIS Programmes</b>	That the Standing Orders in relation to virtual Procurement Unit be submitted to a future meeting of the Joint Committee

<b>Letter from Policing Minister</b>	That the Joint Committee notes the content of the Minister of State's letter.
<b>Regional Collaboration Update</b>	<p>The main item of the next Joint Committee meeting will focus on the future challenges relating to regional collaboration;</p> <p>A report setting out the specific funding issues relating to the Regional Crime Unit be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Committee; and</p> <p>That the Gant charts highlighting progress against specific projects be reinstated.</p>
<b>National Reporting of Stop/Search data by British Transport Police</b>	That the Joint Committee notes the progress in relation to the national reporting of Stop/Search data by British Transport Police.
<b>Regional Priority for APA 2010/11 Business Plan</b>	Members welcomed and approved the proposal and comments from the Joint Committee to inform the APA 2010/11 Business Plan

## 26th February 2010

<b>Reporting Activity</b>	<b>Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee</b>
<b>Police Treatment Centres – Update from Authorities</b>	<p>That the request for one-off funding be declined;</p> <p>That the Chairman of the North West Joint Committee write on behalf of the 5 Police Authorities setting out the consideration made and the decision taken.</p>
<b>Forward Plan of the Joint Committee</b>	That the Forward Plan be noted
<b>Update on the regional collaboration by Police Authorities in relation to custody visiting</b>	That the Chief Executive of Cheshire Police Authority should write to ICVA on behalf of the 5 North West Authorities stating their decision not to rejoin the Association.
<b>Challenges relating to regional collaboration</b>	That the Joint Committee approves the appointment of a Chief Superintendent subject to a review after a period of 12 months;

	<p>That the Chairman and Chief Executive of Cheshire Police Authority be involved in the appointment of the postholder; and</p> <p>That the Joint Committee formally closes the Shared Services Project.</p>
<p><b>Regional Collaboration Update &amp; Specific Funding issues relating to the Regional Crime Unit</b></p> <p><b>Part 2 report in relation to further funding of Titan</b></p>	<p>That Lancashire and Merseyside Police Authorities prepare a set of common standing orders for use with procurement across the North West Authorities; and</p> <p>A report setting out the issues relating to Legal Services be submitted to the meeting of the Joint Committee in August.</p> <p>That the Members of the Joint Committee be briefed on Part 2 information locally by Special Branch Officers</p>

**17<sup>th</sup> May 2010**

<b>Reporting Activity</b>	<b>Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee</b>
<b>Forward Plan of the Joint Committee</b>	That the dates for 2010/11 North West Joint Committee meetings be presented for consideration at the Annual Meeting.
<b>APA Board and Policy Networks</b>	<p>That the representation of the North West at the APA Board and Policy Networks are as follows:</p> <p>APA Board – Paul Murphy</p> <p>Citizen Focus &amp; Partnerships – Raymond Cole</p> <p>Strategic Policing – Margaret Ollerenshaw</p> <p>Business &amp; Corporate Policy – Bill Weightman</p> <p>People – Malcolm Doherty</p>
<b>Update on HMIC Report – a better deal for the public through Joint Working</b>	That the Chief Executive of Merseyside Police Authority seek a legal view in relation to amendments to existing collaboration arrangements and the Statutory Guidance.

<b>Now Statutory Guidance for Police Collaboration</b>	
<b>The Use of Schedule 7 Terrorism Act 2000</b>	That the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority commence work in conjunction with Merseyside Police Authority.
<b>Police Procurement North West</b>	That a report providing an update on progress in relation to procurement be submitted to the next meeting of the Joint Committee.
<b>Regional Collaboration Update</b>	That a presentation from the regional motorway police group is made to the next Joint Committee and to individual Police Authorities;  A paper setting out the business case around ISIS be submitted to the next meeting;  The action plan in respect of firearms equipment and training be submitted to the next meeting; and  That a meeting of the Chairs of the five North West Authorities be arranged in order for them to develop a regional strategy in relation to collaboration.
<b>Report on Titan – Performance Measures and Outcomes</b>	Officers were thanked for their presentation

## **Annual Meeting – 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010**

<b>Reporting Activity</b>	<b>Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee</b>
<b>Presentation from NPIA Collaboration Support Centre</b>	
<b>Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman &amp; Administrative Arrangements for the North West Joint Committee</b>	

<b>Forward Plan of the Joint Committee</b>	
<b>Police Procurement North West</b>	
<b>Regional Collaboration Update</b>	

**15<sup>th</sup> November 2010**

<b>Reporting Activity</b>	<b>Comments and Outcome at the Joint Committee</b>
---------------------------	--

## Timetable

### North West Regional Collaboration Joint Committee's 2009 -10

Notified of Agenda Items	Draft Reports	Final Reports	Agenda Clearance	Agenda Distribution	Meeting
19/10/09	23/10/09	30/10/09	02/11/09	06/11/09	16/11/09
01/02/10	05/02/10	12/02/10	15/02/10	18/02/10	26/02/10
19/04/10	23/04/10	30/04/10	30/04/10	07/05/10	17/05/10
05/07/10	09/07/10	16/07/10	19/07/10	22/07/10	30/07/10
18/10/10	22/10/10	29/10/10	01/11/10	05/11/10	15/11/10



**NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE**

To: **The Chairman and Members  
of the North West Joint Committee**

Meeting: 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010

**Police Procurement North West****Report of the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority****1. Purpose of the Report**

To consider the current position in respect of North West procurement. To update members into the position of the NPIA and ACPO Cabinet. Police Authorities are the corporate bodies with the legal authority to enter into contracts for the supply of goods and services and also the employers of staff. This means that Police Authority leadership is key in helping to drive forward improved outcomes for procurement.

**2. Recommendation**

Members are asked to note the progress made with regard to regional procurement in the North West.

Members are asked to note the report prepared by Chief Constable Graham Maxwell and Chief Constable Peter Neyroud for ACPO Cabinet and to endorse its principles.

Members are asked to recommend that a North West Implementation Plan is developed jointly between Authorities and Constabularies setting out a mechanism for identifying and delivering savings on a regional basis, setting targets for procurement savings and the progress on the development of that plan is reported to this Committee.

**3. Background to the Report**

In the North West, spend analysis carried out in 2007 has driven improvements to the way in which procurement is carried out in the Region. There is a virtual regional procurement group and substantial savings have been made.

- 3.1 A paper taken to ACPO Cabinet on 9th June sets out the action planned to deliver at least £200m of non-IT procurement savings by 2013/14. The Cabinet endorsed the underlying principles and approach in order to implement a revised strategy to deliver further procurement savings. The NPIA estimates that the police service spends some £3.3 billion a year on goods and services from third parties. Although about half of the spend is on information and communications technology; the remainder covers a diverse range of goods and services from helicopters and fleet vehicles to utilities and saddle soap. Some of the spend is proscribed but there are opportunities to develop and promote improved procurement collaboration across policing and the wider public sector.

There are a number of operational decisions that will be impacted on how procurement is approached these include the following options that will need to be considered as a matter of course.

For any decision making such as fleet replacement, air support there are operational choices that have an impact on procurement. If a decision is taken not to incur expenditure, this will impact on delivery of policing, as will decisions to standardise, consolidate and finally procurement. There are options which if taken as standard will also generate savings and this include the routine use of standard non police specific existing contracts for non specialist items. There is also an opportunity to develop better category management with a regional or multi-area lead force approach. We already have spend data within the region, and we have developed to the extent that we now need a more strategic look at the way in which savings are identified.

- 3.2 The ACPO Cabinet paper sets out four areas where leadership decisions are needed:

- adoption of standard specifications
- application of demand management
- effective contract and supplier management
- regional or sub-regional approach to indirect procurement

It is proposed that members agree that this should form the basis of a regional approach to procurement

- 3.3 Regional Forensic Contract

On 15 July the Forensic Services Joint Committee unanimously supported the recommendation to extend the above contract for two years to 31 March 2013 based on nil price increases but with some agreed relaxation of turnaround times for limited products. This contract has delivered £6m + savings. The spending for 09/10 is now based on £26m 09/10 confirmed spend for 14 forces. This differs from the original view of spend at £40m based on samples. The percentage saving now nearing 18%. The contract price is frozen for the remaining 2 years and there is scope to use new management information to look for better value in operational processes mentioned.

#### **4. Financial and Staffing Implications**

Regional procurement may reduce the need for staff in all forces. As part of the review of resources needed to deliver services across the forces there are opportunities to revisit the way in which procurement is delivered.

#### **5. Risk Assessment**

Failure to adopt a rigorous approach to the management of third party spend will mean that the North West is not best able to achieve all of the savings available.

#### **6. Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment**

#### **7. Environmental Impact Assessment**

#### **8. Conclusion**

The most effective way of ensuring that the real savings can be realised is for strong and consistent leadership across Constabularies and Authorities. There is an opportunity to identify a lead officer at a senior level who can ensure that there are robust but achievable targets. It is also an opportunity for standardisation of processes and equipment which will support the overarching collaboration agenda in the region.

**M Carruthers-Watt**  
**Chief Executive, Lancashire**

**Brian Simmons**  
**Assistant Chief Officer, Cheshire**

Contact Officer: Miranda Carruthers-Watt  
[Miranda.carruthers-watt@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Miranda.carruthers-watt@lancashire.gov.uk)  
Brian Simmons  
[Brian.simmons@cheshire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Brian.simmons@cheshire.pnn.police.uk)



## Appendix A

Security Classification:	<b>NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED</b>		
Disclosable under FOIA 2000:	<b>Yes</b>		
Author/Contact:	<b>Dr D A Horne</b>	Force/Organisation:	<b>NPIA</b>
Date Created:	<b>10 May 2010</b>	Telephone:	<b>0207 147 8400</b>

There is an attachment:	<a href="#">4.1</a>
-------------------------	---------------------

**ASSOCIATION OF CHIEF POLICE OFFICERS  
OF ENGLAND, WALES AND NORTHERN IRELAND  
FINANCE & RESOURCES BUSINESS AREA**

PAPER FOR CABINET

**9 June 2010**

**DELIVERING FURTHER PROCUREMENT EFFICIENCY GAINS**

**1. Purpose**

- 1.1 The paper sets out the action planned to deliver at least £200m of non-IT procurement savings by 2013/14. It seeks Cabinet endorsement for the underlying principles and approach in order to implement a revised strategy to deliver further procurement savings.

**2. Context**

- 2.1 The police service spends some £3.3 billion a year on goods and services from third parties. Approximately half this spend is on information and communications technology; the remainder ranges from helicopters to police dog food, and from water bills to data centres. Not all of this spend is "influenceable" by procurement activity (it includes payments to HMRC for example), but there is scope to foster much greater procurement collaboration across the service.
- 2.2 ACPO and the police service have had procurement strategies for some years. The existing Procurement Strategy, agreed by Cabinet in 2008, is delivered through six strands of activity by ACPO's Procurement Portfolio. The Portfolio comprises regional procurement champions (usually Directors of Resources from the larger forces in regions) plus the NPIA and procurement specialists from the service.
- 2.3 National and regional contracts exist for key commodities such as police vehicles, forensics services and construction services. Over 2000 current contracts are listed on the service's procurement contract database, including contracts with other emergency services. A broad summary of procurement contracts is set out in the table below:

<i>Contracts</i>	<i>such as</i>	<i>procured by</i>	<i>annual value (approx)</i>
Strategic national policing contracts	police national database; core airwave service	NPIA procure and pay for	£345m
Operationally significant contracts	forensic services, Identity & Access Management, police vehicle fleet	NPIA award national framework; forces procure and pay	£425m
Key policing contracts	crime scene consumables, body armour	Procured by lead forces (such as the MPS & others)	£75m
Indirect procurement*	energy, fuel cards	various**	£2,455m

\* spending that does not directly support the police service, but without which it cannot function, such as utilities

\*\* such as local government regional purchasing consortia, BuyingSolutions, Firebuy

2.4 Opportunities for further procurement saving exist, both from IT related activity through the ISIS programme and from non-IT spending. Non-IT procurement opportunities particularly include the following: consultancy; uniforms; body armour; fingerprint identification services; forensic services; insurance services; legal services; radio communication services; temporary staff; translator and interpreting services.

2.5 While there has been good progress in the service, (annual cashable procurement efficiency savings reported by the service in 2008/09 amounted to £100m), we believe that further opportunities will only be realised by repositioning the procurement strategy to a more directive approach with a far stronger national and regional focus. This is in line with last month's Treasury announcements where, for central government at least, consultancy spend above £20k requires ministerial approval, and all indirect procurement has to be through centrally-established contracts.

### 3. Proposals for Future Procurement Working

3.1 Whilst much of the current ACPO Procurement strategy remains relevant, new operating principles are required if the service is to achieve the significant financial challenges ahead. The current strategy, with collaboration at its heart, attempts to engage with all forces but this has complicated rather than simplified the procurement landscape. The effort to secure maximum buy-in frequently results in a wide range of suppliers, too many variations in what should be a standard approach, dispersed volumes and lost time.

3.2 To deliver the level of further non-IT procurement savings, the following four proposals are made for the service:

- i. First, for the most significant key spend areas, the service agrees to **apply standard specifications**, so that "one size fits all". Furthermore, specifications are procured once, on behalf of the service, either by a lead force or by the NPIA (the nature of the market related to some commodity areas may necessitate a regional rather than national approach albeit with a common specification). It is imperative that chief officers support and promote the adoption of standard specifications within their respective forces for this approach to succeed. To focus effort where most needed and to accelerate the process of tendering standard specifications we propose that:

- specifications are determined on the basis of the business requirements that reflect the “critical mass” of the service’s spending, rather than seeking the buy in of all forces; although it is recognised that on rare occasions, ‘local’ requirements may need to be included. These will be subject to the approval of the Collaborative Procurement Programme Board
  - approaches to the market, such as issuing of OJEU notices, for these spend areas are only routed through the lead force or NPIA unless there is a compelling reason otherwise
  - operational and stakeholder requirements will be managed through the Collaborative Procurement Programme Board with input from ACPO business areas, such as Uniformed Operations in particular Roads Policing and Firearms Portfolios.
- ii. Secondly, **demand management** is applied, challenging the need to purchase and if proven, the quantity and the frequency; where demand is proven, to seek to put in place contracts incorporating clearer commitments from forces to maximise the buying power of the service. We propose that forces provide regional high level spend plans in the key category areas to allow this co-ordinated strategy to be implemented.
- iii. Thirdly, ensuring effective **contract and supplier management** arrangements are in place. We propose that a Supplier Relationship Management approach is adopted across the police service, supported by effective training to allow procurement staff to deliver the latest best practice in this key area. This can help ensure effective arrangements with key suppliers and remedies for contract failures. But this approach can go further in pressing for renegotiation of terms wherever possible, reflecting the much tougher fiscal climate (and the corresponding change in the terms of trade for consultants etc). This could release considerable cash savings.
- iv. Lastly, despite the size of this spend, we believe that there is little justification for scarce force procurement skills to be applied towards **indirect procurement** when alternatives exist, either regionally (through local consortia) or nationally (through BuyingSolutions or other wider market related solutions). We also believe that scarce procurement skills should be encouraged to operate regionally, or sub-regionally, under the direction of Regional Procurement Champions. While there will be a continuing requirement for a local procurement presence, this can be delivered in different ways and will increasingly reflect regional and sub regional activity. To facilitate this we propose that:
- forces and authorities migrate to the standard contract conditions developed by BuyingSolutions (which a number of regions have already adopted)
  - the NPIA procurement resource seeks to extend support to the work of regional procurement champions
  - forces consider sharing procurement services with neighbouring forces to facilitate collaboration, brigade regional plans and maximise use of limited resources
  - Other wider market related solutions are considered that aggregate the management of national volumes across common in-direct spend categories.

- 3.3 Repositioning the procurement strategy requires, ideally, better management information systems across the police service. Service-wide procurement plans, contract management information and spend data is not routinely available across forces. Mapping the services' spending would ideally be routed through an online police market-place to make purchasing as easy as "Amazon" procurement. A strategy has been considered by the Procurement Portfolio but funding is not in place. Cabinet will want to recognise the importance of effective procurement function as a key part of the efficiency agenda. We believe there is a strong case for promoting the regional role in procurement (or sub-regional depending on size) and for reducing the local, individual, force component.
- 3.4

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 The previous government set out a target of £200m of savings from non-IT procurement activity. A savings trajectory had been discussed within ACPO procurement and the Home Office and the latest copy is [attached](#).
- 4.2 There is no shared consensus about the definition of a procurement saving and we have proposed that this should be consistent, preferably based on OGC criteria. The NPIA is in the process of agreeing guidance with the Home Office and National Audit Office to ensure that the service adopts a common approach to the recording of procurement savings. Procurement savings arise not just from acquisition savings, but also from spend avoidance, specification reduction, better contract management and reduced overheads.

#### **5. Human Rights Audit**

- 5.1 Human Rights issues have been considered in the formulation of this paper and the proposal found to be HR compliant.

#### **6. Conclusion**

- 6.1 In order to achieve £200m savings from non-IT procurement, a revised approach to procurement activity within the police service is essential. Adoption of the four proposals included in this paper will assist with the delivery of further efficiency gains.

#### **7. Decision[s] Required**

- 7.1 Cabinet is asked to endorse the principles and approach outlined in the four proposals in paragraph 3.2 (i)-(iv):
- adoption of standard specifications
  - application of demand management
  - effective contract and supplier management
  - regional or sub-regional approach to indirect procurement.

**Grahame Maxwell**  
**Chief Constable**  
**Head of Finance and Resources Business Area**

**Peter Neyroud**  
**Chief Constable**  
**NPIA Chief Executive**

Version 4/2010

**NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE**

**To: The Chairman and Members  
of the North West Joint Committee**

**Meeting: 30 July 2010**

**Home Office Strategy – Future of Policing**

**Report of the Chief Executive of Lancashire Police Authority**

**1. Purpose of the Report**

To advise the Chairman and Members of the Committee of the latest position in respect of the Coalition Government proposals on the future of Policing.

To update members in respect of the support given by the Association of Police Authority Chief Executives and PATS to the APA secretariat at the request of the APA Council.

To advise members of the current position in respect of timescales for responses to the Home Office.

**2. Recommendation**

Members are requested to consider whether a North West view of the proposed Paving Document should be developed.

There are a number of pieces of advice that will be needed by Police Authorities and it is recommended that a collaborative approach be taken with work undertaken on a pan North West basis.

Members are requested to note the papers prepared by APACE and submitted to the APA (Appendix 1) and the APA submission to the Home Office. (Appendix 2)

### 3. Background to the Report

- 3.4 The Coalition Government set out their proposals for the reform of Policing in the Coalition agreement published in May 2010. The Home Secretary and the Policing and Justice Minister, Nick Herbert have confirmed the Governments intention to publish a "paving document" and a Ministerial Statement before parliament rises. This will be a precursor to the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill to be laid before Parliament in the next session. The government have confirmed that this bill will include a number of matters including a full review of the terms and conditions for police officer employment and measures to make the police more accountable through oversight by a directly elected individual, who will be subject to strict checks and balances by locally elected individuals.
- 3.5 The Policing Minister has confirmed the government's intention to continue to seek input from policing professionals before the introduction of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill. The APA Council has adopted the following motion: **"To recognise the political will of the Government to implement reform. In principle the APA continues to have significant concerns about the model of policing governance being pursued by the coalition government, and it is not one that the APA would choose. However, on the condition that the Government wishes to engage constructively with the APA we will respond positively to influence the detail and to shape the outcome of changes to police governance and accountability, and other strategic issues."**
- 3.6 The detail behind the proposals is not clear and is the subject of discussion at all levels in the Home Office with APA, ACPO, LGA and a range of other interested parties. There are a number of issues that will need to be considered whatever the structure of the DEI and any supporting bodies and there is an argument that given that the time to influence decisions is before they are made, there are opportunities to be engaged with the Home Office colleagues whilst they are drafting the legislation. It is obviously a matter for individual authorities to decide how far and to what level they wish to be engaged in that process.
- 3.7 It is clear that there is an expectation that Collaboration and Joint working will play a strong part in the future management of resources across policing. Government has indicated that it is likely that there will be a role for the DEI to secure this. It will be important for Authorities and Chief Constables to consider how this might be effectively delivered. The present arrangements under S 6ZA of the Police Act 1996, give Authorities a Duty to secure collaboration. It is not clear if this is intended to be replicated and it is also not clear how this might impact on matters which relate to securing collaboration where there is a difference of view between the Chief Constable and the DEI.

3.8 As well as representations on the DEI and there will need to be consideration of any potential transitional arrangements. These have started and confirmation has been received from the Home Office that so far as existing Independent Members are concerned, transitional arrangements will be provided for to allow Authorities, if they choose, not to hold additional recruitment processes. Again, this is not a subject that has been clearly defined but the APA has been asked as statutory consultee to respond back to government by the 23 July. An oral update will be presented to the Committee. As it becomes clearer whether the Government intends the DEI to be a corporate entity, there are a number of other matters including the status of Staff employed by Authorities which will need further clarity.

3.9 There are a series of meetings arranged in August by the APA for Chairs and Chief Executives. In order to try to capture people during the holiday period, there are two meetings arranged for the 4<sup>th</sup> August and 26<sup>th</sup> August. It is also proposed that a full APA Emergency Council meeting is held on 1<sup>st</sup> September.

#### **4. Financial and Staffing Implications**

As yet the implications are not clearly stated, the Policing Minister has stated that the Cost of Elections will be an additional cost but there is not expected to be any additional cost of delivering altered arrangements.

#### **5. Risk Assessment**

If Police Authorities do not involve themselves with the thinking of the Government on the matters which are to be in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill, they will have limited ability to influence its contents. Although Authorities may wish to be engaged with the Home Office on the Bill's passage through Parliament, the most likely opportunity to influence the detail is at the drafting stage.

#### **6. Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment**

None at this time.

#### **7. Environmental Impact Assessment**

None at this time.

**8. Conclusion**

This is a fast moving and complex situation and it is important that Authorities consider the arrangements that they have in place to respond appropriately.

**Miranda Carruthers-Watt  
Chief Executive  
Lancashire Police Authority**

**Background Papers**

The Coalition: our programme for government



**The future of policing – key strategic challenges**  
**Comments from the Association of Police Authority Chief Executives (APACE)**  
**for consideration by the Association of Police Authorities (APA)**

1. These comments are made in the context of the Coalition Government's agreement announced in May, the Queen's Speech together with supplemental provided in speeches by the Home Secretary, Policing Minister and senior Home Office officials during the recent APA/ACPO conference.
2. The Home Office is seeking views from both the APA and Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) on the following six areas of strategic reform:
  - Value for money and resources
  - Local accountability
  - The national policing landscape
  - Performance, bureaucracy and transparency
  - Workforce reform
  - Criminal justice reform
3. We would suggest that a seventh area is covered by the APA which relates to the transition required from the present governance and accountability arrangements to those implemented through legislation. In addition each of these areas should be viewed in the context of the desired outcome for policing in the early decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
4. There have been many reports into policing in recent decades but perhaps the one tackling governance and accountability issues in depth was the work prior to the establishment of the Police Service of Northern Ireland. As stated in the Report of the Independent Commission on Policing in Northern Ireland (the Patten Report), policing is an integral part of the system of law which underpins a healthy and democratic society. It is thus perhaps inevitable that while governments introduce legislation which alters the specific powers given to police officers fairly frequently, the opportunity substantially to revisit the legislative framework underpinning policing occurs relatively infrequently with only two such Acts having been passed in the last fifty years (the Police Acts of 1964 and 1996). The opportunity afforded by the current Government's proposals must therefore be viewed as such– an opportunity to be taken for the benefit of communities, those whom the police, government and any policing governance structure serve. There must therefore be clarity in defining the outcomes desired for policing.

The legislation once introduced, should be considered as an international exemplar and capable of underpinning policing for future decades. To minimise the strategic risks associated with the change it will be important to consider how the strengths within the current system are maintained and enhanced alongside what is acknowledged to be an opportunity for more fundamental change. To this end the Government's stated aim of rebalancing the tripartite is very much welcomed. This rebalancing should not only be between the centre and the local but also between the two elements, the chief police officer and the governance structure, at the local level.

5. Despite being a service with a distinguished history of nearly 200 years, the service has increasingly become structured around the short to medium term. This approach is inherent in a number of practices and procedures associated with the service: fixed term appointments of chief officers for five years; three-year strategic plans; a rank and career structure which sees police officers moving every two to three years and governments with up to five-year terms. The challenges facing policing require a longer-term view. This has been reflected in 'Learning Lessons; an overview of the first ten joint inspections of police authorities by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and the Audit Commission' which concluded that most police authorities inspected are not taking a sufficiently strategic lead in deciding the longer-term shape of policing for their area. While the financial challenges facing the service will require short and medium term actions, such actions must be viewed in the context of their impact on and the need for longer-term policing delivery.
6. To this end it is helpful to be reminded, as the Policing Minister did at the ACPO/APA conference, of the original principles put forward by Robert Peel. The challenge is to apply those principles to the complexities facing modern policing. This includes meeting the needs of a diverse society where the crime and disorder referred to by Peel ranges from anti-social behaviour through to highly sophisticated and well funded international organised crime groups.
7. Those with governance and accountability responsibilities for policing must be equipped to ensure that these complexities are addressed. The Government's stated intention to move from bureaucratic accountability to democratic accountability will only be achieved if those in the role can truly be the primary influence on policing in terms of policing governance. While recognising operational independence, those charged with governance should be capable of determining policing style as well as holding those who deliver the service to account. For example, communities would expect those exercising governance to influence policing policy on the extent to which Tasers are used in the delivery of law and order, as well as being able to require an account of their use in any individual scenario or location.

8. These introductory paragraphs have focused on governance and accountability at both national and local levels. Governance should reside at the highest executive and non-executive levels within an organisation, for policing this is force level. This accords with the good governance standard. The distinction between governance and accountability is that accountability is the process by which policing is overseen and legitimised and through which the views of stakeholders are taken into account by the organisation. Consideration will need to be given to the respective roles of any governance structures in both the governance and/or accountability functions.
9. For the public it is unlikely that, even in the smallest forces, they would define force level as local in their own terms. Therefore any governance model needs to accommodate the needs of the 'local' as defined by those that work and live in a force area. At the most local level it would seem more appropriate to consider the concepts of answerability and responsiveness rather than accountability. By definition, such local structures are likely to be many and varied and it is recognised that this variety is essential to reflect the diverse needs of diverse neighbourhoods. At neighbourhood level less formal structures already exist. Force level governance structures must have the ability to accommodate such structures and be linked in a way to ensure that local policing is answerable to local communities and their views are taken into account when determining local policing priorities without creating unnecessary bureaucracy.
10. Having provided some context, comment is made on the areas for strategic reform.

### **Value for money and resources**

11. There are two complementary but distinct issues to be addressed. Firstly there is the quantum of resource available and secondly how value for money is achieved in the use of that resource. It is recognised that the former is going to be significantly less in future years and therefore this impacts significantly on the latter. Despite a raft of inspection activity in this area, whether by HMIC or the Audit Commission, there is still no agreed definition of value for money. It is important to understand whose value is being considered against the expenditure of whose money. In this context local circumstance will dictate the evaluation of services and their prioritisation by the bodies charged with their delivery. The scale of the financial challenge will require a fundamental rethink. It must not mean indiscriminate proportionate cuts, and while the application of 'six sigma' and 'lean business' together with proven effective programmes such as "Operation Quest" will improve efficiency, it will not deliver the scale of savings required. It will be necessary to ask questions, such as:
  - Are basic command units sustainable?
  - Is the current model of neighbourhood policing sustainable?
  - What is the level of resilience required, both locally and nationally, to deliver the desired outcomes for British policing?

- What activities require the use of warranted officers?
- Is it time for there to be a statutory definition of what constitutes 'policing services' so that finite resources can be properly allocated on that basis?
- Linked to the point above, should the police service cease to be the 'provider of last resort' in matters that fall within the statutory functions of other organisations or public bodies, e.g. noise abatement, stray dogs etc?
- Should there be a presumption of collaboration unless there is a reason not to do so; a reversal of the position largely adopted to date?
- Does the current policing model allow local delivery of value for money when 80-85% of the costs of the service are staffing costs which are regulated and agreed centrally?
- Is there a continuing role for centrally set standards, such as those for protective services, which, while providing certainty of delivery, limit local flexibility in the use of resources?
- Is there a role for centrally mandating collaboration and how does it fit the stated objective for increased localism and local democratic accountability?
- Where does the delivery of policing fit with the concept of more integrated delivery of local services, for example the potential synergies across all emergency services and/or local government?
- How can the model for policing ensure that spending decisions are made for the longer as well as the short to medium term, for example estates strategies, ICT capital investment?
- How can we ensure stability in medium term financial planning? For example, three year funding settlements have been welcomed by authorities and forces because they support medium-term financial planning and service development.
- How will the approach to budget reductions impact on individual forces in the light of the current balance in funding between the local raised precept and central grants? For example a 25% cut in central grant to those with a 50:50 split between grant and precept would produce an overall budget cut of 12.5% compared to current spend (assuming a freeze in council tax). The same cut to a force with a 68:32 grant to precept split would produce an overall budget cut of 17%.
- What local fund raising freedoms will be provided to a directly elected individual elected on a mandate of increased spending on policing?

## Accountability

12. While the Home Office has sought views on local accountability, it is believed that local accountability cannot be viewed in isolation. It needs to be seen in the context of the overall governance and accountability framework for policing. The Patten Report usefully categorises various aspects of accountability:

- *Democratic* accountability by which elected representatives of a community tell the police what sort of service they want from the police and hold the police to account for delivering it
- *Transparency* by which the community is kept informed and can ask questions about what the police are doing and why
- *Legal* accountability by which the police are held to account if they misuse their powers
- *Financial* accountability by which the police service are audited and held to account for its delivery of value for public money
- *Internal* accountability by which officers are accountable within a police organisation

13. These aspects need to be reflected in any governance model which should also accord with the six core principles of good governance<sup>1</sup>. Legislation to introduce a revised model of governance should be tested against both the aspects of accountability above and the principles. Having given consideration to what makes up an accountability role, what is of critical significance is how the accountability responsibilities are discharged.

14. The Home Office has only sought comments on accountability but this ignores governance. Views have also not been sought specifically on the operational independence of the police. While this is rightly prized by police officers and it is recognised that this might not require statutory definition<sup>2</sup>, some shared understanding of demarcation needs to be explored and agreed. Some of the practical issues are perhaps helpfully illustrated as follows:

- If, having consulted their communities, a directly elected individual believes that the use of s.44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 is causing significant concern. That individual raises this with the local chief officer and asks that the use of this power (which has now been judged to be unlawful by the European Court of Human Rights) be suspended. The chief officer disagrees and argues that this domestic legislation remains intact and offers the police an invaluable tool in countering terrorism. The head of the regional CTU also takes this view. Is this a question in which 'operational independence' trumps the view of the elected individual and those of their communities? If so, what does this say about the 'rebalancing' of policing accountability, influence and control?

---

<sup>1</sup> Independent Commission for Good Governance in Public Services; January 2005

<sup>2</sup> This area is currently governed by the common law – for a useful summary of the issues and authorities see *R v Chief Constable of Sussex, ex parte International Trader's Ferry Ltd* [1998] All ER (D) 568

- In advance of a planned and controversial demonstration community representatives express concerns about the expected approach to be taken by their force. They raise these concerns with their directly elected individual who in turn raises them with the chief officer. In the decisions around policing style that follow, is this ultimately a purely 'operational' matter for the police to determine?
- The governance entity for a policing area questions the proportional allocation of resource between neighbourhood policing and protective services, asking the chief officer to allocate substantial sums towards participatory budgeting in which the communities of the area have a direct say in prioritising spend. What happens when agreement cannot be reached with the chief officer?
- What is the role of the local governance structure in collaboration, regional and national policing delivery?
- When selecting an HR or ICT system for the future efficiency and effectiveness of the force, is the decision to outsource some services and deliver others from within an 'operational' matter reserved to the chief officer?
- A decision to close a police station. In balancing any opposition by the local community with the costs and affordability of the estates management function, where does the final decision lie and what is the rationale behind that process?
- What will communities expect those directly elected to be able to do in respect of individual and/or collective concerns on policing matters? Will they expect them to have some powers to resolve community grievances (complaints) or have sanctions falling short of dismissal in respect of chief officers whose performance is unsatisfactory?
- What is the link between operational independence and the management of assets such as property and does this require all staff to be placed under the direction and control of a chief officer?
- Is there a model in which the role of chief constable is analogous to that of a chief operating officer rather than a chief executive?
- How can the arrangements ensure that those with governance responsibilities take account of the full range of policing needs, including protective services and counter-terrorism? Such matters are often not raised by local communities as priorities as fortunately they rarely impact on our daily lives. However the infrequency of occurrence does not correlate to the expertise and skills required on the relative small number of occasions demands are made.

15. The Home Secretary and Policing Minister have indicated that those who are directly elected will set local priorities, set the budget and precept, appoint and dismiss the chief officer together with being responsible for everything that forces currently do; from counter-terrorism to neighbourhood policing. Of the functions presented, the final one relates to accountability whereas the others are executive functions and those of governance. However these functions do not address what are considered fundamental questions around roles and responsibilities given in the preceding bulleted list.
16. Form will need to follow function. Once the breadth of function and responsibility is determined, for all elements of the tripartite arrangement, then the legislative framework and the day-to-day operation of that framework can be developed. In effect this is the detail that will be the manifestation of the rebalancing of the tripartite arrangement, giving effect to the desired roles for the Home Secretary, chief officer and directly elected individuals.
17. Function will also need to be taken into account when determining the checks and balances both required of and inherent in our public institutions when power is invested in a single individual. The challenges faced by the directly elected individual are considerable. Arrangements will be necessary to equip them to be able to perform their role. They will need to represent the interests of constituencies which in the main are significantly bigger than any other constitutional arrangement in place in England and Wales. They will be working with a range of different local government structures. One size is unlikely to fit all and local flexibility is both desirable and to be expected. This is especially so in Wales where Local Government comes within the purview of the Wales Assembly Government.
18. While checks and balances are essential to any governance model, steps must be taken to ensure that the governance model does not have the unintended consequence of diverting attention from the desired outcome in relation to policing. For example, those drawn from constituent local authorities to form a check and balance body may be from a different political grouping than the directly elected individual. This risks those charged with governance and accountability having to spend a disproportionate amount of time meeting the demands of their own scrutiny body rather than spending that time holding the chief officer to account.
19. There also needs to be clarity on the potentially cluttered landscape of elected individuals with a claim to a community safety mandate. The clarity needed should not only 'de-clutter' this landscape; opportunity should also be taken to ensure that the landscape is coherent and capable of being fully understood by citizens. This includes local ward councillors, directly elected individuals, elected mayors, MPs and the Government's own electoral mandate. Are there arrangements that should be implemented now to identify the standing of a directly elected individual within this landscape? For Wales, any changes to the partnership landscape will need the agreement of the Welsh Assembly Government.

20. Police forces are significant businesses both in terms of budget and number of employees with a considerable depth of expertise and access to information. Against that background. There may be a need to complement the skills of those directly elected by providing them with the ability to obtain advice and information whether through an executive team to support them and/or appointment of the equivalent of non-executive Board support. In addition they need to consider deputising functions to permit the office and function to continue in the event of the individual being unable to fulfil their duties.
21. The exercise of all public functions should be undertaken within a governance framework in which there is transparency and effective scrutiny. Therefore, whatever powers are given to the governance body, they must be the subject of scrutiny so that there is a transparent examination and holding to account for decisions which are taken. There must be a role for people whose skills and abilities support effective decision-making in relations to governance, and thereby scrutiny, in relation to strategic policy making. The outcome of the first tranche of police authority inspections has demonstrated that the mix of both independent members and those from local councils has been helpful in performing a similar function in respect of holding the account the chief officer.
22. The scrutiny model must be one that is readily understood by communities. The complexity of the local government structures within local government areas are not without challenge in terms of building links into the scrutiny role. It may be helpful to consider any model from the perspective of the citizen to achieve the outcomes desired in a proportionate and effective manner.
23. This paper has not dealt with a number of detailed aspects of the possible revisions to governance which are covered in the APACE paper 'Proposals for Policing Reform' prepared in June. This deals with issues such as partnerships and constituency. Reference is therefore made to this document for such further details.

### **National policing landscape**

24. This document has already made reference to the rebalancing of the tripartite arrangements which also has relevance to the national policing landscape. The following points may be worthy of consideration:
  - How does the tripartite arrangement fit in to the wider policing and community safety landscape at a local level?
  - What is the relationship to be between the Home Secretary and any governance structure at local level? Does local extend to links at sub-force level, such as statutory bodies such as CDRPs, Children's Trusts or even neighbourhood structures?
  - What should be the role and function of the National Policing Board, if any?

- How does territorial policing, both for forces and their governance structures, link into other individual policing bodies such as SOCA/Border Policing?
- How can the potentially competing community safety mandates of those elected locally be reconciled, that is, local ward councillors, potentially mayors in major cities and directly elected individuals?
- Is there a need for a further redefinition of the role of HMIC? They have recently set out an ambition to be the public's fierce advocate. This ambition has the potential to conflict with those who are directly elected who will argue that it is a central tenet of their direct democratic mandate.
- How can ACPO's role be appropriately redefined so that ACPO plays a legitimate and coherent role in the policing landscape? Would the creation of a 'professional body' need to be accompanied by the characteristics usually associated with such bodies, including the ability to discipline, 'strike off'?
- What is proposed in relation to the national role of both the MPA and the MPS, for example in matters of counter-terrorism and diplomatic protection?
- What structures, if any, should remain or be established at sub-force level? Is there a continuing role or need for community safety partnerships and if so, how do they work with a revised governance model for policing?
- Should there be flexibility in structures to accommodate the national variation, for example Wales with the Welsh Assembly, London, two tier and single tier local government?
- What are the respective future roles of the 'regulators' such as HMIC, Audit Commission and the Surveillance Commissioner?
- Is there an opportunity to de-clutter the landscape both for locality and inspectorates?
- What role should any directly elected individual have in respect of complaints? In light of the compelling research about satisfaction and expectation, the ability of one single body to deal with lower level complaints about quality of service swiftly and simply is a significant crater in the current 'landscape'.
- Should the opportunity be taken to simplify structures for the benefit and understanding of communities? For example will those directly elected still have duties and responsibilities on airport security executive boards, children's trusts and overview and scrutiny functions?

## **Performance, bureaucracy and transparency**

25. The next two years, if they are to be a period of transition, risk a lacuna in governance. Police authorities potentially risk being seen increasingly as 'lame ducks'. Authorities have already identified the risk of potential member and staff losses during this period. Staff within authorities are equivalent to the Government's own civil service, providing professional advice and support. If this period also coincides with a withdrawal of central influence by the Home Secretary, the space created is likely to be occupied by chief officers, creating further imbalance rather than rebalancing of the tripartite arrangements.
26. It is suggested that the principle underpinning any performance framework should be that it seeks no other information than that which is necessary for the successful management of a business. For policing this must include an understanding of those performance metrics which can be used to provide communities with the reassurance that the service is meeting their needs together with the more usual internal management metrics associated with any business. The assumption behind the provision of information to the public should be that in principle all data and information should be readily available and accessible unless there is a risk to public safety through its release.
27. In effect the preceding paragraph encapsulates what is needed by two elements of the tripartite. It is believed that the question of what the Home Secretary needs to assure herself of the overall health of British policing must also be addressed. What role is intended for the Home Secretary should governance be perceived to be failing both collectively but also in the case of an individual force? Is this role one for a refocused HMIC?
28. As in any part of the public sector there should be an appropriate focus on improvement. A significant gap in the current arrangements has been the support provided for improvement in role. This statement is made in the context of comparing the sector to the transformational support provided to local authorities. While the Home Secretary may reserve powers for those who are deemed to be 'failing', those falling 'short' should be able to find support to improve and enhance their performance. This applies both to forces and those charged with governance. This by implication warrants the use of benchmarking, both within the sector but also with relevant comparators in the public and private sectors. In Wales, inspection has been replaced with a programme of improvement.
29. Those elected are likely to have been successful on a mandate of meeting local concerns. However those charged with holding the chief officer to account must not lose sight of the wider policing function. This risks a replay of the position outlined in the report of Sir Denis O'Connor; 'Closing the Gap' where over a sustained period insufficient attention and resource had been allocated to the provision of protective services.

30. There continues to be a need for both internal and external audit of the probity of the use of public resource both by individuals and collectively. A role for inspection continues but the opportunity should be taken to ensure rationalisation of the audit and inspection framework. Audit and inspection must deliver assessments which add value to the sector without making disproportionate demands on the sector.
31. A review of the bureaucracy associated with policing must also include bureaucracy in governance. The opportunity afforded by new legislation should be used to not only establish a robust governance framework but also to remove those unnecessary and disproportionate statutory burdens placed on governance bodies.

### **Workforce reform**

32. While considerable work has been undertaken on workforce modernisation, the financial challenge facing the sector will require more fundamental issues to be addressed:

- What resource will be required to provide resilience in policing and what is the make-up of that resource? What is the need for the warranted officer in this model?
- Those who are directly elected must have access to the necessary professional advice to be able to challenge the chief officer on workforce issues. This is particularly the case where the vast bulk of expenditure is people related. For those who are directly elected with overall responsibility for budget and delivery they must be capable of challenging the neighbourhood policing model being used, whether uniformed officers are being used in appropriate roles and whether police staff are being used effectively.
- Should a more radical approach be taken to workforce issues? Is this the time to bring all police officers into the employment framework which applies to all others? There are forces whose police officers are employees, for example the Civil Nuclear Constabulary. There are also others who enforce the law through the exercise of considerable warranted powers, such as revenue and customs, who do so in the capacity as employees. Would this provide for greater local flexibility? However recognition would be needed of the requirements of the service to support national policing demands such as those associated with events such as the Olympics.
- The current framework for policing, including the national negotiating machinery, the regulatory framework, the status of officer of the crown and pension scheme gives the sector rigidity, the corollary of which is a significantly reduced degree of managerial discretion. The product of this is a lack of nimbleness that hinders the police service's ability to respond and deliver in times of financial restraint. For example the inability to offer redundancy as part of any restructuring or the drawing in of expertise and skills at ranks other than constable. It also directly undermines claims towards localism.
- What is the correct make up of the policing family? For example the current number of PCSOs is largely a function of the level of grant associated with their provision.

- What is their role into the future?
  - The proposed review of police and police staff terms and conditions provides a timely opportunity for a wide ranging review focused on placing police and police staff pay and conditions on a modern 21<sup>st</sup> century footing that is flexible, fit for purpose and supports service needs. It also provides the opportunity to introduce the sort of flexibilities that will enable forces/authorities to utilise and deploy the workforce to best effect to support the delivery of policing plans, to achieve value for money and secure the right workforce mix.
33. In his presentation to the ACPO/APA Conference, Stephen Rimmer discussed the leadership capabilities necessary to drive out costs, preparedness to challenge and be challenged, responsiveness to public expectations and getting to the other side of complexity. This was said in the context of the police officers but these capabilities must also characterise those charged with governance. Not only must those charged with governance have these capabilities they must ensure that the service, throughout its structures, both for police officers and police staff, is reflective of the communities they serve. There continues to be significant under representation of women and BME officers and staff in the higher ranks and roles of the service.
34. The proposals for directly elected individuals appear to only provide a role for them in the appointment of the chief constable. Comparison with other parts of the public sector would demonstrate a joint approach to the appointment of the most senior levels within an organisation. While appointments to such posts are currently within the statutory remit of authorities, there is almost always joint working between an authority and its chief officer in the process leading to appointment. The context to chief officer appointments is that those applying are drawn from a relatively small field with appointments potentially made by a small number of individuals. There are significant risks of a lack of transparency and openness within such a small network. This must be guarded against as the highest ranks of the service have yet to be representative of the communities they serve.
35. There has been much criticism levied at the current regulatory framework which determines the level of pay for chief officers with anecdotal evidence of 'alternative packages' being negotiated. The current approach is untenable and a decision is needed on whether to move to locally negotiated packages or a national framework which is observed. Whichever route there must be transparency in the package both within the service but more importantly to the public.
36. The role, if any, for the Home Secretary needs to be clarified. It could be argued that the move away from central control negates the need for Home Secretary involvement in chief officer appointments. The sector does not view the current Senior Appointment Panel process as adding any value.

## **Criminal Justice Reform**

37. The police are often viewed by the public as the owners of the whole criminal justice system. Trust and confidence in the police is associated with the eventual criminal justice outcome and therefore any review of policing should incorporate criminal justice reforms. Such reforms need to address bureaucracy together with the provision of information on criminal justice outcomes to the public. Therefore the suggestion of those who are directly elected having a significant role in the criminal justice arena is welcomed. As the Home Office has indicated that this aspect of reform is not under the same time pressures as the others areas covered in this paper, further details are not provided.

## **Transition**

38. The Government's proposals will require installing new accountability structures created in fast time under difficult conditions in a highly regulated and scrutinised environment. The importance of the transition cannot be overstated. Transition will need to encompass the tasks necessary to establish the revised arrangements while ensuring that governance and accountability of the policing continues to be effective in the transition period. To this end transitional issues need to be addressed with immediate effect, even during the course of the development of policy and legislation. Transitional issues will need to:

- Identify which areas of the precursor police authorities and forces are implicated in the establishment of the revised structures
- Establish effective co-ordination and co-operation between all relevant bodies including existing authorities and forces, Home Office, DCLG, WAG, Treasury and other regulators
- Establish the electoral framework, and the mechanisms for enabling such elections, the first of their kind, to take place
- Establish the revised arrangements to include the:
  - Establishment of the appropriate legal entities
  - Providing for transfer of staff and, if necessary, selection and recruitment
  - Establishment of governance, accountability and control frameworks
- Establish mechanisms for those charged with governance to engage with their communities
- Develop planning documentation, statutory and otherwise
- Establish budget requirements and ensuring adequate and timely budget provision, to include precepting provisions

- Establish the technical environment for the governance structures
- Establish the operational environment, policies, procedures and processes of the revised governance structures
- Develop communication and public relations strategy and mechanisms for interfacing with the external environment
- Provide an appropriate work environment for the governance body, for example local authorities who currently host police authorities may be unwilling to continue to offer such an arrangement into the future those directly elected may consider their independence compromised by co-location with the force.
- Ensure that the liabilities of the precursor authorities are properly transferred

APACE  
11 July 2010



**Submission to the Home Office on the Future Policing Landscape**

**v.2**

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 The APA has been invited to submit views to assist the development of a public-facing strategy document on police reform, commissioned by the new coalition Government. This review of policing provides a real opportunity to reform the policing landscape, provide greater clarity and rationalisation between local and national organisations, stronger public accountability, and increased value for money. The APA is fully committed to seizing this opportunity to address many of the issues which are ripe for reform.

1.2 As a statutory consultee with a formal governance structure it is essential that we have sufficient time to consult fully with our membership who represent the interests of the public. Upon publication of the Government's strategy paper we would recommend a twelve week period to enable full and proper consultation in accordance with Cabinet Office rules.

1.3 This submission will provide an initial view in terms of the outcomes the reforms are seeking to achieve, considerations in terms of the transition and change management programme, and a more detailed analysis of the six key headings for reform provided by the Home Office. Although there are immediate priorities relating to the proposed Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill, the interdependent nature of policing means one area of policing cannot be radically reformed without an understanding and assessment of the implications on wider service delivery.

1.5 The Government's stated imperatives for change are to rebalance the tripartite relationship to strengthen the democratic accountability of policing at the local level and to secure the efficiencies necessary to address the fiscal deficit. As the voice of the community and customer the APA will embrace this opportunity to influence these proposed reforms; the aspiration to strengthen the voice at the local level is to be welcomed but should not lead to the community being disenfranchised at the national level. It is equally important that these reforms create the conditions which maximise the opportunity to deliver real value for money.

1.6 Policing is a critical national service and its delivery must be maintained through any change programme. Continuity will be essential and all risks associated with such fundamental change must be identified, managed and resourced as part of a comprehensive transition plan.

## Defining the Outcome

1.7 The APA believes that all reform must take place in the context of clearly defined outcomes and in this case we would expect to see clear benefits for our communities. In the difficult financial climate, it is particularly important that efficiency and value for money are key considerations – we cannot afford to make changes for the sake of change, but to support the need for clearly defined improvements. The APA would like to see the Strategy identify the measurable objectives necessary to validate the outcomes.

1.8 More specifically, the APA has identified the following principles that should underpin the reforms and supporting change programme:

- We must continue to invest in the **tripartite relationship** but it must be more clearly defined. It must balance the policing requirements of local democratic accountability, delivered by effective professionals, supported and enabled by the Home Secretary. To be effective the tripartite must operate within a national framework that links the local to the national. In Wales it needs to be recognised that there is another partner in the policing arrangement, the Wales Assembly Government (WAG).
- **Efficiency and value for money** must be a core principle – all proposed changes should be supported by a comprehensively costed plan, which takes into account both short and long term investments required, and the potential savings to be accrued. The particular aim should be to see significant and clearly defined savings over a five year period. No national reform should take place at the expense of local service delivery.
- Reforms should aim to enhance service delivery by **reducing unnecessary bureaucracy** in order to free up the police to focus on effective operational delivery. We should also use these reforms to enhance the professional management of resources. Freeing up the service to continue to deliver within a difficult financial climate will be essential to delivering efficiency and effectiveness.
- The principle of **public accountability** should be demonstrated at all levels of reform. Ensuring the views of the public are represented from the very local to the most strategic levels will be crucial if democratic accountability is to be genuinely achieved. Equally, understanding and managing public expectations through the reform programme will be essential to ensure the service continues to raise confidence and increase satisfaction.
- The **principle of flexibility** needs to be adopted in the process of reform and the drafting of legislation, to reflect localism in its widest sense. One size does not fit all in relation to policing and policing governance, and the requirements in relation to a governance model will differ from area to area.

## **2.0 Workforce Review**

### **Funding - CSR**

2.1 Funding arrangements must support the new policing model and its intent therefore any review of the model should be considered in conjunction with the financial arrangements required to deliver and sustain it.

#### *Areas for Consideration:*

2.1.1 Should specific grants for national policing functions, including CT, Borders and SOCA be maintained and if so what are the implications for national governance and oversight. Particular consideration should be given to the link between local and national governance in this respect.

2.1.2 The Home Office will need to consider the allocation of grants and future funding. Options might include:

- Whether to set criteria for allocation of funding streams; or
- Should they become part of an overall fund and allocated accordingly; or
- Whether to accept the need for specific grant funding for specialist areas.

2.1.3 Is there a need to develop an approach for consolidating CDRP and CSP funding into a single fund, within the principles of Total Place, administered by local police governance arrangements.

2.1.4 Consider the need to "top-slice" expenditure for all policing functions of national interest. Such as a Collaboration fund and a National Business improvement fund.

2.1.5 The Home Office should consider an immediate review of the police funding formula and recognize that this needs to be updated to take into account 21st Century requirements/needs and the principles of equity. The issue of Capping needs to be reviewed to consider whether there should be flexibility for local communities to determine the appropriate level. The Wales dimension will also have to be taken into account and addressed in consultation with the Welsh Assembly.

### **Funding - Precept**

2.2 Precepting allows communities to theoretically have more policing. If a community 'wants' the gold standard service, they have the option to contribute more. Under new accountability arrangements, the check and balance on funding would be community opinion on service delivery and VFM.

#### *The APA believes further thought should be given to*

2.2.1 The context of greater local democratic accountability and the implications of capping from 2013/14 coupled with the possible removal of damping from the formula.

2.2.2 Consideration of the prospects for re-calibrating the balance between central and local funding (ie. Reduce central spending and increasing local taxation)?

2.2.3 Consider check and balance on excessive local tax, to reinforce 'power to the people'.

## **Value for Money**

2.3 Responsibility for achieving and measuring VFM must reside where expenditure falls. The localism agenda means that responsibility for achieving VFM at the local level rests with the governance body. Responsibility for cross border and national delivery outcomes must also be considered. The VFM agenda must ensure a direct line of accountability between budget holders and outcomes to incentivise VFM improvement.

2.4 There are three issues which are best handled at the national level: Policing improvement, which requires recording, dissemination and implementation of best practice, inspection and reporting of VFM performance, and procurement.

### *Areas for Consideration:*

2.4.1 VFM will be seen as a core activity by the governance body and driven from the top.

2.4.2 Assign one national assessor for VFM and performance to reduce confusion and bureaucracy.

2.4.3 Consolidate and improve support mechanisms for VFM performance improvement – especially functions of knowledge sharing and implementation support.

2.4.4 Greater VFM gains will be achieved through changes to police regulations on pay and conditions of service.

2.4.5 The need for a body performing an improvement/support function to ensure VFM is driven at the national level.

2.4.6 Corporate and back office functions for blue light services are perceived as congruous, offering potential efficiency opportunities through collaboration and sharing.

## **Workforce Reform**

2.5 Many VFM and performance improvement initiatives have limited potential because of structural rigidity in pay and reward arrangements. Removing these rigidities should release significant savings and productivity improvements, particularly from workforce modernisation (mix) models and better matching resources to demand.

2.6 Existing structures for determining pay and conditions may not be the most effective vehicles for achieving change. Whilst short term productivity improvement is possible, longer term changes to corporate culture, incentives and leadership development require significant re-working of pay and reward structures. The different pay and conditions of service between police officers and police staff impose significant barriers to business improvement– especially regarding workforce mix and inter-force collaboration.

### *Areas for Consideration:*

2.6.1 The governance body should be the statutory employer, with the ability to shape their workforce to satisfy policing needs.

2.6.2 Review of the effectiveness of existing structures for determining pay and conditions of service (PNB).

2.6.3 Review of remuneration and conditions of service to eliminate structural rigidities associated with, for example, overtime, deployment, mutual aid, workforce mix, etc. (must include pension entitlements)

2.6.4 The need for political commitment to driving the necessary changes to pay and conditions of service. Equally, the tripartite must share collective intent and ambition in this regard.

2.6.5 The ability to devolve greater responsibility and flexibility for determining appropriate pay and reward structures to the local level.

2.6.6 The extent to which empowering staff and enhancing corporate learning have the potential to deliver greater VFM.

### **Leadership**

2.7 The local governance body will recruit and employ policing leaders and will want a firm hand in overseeing how they are identified, nurtured and developed. Talent management is most effectively done centrally as Chief Officers are a national asset. Responsibility for police leadership must be managed equally by the Tripartite to ensure our future policing leaders reflect the equal needs and interests of the community, operational policing and government.

2.8 Communities want reassurances that their policing leaders reflect the diverse communities they serve –the diversity challenge within forces, particularly at senior ranks, has yet to have demonstrated significant progress and the governance body should take responsibility for this issue.

#### Areas for Consideration:

2.9.1 The role and relevance of the Senior Appointments Panel (SAP) in the context of the new policing landscape including the role of the Home Secretary in the appointment of Chief Officers.

2.9.2 The creation of a strategic overarching talent management body at the national level.

2.9.3 The NCPL curriculum and its relevance to any changed governance arrangements if business and management competencies are no longer the direct responsibility of chief officers.

### **3.0 Local Accountability**

3.1 Local accountability has to be seen in the wider context of the overall governance and accountability framework for policing. Any legislation to introduce a revised model of governance should be tested against the Patten report categorisation of accountability and the six core principles of good governance established by the Independent Commission for Good Governance in Public Services.

### *Areas for Consideration:*

- 3.1.1 There is a requirement to rationalise the duties and responsibilities of the governance body to establish its core functions and to ensure that its powers are sufficient to discharge them. The creation of a governing body with functions, duties, and powers prescribed within a single piece of clear legislation will enable improved policing governance.
- 3.1.2 The legal status of the governance body / entity needs to be clarified in order to develop the detail of the model.
- 3.4 Checks and balances – a structure will be required to ensure political balance and to incorporate independent representation. Consideration should also be given to independent members retaining voting rights in any governance structure to reduce the risk of over party-politicisation.
- 3.1.3 The relationship between the governance and scrutiny function and how might existing powers be allocated between a governance body and a checks and balance body. Essentially, form needs to follow function.
- 3.1.4 Legislation should not be framed prescriptively, in order to allow for local interpretation based upon specific geographical and local government conditions. This is particularly pertinent, but not exclusively so, for Wales with a devolved administration.
- 3.1.5 There are significant issues around costs, not only to the Government in holding elections, but also to individuals wishing to stand as candidates. Arrangements need to be structured so that candidates are not excluded on the basis of finance.
- 3.1.6 It is important that eligibility criteria take into account the balance between attracting a diverse mix of candidates to stand for appointment and ensuring that security and competence considerations are fulfilled. We believe it to be important that a time bar should be applied for police officers wishing to stand for appointment.
- 3.1.7 There is a need for effective representation of all communities within the entire geographical area. Ensuring diversity in representation is a key concern, for example, BME candidates will encounter additional difficulties in any direct election process, and it is therefore essential to have an alternative independent route for diverse communities to be represented in the governance regime. The good work that has been undertaken by police authorities with BME communities may be lost if they cannot see how their communities are to be properly represented.
- 3.1.8 Operational independence may not be amenable to or require legal definition, but clarity is required in relation to the 'power of direction' that a governing body has. Some shared understanding of what operational independence is needs to be explored.
- 3.1.9 Whatever the functions of the governance body there will need to be consideration of the requirement for capability support, whether this is an executive team or a non-executive board. In terms of resilience the issue of deputising also needs consideration.
- 3.1.10 In the present fiscal climate the governance body should retain direct control of duties and responsibilities that are not deemed direct operational matters e.g. financial and resource management.

3.1.11 The investing of significant power in one individual gives rise to the potential for the inappropriate exercise of that power and the potential for individuals to be susceptible to undue influence. Will there be powers of censure, override, and ultimately recall, and if so what form will this take?

3.1.12 Will there be a re-balancing of the governance body relationship with regulatory bodies such as IPCC, the Information Commissioner, the Surveillance Commissioner, etc. How would the police / governance body complaints system be configured?

3.1.13 Will the 'fierce public advocate' role of HMI be reconfigured to avoid conflict with the governance body role?

3.1.14 In relation to connecting to strategic partnership's at a local and regional level, e.g. CSPs, LSPs, LCJB, City Regions, how is this envisaged? Locally, who would have the primacy in terms of the community safety mandate?

3.1.15 Without prescribing how, the governance body should have a duty to engage with all local communities.

3.1.16 There is a need to ensure that communities have sufficient information on policing and governance body performance in order to be able to hold them to account

3.1.17 It is intended that the governance body will have greater visibility to the community which is likely to result in more complaints being made directly to the body about the police. Communities will reasonably expect the body to have an active and independent role in investigating complaints made against the police service. Should the governance body have a greater role to investigate ACPO complaints as well as non-ACPO complaints? If the governance body were to take on a greater investigation responsibility for service level complaints, is there still a need for an additional (and bureaucratic) right of appeal to the IPCC if a matter has already been investigated by the independent governance body? What types of complaints might still be appropriate to remain being investigated by the force, for example anti-corruption, managed investigations by the IPCC and Direction and Control complaints?

### **Transitional Arrangements**

3.2 The transition to the governance and accountability structures proposed by the Coalition Government is essentially a risk management exercise. The aspiration should be to deliver the changes seamlessly with no impact to operational policing and service delivery. The management of strategic change of this magnitude requires the articulation of a clear vision of the future and the production of a change management strategy supported by a well resourced implementation plan.

3.3 The importance of this transition cannot be overstated. Transition will need to encompass the tasks necessary to establish the revised arrangements while ensuring that governance and accountability and service delivery of policing continues to be effective during the transition period. Given the ambitious timeframe for change, transitional issues need to be addressed with immediate effect, even during the course of the development of policy and legislation.

*Transitional issues will need to address:*

- 3.3.1 The development and resourcing of the transition plan, incorporating the tripartite leadership as owners and change managers of the transition process.
- 3.3.2 The need to identify the operational and governance challenges and risks during the transitional period, and ensure a risk mitigation plan is in place e.g. ensure no risk is transferred to the 2012 Olympics. This should also reflect the need to motivate and support police authorities through the change programme, protect staff as much as possible and providing good clear communications to help minimise talent loss of both police authority members and staff.
- 3.3.3 Identifying which areas of the precursor police authorities and forces are implicated in the establishment of the revised structures
- 3.3.4 Establishing effective co-ordination and co-operation between all relevant bodies including existing authorities and forces, Home Office, DCLG, WAG, Treasury and other regulators.
- 3.3.5 Establishing the electoral framework and the mechanisms and funding for enabling such elections, the first of their kind, to take place.
- 3.3.6 Establishing the revised arrangements to include the:
  - Establishment of the appropriate legal entities
  - Providing for staff selection and recruitment
  - Establishment of governance, accountability and control frameworks
- 3.3.7 Establishing mechanisms for those charged with governance to engage with their communities.
- 3.3.8 Developing planning documentation, statutory and otherwise.
- 3.3.9 Establishing budget requirements for the change process and ensuring adequate and timely budget provision, to include precepting provisions to sustain the future bodies corporate.
- 3.3.10 Establishing the technical environment for the governance structures.
- 3.3.11 Establishing the operational environment, policies, procedures and processes of the revised local to national governance structures.
- 3.3.12 Developing communication and public relations strategy and mechanisms for interfacing with the external environment to inspire candidates to stand and inform and motivate the public to vote.
- 3.3.13 Providing an appropriate work environment for the governance body, for example local authorities who currently host police authorities may be unwilling to continue to offer such an arrangement into the future, and the governance body may consider its independence compromised by co-location with the force.
- 3.3.14 Underpinning the governance arrangements with an overlap period where existing structures formally handover to their replacement bodies.
- 3.3.15 Ensure that the liabilities of the precursor authorities are properly transferred.

## **4.0 National Policing Landscape**

4.1 The APA believes there are significant opportunities to rationalise the national policing landscape and that underpinning these opportunities are a number of key principles which need to be considered. Amongst these are a need for enhanced accountability of national policing issues such as counter-terrorism and serious and organised crime and associated agencies such as SOCA and any new Border force. This would also include bringing appropriate scrutiny and tripartite accountability to the activities and c.£300m budget of ACPO TAM.

4.2 Securing greater, more locally fostered public trust and confidence in level 2 policing needs to be considered as a priority. Reflecting the concerns of communities, the APA believes that there is a requirement for enhanced co-operation and a greater prioritisation to tackle the threat of serious and organised crime, and this would include 'joining up' the fight against the £20-40billion threat of serious and organised crime with a cross-cutting, public-facing strategy akin to 'Contest'. Underlying this is a value for money principle of greater national coordination in facilitating increased universal procurement where this is demonstrably in the interests of efficiency and effectiveness.

### *Areas for consideration:*

4.2.1 Protect and strengthen the 'golden thread' which links local policing and local accountability to the national level; this both ensures national policy is informed by local concerns and assists local 'buy in' to national priorities. There remains a role for national strategic direction of cross border matters, albeit this direction is best exercised through the medium of a board which brings local and regional perspectives to bear, and assists with local buy in.

4.2.2 Consider the use of statute to ensure that the 'neighbourhoods agenda' crucial to the message and mandate of any individual elected to oversee policing, does not undermine national strategic priorities.

4.2.3 Governance models could stymie moves to national procurement and hence more efficiency and effectiveness. It is important that those tempted to pursue an exclusively local agenda are prevented from doing so in the national interest by statute or practise.

4.2.4 Any move towards a national policing agency (possibly encompassing Borders, Serious Organised crime, CT) must be held to account by a range of those representing the communities served by this agency, not simply the Home Office.

4.2.5 ACPO's 'shield of secrecy' (as a private limited company it is exempt from FOI requests) must not be sustained and ACPO funding should be reviewed to protect the credibility of the organisation.

4.2.6 Leadership training must be influenced from outside as well as within the policing family – if ACPO take on this function, the tripartite must retain meaningful influence over the form, function and content of training.

4.2.7 The voice of the local communities must continue to influence meaningfully at the national level. Decision makers must take cognisance of the experiences of local people and therefore local governance bodies must continue to be effectively represented at the national level by an empowered body, which retains statutory consultee status.

## **Collaboration**

4.2.8 That the Home Secretary should consider defining a new national landscape in which collaboration and/or national procurement is the default option for all forces where this would result in greater efficiency or effectiveness. This would ensure that best value is embedded into all future national procurement.

4.2.9 We have been consistent advocates of the principles behind HMCIC's 'informed choice' model, designed to foster collaboration, but believe that this root and branch review in the context of economic emergency offers the scope to embed these principles on a firmer and more consistent footing across the service.

4.2.10 Any collaborative structures imposed by a national framework should utilise existing relationships to build upon best practise notably across Wales, in Yorkshire and the Humber, and in Kent and Essex.

## **Regionalisation**

4.2.11 Mirroring the greater public accountability for ACPO TAM at the national level, the Regional CTU and CTIU hubs should be subject to appropriate and meaningful levels of regional scrutiny, drawn from the governance model, and possibly supplemented by regional 'independent reviewers' of the implementation of CT legislation, who would mirror the national work of Lord Carlile QC.

4.2.12 Assuming that regionalisation (the substantial expansion of the regional Counter Terrorism hubs to encompass other 'level two' threats) is likely to be cost-prohibitive, we recommend an increased emphasis on the tackling of borderless threats from the centre, building on existing arrangements. This would not be a retrograde return to the historical tackling of all serious crimes from the centre, but an arrangement fit to close the gaps of the 21st century – concentrating the investigation and tackling of 'borderless' crime (SOC, e-crime, etc) in a hub of expertise. It is crucial that this central hub is enhanced with a new structure of accountability – based on the governance model – this would draw in representatives from across the country.

## **A National Police Agency**

4.2.13 We recognise the sincerely-founded resistance to the creation of a National Police Agency or Force, at the time of Peel and at the occasion of every subsequent significant attempt to reform the police. However, in our present context of increasingly 'borderless crimes' we see a clear need for efficient and effective national arrangements to tackle what are evidently national threats.

4.2.14 There are strong arguments on the basis of efficiency, effectiveness and enhanced public accountability for drawing together some national policing functions into a reformulated agency, but believe that in the present climate, the set up costs of a new agency are likely to prove an insurmountable barrier.

4.2.15 Such a national agency, (or, in the absence of a national agency, each of the existing agencies), could be made accountable to a sub group of the National Policing Board. This sub group should include appropriate representation from the governance model and should be invested with the power to direct the agencies concerned with tackling 'borderless' threats and, make recommendations to the National Security Committee on the respective allocations of funding between the relevant agencies.

4.2.16 We are persuaded that the vast majority of NPIA's present functions will need to be fulfilled in any future landscape. Whether the agency remains in its present form, or its responsibilities are split between other agencies, it is essential that the tripartite retain meaningful influence and governance over how these various duties are delivered. In particular, in order to protect public trust and confidence in the police into the future, it is essential that any governance model should retain meaningful influence over the content of police training, including police leadership.

### **The Role of HMIC**

4.2.18 HMIC plays an essential and valued role. However, it cannot credibly claim to be the fierce advocate of the public interest without being in anyway structurally or practically accountable to, or responsive to what the public express as their interest. Whilst HMIC helpfully defends the interests of excellence in policing practice and there will no doubt need to play a greater role in assessing to what extent the polices' services are value for money (though the roles of the Audit Commission and others are also key here), the interests of the public are better identified and defended by the public themselves, through the police governance model. It is suggested that HMIC should be commissioned by a Board drawn from those within the governance model.

4.2.19 We can see this reformed and more publically-accountable HMIC as the 'natural home' for the necessary function of identifying and assessing adherence to a minimum core of national standards, ensuring an appropriate level of national consistency (particularly in 'closing the gap' around protective services) and possibly identifying 'best options' for procurement.

### **Local Partnership Arrangements**

4.2.10 Police Authorities currently have a mixed level of involvement in local partnerships. Authorities are statutory members of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), and some sit as members of Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs). The proposed changes to police accountability provide an opportunity to review and rationalise the wider local partnership landscape. In Wales the 22 CSP's are coterminous with local authorities and Local Service Boards and there are no LSPs. Community safety is a devolved issue for Wales and any proposals for new arrangements may not be appropriate due to the different structure of partnerships, and would need to be agreed with WAG.

## **5.0 Performance, Inspection and Regulation**

5.1 The APA believes that there are four key areas which require addressing within any future landscape strategy;

- Performance Framework-Operational
- Performance Framework-Governance
- Improvement and Support
- Audit and Inspection

### **Performance Framework-Operational (Force)**

5.1.1 It is understood that the Home Secretary might not continue with Strategic Policing Requirements and this requires early clarification. It would be consistent to devolve much of this having considered the impact of greater flexibility on the performance landscape

5.1.2 Localism would suggest that the development of the performance framework would be devolved to the governance body, and if so should HMIC continue to have overall performance oversight at a local level, and how would this impact at Level 2/cross border level? Perhaps the focus of HMIC in the new landscape should be more on inspection, advising on improvement and strengthening force capability.

### **Performance Framework- Governance**

5.1.4 Consideration should be given to the need for national standards of governance should the standards include both ethics/behaviour and performance? How could this be done in a way that is consistent with the less bureaucratic, more devolved and self-regulated approach advocated by Government?

### **Improvements and Support**

5.1.5 How would national improvement support for forces and for governance structures be carried out? Clarity of direction in relation to NPIA or the potential transfer of funds to alternative improvement approaches is needed. Would this potentially be a future role for national representative bodies of the tripartite to more accurately reflect a non-bureaucratic sector led approach, and potentially provide better value for money?

### **Inspection and Audit**

5.1.6 What should be the future approach to inspection for both forces and for governance structures? Should this be more light touch and risk based for both to avoid bureaucracy with a greater emphasis given to a 'self-assessment approach' supported by improvement structures, and greater value for money?

5.1.8 Who is/are the appropriate inspectorate(s) for the governance structures, and how can audit be better integrated with inspection to avoid bureaucracy and duplication? How should the central intervention / ladder of support work under the new arrangements? Would it be consistent with greater devolution to ensure there were more limited central powers of intervention/supervision?



## NORTH WEST JOINT COMMITTEE

To: The Chairman and Members  
of the North West Joint Committee

Meeting: 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010

### Regional Collaboration Update

#### Report of the Chief Constable - Cheshire Police

#### 1. Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Members of the North West Joint Committee with an update in relation to regional collaboration

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Joint Committee supports the proposed collaboration principles for the North West Region.
- 2.2 That the Joint Committee supports the proposed priority areas for collaboration and the methodology outlined.
- 2.3 That the joint committee considers and notes the update

#### 3. Background to the Report

- 3.1.1 Collaboration work continues between the North West Forces under a number of work streams. A report on existing collaboration follows in full.

#### 4. Updates

##### 4.1 **Proposed Collaboration Principles and Priority Areas**

For a full outline on the proposed principles and areas for collaboration see Appendix A.

#### 4.1.1 Regional Collaboration Principles are proposed, including:

- defining the aims and objectives for collaboration
- identifying what areas of business may be considered
- under what circumstances these areas will be considered
- opportunities for collaboration outside of the immediate North West Police Forces
- what model of collaboration to apply, including joint venture, lead organisation, outsourcing and
- which funding formulas will be used.

#### 4.1.2 Priority areas for collaboration are also discussed and include:

- Forensic Services. Forensic procurement collaboration is already underway and the possibility of regional central support units for the future are discussed.
- Serious and Organised Crime. (See Appendix B in Part 2 of for full update) The need for a review of structures and capabilities within each individual force and within the existing regional teams (Titan) is to be undertaken with work on models under Titan (Regional Crime Unit, Regional Assets Recovery Team and The Regional Intelligence Unit) already underway. An options paper for future policing models to address serious and organised crime seeking to balance cost against risk management will be provided with links into Counter Terrorism and The Serious Organised Crime Unit being considered.
- Uniformed Operations. The third area prioritised for joint working will include firearms, public order, dog and mounted sections, search capabilities, air support, Disaster Victim Identification work and contingency/ emergency planning. Firearms and public order structures have been proposed as the first areas for review.

## 4.2 Firearms

For Firearms Capability Matrix see Appendix C

- 4.2.1 A number of projects are underway to look at specific firearms procurement and training issues between individual forces. These are all at different stages of development. A comprehensive review is needed to look at the overall regional threat assessment from firearms taking into account the current firearms cadre and associated overall costs.
- 4.2.2 ACC Hopkins has commenced the information gathering exercise by circulating a firearms capability matrix, the results of which are due back in August 2010 and will be used to inform a review of firearms capability within the region.

4.2.3 That review will consider the role and deployment of Armed Response Vehicles e.g. as a regional asset locally deployed and controlled, with deployment locations based on demand and the ability to access all parts of the region within set timescales. An alternative may be for Forces to maintain a more local Armed Response Vehicle capability with training and provision of equipment provided at a Regional level. Their primary role would be to deal with initial firearms incidents with command and control being delivered locally through existing Force structures.

4.2.4 The review will look at the specialist firearms capabilities above Armed Response Vehicles level and consider the potential to pool resources to be located in syndicates across the Region. Command and control issues would need to be clearly established but there are options to consider in this regard including the potential to form a regional cadre of Tactical Firearms Commanders. Specialist skills to be included in such syndicates may include Dynamic Intervention teams, Rifle Officers, Close Protection Officers, and Tactical Advisors etc.

#### **4.3 Criminal Justice**

4.3.1 The Criminal Justice 2010 Group is currently leading on a piece of work around Virtual Courts. Cheshire are preparing a 'Project Impact Document' which will feed into a wider debate when complete. The report is due for submission at the start of August 2010. The Regional Group recognises that Virtual Courts although discretionary at the moment may well be enforced on areas due to prison populations, court closures and a need to move more towards 'out of court disposals'.

4.3.2 Modernising Charging is now live in both Cheshire and Merseyside. In general the process seems to be working although there have been some teething problems due to slight differences in the requirements of file content. A meeting between the two forces and CPS is to take place shortly to address these issues.

4.3.3 The second leg of Modernising Charging, which includes the decision making process being returned back to the police for summary offences is likely to be made later this year.

#### **4.4 National Information System Agenda**

4.4.1 A meeting to review each Force's planned project list to identify potential opportunities for collaboration is to be arranged.

4.4.2 Airwave Service management – The North West Region Airwave managed service business case has been completed. Airwave solutions will be presenting the business case to the regional head of IT meeting in July. An update is awaited.

- 4.4.3 HOLMES 2 – GMP are looking to Unisys (information technology and solutions company) to take more of a partnership approach and invest more effort into assisting GMP deliver its strategy towards North West Convergence.
- 4.4.4 HOLMES 2 cont'd - A meeting with key stakeholders has been scheduled for 5<sup>th</sup> August. All forces have been invited to send representatives to the meeting. West Midlands are attending this meeting and will be able to discuss their experiences with Warwickshire.
- 4.4.5 Integrated Communications Control System – All Force representatives have been requested to provide a summary of their current Integrated Communications Control System position and raise any identified future requirements to inform the regional work stream.
- 4.4.6 Digital Interviews – Cheshire, GMP and Merseyside are all keen to pursue a collaborative approach to digital interviews which would be used to replace the analogue interview tapes and allow central live monitoring, with further benefits such as improved capability, improved reliability and reduced costs. A meeting is to take place in Cheshire in August.
- 4.4.7 Automatic Number Plate Recognition – A report of the joint Lancashire and Merseyside Automatic Number Plate Recognition Workshop is awaited.
- 4.4.8 Mobile Data – There is potential for further collaboration on the use of Netbooks. A meeting to identify potential collaboration will be arranged.
- 4.4.9 Telecoms – potential for collaboration in the procurement of telecoms services has been identified with forces agreeing to document their current telecommunications contracts to help identify any such opportunities. Monthly telecoms meetings have been scheduled.

## **4.5 CCTV**

- 4.5.1 The facial identification project in the Met has still not been formally evaluated and so the next meeting has been postponed until the end of August 2010. Cheshire have recently developed a model for the management of unidentified images from CCTV which formalises the end to end use of CCTV evidence. Recent successful cases have involved the sharing of images from other Forces to be displayed on Cheshire's "Caught on Camera" database, and also to search against unidentified "scene" images. This model will be presented to our regional meeting at the next meeting with a view to opening up opportunities for consistent management of CCTV images across the region. Plans for a regional image database have been frustrated largely due to the associated costs of storage and differing IT networks, albeit the three Niche Forces could overcome some of the latter issues through "Interniche" (an IT solution to link 'Niche' systems) although there are still cost implications to this.

## 4.6 Counter Terrorism

For a full update see Appendix D

4.6.1 A North West review has been completed of Force Counter Terrorism capability and their relationship with North West Counter Terrorism Unit. The aims of the review were to:

- Identify the total risk picture for the Region.
- Identify the total resources allocated to force counter terrorism activity.
- Identify the total resource picture allocated to the North West Counter Terrorism Unit.
- Identify the basic operating requirements for forces set by the National Co-ordinator Special Branch.
- Identify gaps and capability or capacity or excess capability or capacity against current and future anticipated requirements.
- Identify future state proposal for how the Counter Terrorism Unit and Counter Terrorism Bureau's could be developed in the Region with due regard to the lead force model and the constitutional position of Chief Constables.
- Develop detailed business cases for each area of future collaboration.

4.6.2 Four milestones or gateways were set to track and measure progress inc:

- A summary paper on the regional threat picture and future national drivers for change in Counter Terrorism. This paper was produced and circulated to ACPO officers within the region.
- Identify Level 1 capability and identified areas for potential collaboration, coinciding with an initiative from National Co-ordinator of Special Branch to determine capability and capacity across the UK. North West Counter Terrorism Unit is in possession of all submissions in relation from across the region which are being used to inform subsequent projects.
- Production of a business case based on risks posed by gaps in capability where benefits can be rapidly secured
- A further business case on lower risk or more complex projects would follow.

4.6.3 Since the terms of reference for this review were documented, significant changes at National level have shifted the landscape:

- The National Review of Counter Terrorism and its infrastructure conducted by Chief Constable Tim Brayne: fundamental proposals to realign Counter Terrorism policing in the UK.
- ACC Thompson commissioned by Assistant Commissioner of Special Operations (on behalf of ACPO (Territorial Allied Matters) to

conduct a further review to encapsulate further thinking around National Counter Terrorism configuration.

- Regional developments regarding collaboration
- Interoperability Programme (West Midlands Counter Terrorism Unit)

4.6.4 The aforementioned reports have impacted and inform the below continuing developments which were discussed at the North West ACPO meeting in March and June as programmes that will drive closer regional collaboration.

#### Intelligence Management Update

4.6.5 The implementation phase of the Strategic Intelligence Hub has been commenced. The Hub will comprise a number of functions and will look to control all the intelligence activity within the North West Counter Terrorism Unit, understand the threat and to support forces in the region through prioritisation.

4.6.6 On a broader picture this piece of work is linked to the North West Counter Terrorism Unit leading on the intelligence strand of the national interoperability work led by Chief Constable Simms, aiming to deliver consistent doctrine and business processes across the Counter Terrorism Police Intelligence Network.

4.6.7 Once the Strategic Intelligence Hub has been embedded it is proposed that opportunities for collaboration are actively pursued. This will involve the use of North West Counter Terrorism Unit assets to support local intelligence activity at the tactical level and will explore the benefit of specialised intelligence functionality being managed at regional level for example Counter Terrorism Prison Intelligence

#### Counter Terrorism Police Operation Rooms

4.6.8 These are now compliant with ACPO Territorial Allied Matters minimum standards and a working group is currently formulating standard operating procedures to identify the role of the rooms and its support in relation to handling of products and data. These rooms are capable of supporting communication with up to eight surveillance teams plus a further three support teams from partner agencies.

#### New Build/Terrorism Act Custody

4.6.9 Force Headquarters – Building work is expected to be completed on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2011 and fully operational in September 2011. Tenders for the Counter Terrorism Unit specific IT have been received and are under evaluation. Work around preparing staff for the move has commenced.

4.6.10 Terrorism Act Custody - Building work is taking place on a site close to the new build Counter Terrorism Hub. The building houses the new North Manchester Divisional HQ, Divisional and Terrorism Act custody complex. Practical completion of the building is expected in August 2011. This facility will provide 12 Terrorism Act cells and is jointly funded by ACPO (Territorial Allied Matters) and Greater Manchester Police Authority.

4.6.11 National Special Branch Intelligence System – Will see all North West Special Offices using the same intelligence system for the first time. The collaboration group is working with NPIA and The National Special Branch Intelligence System to create a training package to support those forces in the North West in the new software and will be the first area to pilot this new training.

#### Counter terrorism Professional

4.6.12 A small working group within the North West region has begun considering what a Counter Terrorism professional would look like, skills required and training requirements to support the reality. As this work matures across the Region it is anticipated there will be significant efficiency and effective benefits for all forces at local level. A pilot version of the CT professional in the form of investigative “pods” is anticipated to be launched in September 2010 as a means to drive this work forward for the NW region.

### **5. Financial and Staffing Implications**

- 5.1 Collaboration costs will be distributed around the North West and North Wales regions as a percentage of the total Police Grant and as previously agreed in Principles xv, xvi and xvii shown in Appendix A.
- 5.2 Each force should identify a ‘collaboration lead’ to act as a point of contact, to progress locally identified collaborative opportunities, and to liaise on behalf of regional projects.
- 5.3 Staffing implications for individual collaboration projects will be determined as the process develops and in accordance with the collaborative model to be adopted. Teams will be formed on a ‘virtual’ or ‘substantial’ basis with clearly defined objectives and timescales.

### **6. Risk Assessment**

Identified risks concerning the collaboration projects are:

- 6.1 There is a gap within the suggested management and governance arrangements which need to be further considered in respect of the North Wales Police Authority and the role that they will have in terms of collaboration oversight. The North Wales Police are represented by invitation to the North West Regional ACPO meeting but the involvement of the North Wales Police Authority at either the North West Joint Committee or via another forum needs to be formally agreed.
- 6.2 There is a risk that agreed collaboration objectives and decisions will not be properly disseminated across the region and that this may act as a barrier to success. A communications strategy will be developed to address this issue on a regional basis.

- 6.3 There is a risk that existing collaboration agreements (some for substantial projects) may not be sufficiently robust to meet ongoing operational/financial needs or may not meet new legislative requirements. Such agreements will be re-examined as individual business areas are reviewed.

**7. Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment**

The potential changes to service delivery as discussed within this document will be designed to reduce cost whilst maintaining effective risk management. The aim is to provide efficient and cost effective policing services throughout the North West and it is not envisaged that there will be any negative impact on individual communities or groups.

**8. Environmental Impact Assessment**

The proposed regional collaboration projects will review the number of individual units performing the same function in each force area in order to provide more cost effective solutions. This may involve a reduction in numbers and as a consequence, deliver a positive impact upon the environmental impact from that area of business.

**9. Conclusion**

In considering the information contained within this paper it is requested that the Joint Committee supports the proposed principles and the priority areas for collaboration in the North West Region.

Members are asked to note the update

**David Whatton**  
**Chief Constable of Cheshire**

**Contact Officer:** Richard Rees  
Staff Officer to CC Whatton  
01244 612115

## Proposed Collaboration Principles and Priority Areas for Collaboration – 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010

### 1. Background to the Report

Chief Constables from the North West Region and North Wales Police met on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July to consider priority areas for collaboration based upon the principles of reducing cost whilst maintaining effective risk management. Proposed actions included the drafting of regional collaboration principles, the review of funding streams for existing collaborative ventures, the assessment of current regional threat levels and the identification of essential areas of business to be maintained.

### 2. Regional Collaboration Principles

2.1 The individual Authorities and Forces within the North West Region have their own objectives to deliver a policing service to meet the needs of their local communities. They are similar in many aspects (e.g. Prevent and Investigate Crime, Protect Vulnerable People etc) and provide an established base from which to progress collaborative working.

2.2.1 The objectives outlined below are designed to complement the primary statutory functions of Authorities and Forces to deliver locally accountable services:

- i. The primary aim of collaboration is to provide greater good for the people of the North West and North Wales which may not be of immediately identifiable benefit to an individual force.
- ii. The North West Regional Police Authorities and Forces will work together to provide joint policing services where this will secure greater efficiency and effectiveness, provide added value and reduce costs whilst retaining local independence in terms of service accountability and decision making.
- iii. The North West Region is a recognised entity with media coverage co-terminus with its geographic boundary. The five Authorities and Forces within the region will work closely with the North Wales Police Authority and Force to extend the breadth of collaborative activities where it is appropriate.
- iv. Any aspect of policing, other than Neighbourhood Policing, may be considered for Joint Working.

- v. Joint Working will only be agreed where it significantly reduces cost or where it significantly adds to capability or efficiency and where any changes in risk levels to the public have been fully considered.
- vi. It is recognised that there are already numerous examples of best practice within different aspects of policing in the North West. Where Joint Working is considered, the Force delivering best value in any given business area will be used as the benchmark against which any collaboration should deliver.
- vii. The North West region will provide savings in appropriate services by sharing their development and operation, by ensuring interoperability of systems and by delivering economies of scale through sharing of overhead costs.
- viii. North West police forces will engage with non-police partners across the region in pursuit of common objectives and so maximise the opportunities to achieve additional finance from available funding streams.
- ix. The region will contribute to the national policing agenda using its combined strength to increase the influence of the North West at a national level.
- x. The regional collaboration structure will provide significant support for North West forces but this will not preclude collaborative working with other forces/partners outside the region. Likewise, forces may opt in or out of individual schemes as they are proposed to best suit their operational and/or financial needs.
- xi. The North West ACPO Regional meeting will become the Management Board for regional collaborative activity and collaboration will form the main agenda item. The Chief Superintendent, Regional Collaboration Co-ordinator will ensure that updated actions and reports are available and will facilitate the meeting.
- xii. The North West Joint Committee of Police Authorities will provide the governance structure and oversight of collaborative activity. The Chief Superintendent, Regional Collaboration Coordinator will work to support the Joint Committee meetings by providing requisite updates and papers.

- xiii. Each member Force will provide the assistance and expertise required to progress collaborative working as either a 'virtual' or a 'substantial' member of a team depending on the individual needs of specific projects.
- xiv. The most appropriate model will be applied to each collaborative venture to ensure that the maximum progress is made with the minimum amount of bureaucracy i.e. Reciprocal Agreement, Joint Initiative, Lead Organisation, Joint Venture or alternative models such as Outsourcing or Public Sector Cooperative Agreements. The model selected will be determined by the complexity of the proposed agreement and the regulations surrounding it (e.g. Procurement Regulations, Direction and Control issues etc.)
- xv. Collaboration costs will be distributed around the North West region as a percentage of the total Police Grant and as previously agreed:
 

Cheshire	11%
Cumbria	6%
Greater Manchester Police	41%
Lancashire	19%
Merseyside	23%
- xvi. Collaboration costs for Joint Working involving the 5 North West forces and North Wales Police based upon a percentage of the total Police Grant will be:
 

Cheshire	10.5%
Cumbria	5.3%
Greater Manchester Police	38%
Lancashire	17.5%
Merseyside	21.4%
North Wales	7.3%
- xvii. The above funding formulas will be adopted as the 'norm' for regional collaborative working but there may be specific projects where different funding arrangements will be required.

### **3. Priority Areas For Collaboration**

At the meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> July the Chief Constables suggested three separate business areas as priorities for collaboration; Forensic Services, Serious and Organised Crime and Uniformed Operations.

### **3.1 Forensic Collaboration**

- 3.1.1 There are already a number of existing collaborations between North West/North Wales forces in terms of Forensic Services, not least of which is membership of the 14-strong forensic procurement collaboration which has already generated savings for regional forces. A more fundamental review of Forensic Services will be undertaken, however, seeking to apply regional solutions to ensure that the most efficient and effective structures and processes are in place.
- 3.1.2 It may be desirable to maintain a more localised crime scene investigation service to cater for 'volume crime' on a day-to-day basis although internal structures should be examined to ensure that the most efficient and effective service is being provided, unhindered by existing force boundaries. There are potentially further areas for saving, however, in relation to non-scene examination central support units which, in most cases, are replicated in each force in the region. These units are already centralised on single sites and as such are regarded as a Force rather than a local resource. Given the increasing use of technology within Forensic Services there is the scope to consider more cost effective solutions to the traditional way of working and to examine the potential benefits of pooling resources into larger, but fewer (or even single) units, with subsequent reductions in management structures.
- 3.1.3 The terms of reference for a review of Forensic Services in the region are being finalised and work on the review will commence as soon as that process is complete.

### **3.2 Serious and Organised Crime**

- 3.2.1 A review of structures and of capability to address serious and organised crime in each individual force and within the existing Regional teams (Titan) will be undertaken. This will include an analysis of costs and of regional threat assessments including an assessment of residual risks where consideration is given to withdrawing any services. The review will provide an options paper for future policing models to address serious and organised crime seeking to balance cost against risk management.
- 3.2.2 Teams located in individual forces include major investigation teams, covert (witness) protection units, covert policing units, surveillance units and force crime operations units. Collaborative agreements already exist between certain regional partners in relation to some of these units but this review will provide the opportunity to assess the viability of providing all of these functions on a regional basis.

- 3.2.3 Titan is comprised of the Regional Crime Unit (RCU), the Regional Asset Recovery Team (RART) and the Regional Intelligence Unit (RIU) with all five regional forces and North Wales Police contributing to the structure. At present levels the RCU cost will increase by approx £1 million in 2011/12 to a total cost of approx. £4.2 million as government funding ceases. 86% of the budget is comprised of staffing costs. The RART is fully funded by central government (excluding pension contributions) with a total budget of approx. £1.16 million although confirmation of continued funding for 2011/12 has not yet been received. It consists of 11 police officers, 9 police staff and 8 other staff from non-police partner agencies. At present levels the RIU costs will increase by approx £448k in 2011/12 when Home Office funding finishes to a total cost of approx £1 million. 71% of the budget is comprised of staffing costs.
- 3.2.4 A review of models to determine the future resourcing and direction of Titan has already been commissioned and is being progressed by Detective Chief Superintendent Simon Leach. A refresh of the regional threat levels in relation to serious and organised crime will be completed alongside this review and the role that Titan can play in any new regional collaboration involving resources currently based in forces will be fully considered. Links at this level to the Counter Terrorism Unit in Manchester and to SOCA will also be fully explored to assess the potential for additional operational support in this area of policing.

### **3.3 Uniformed Operations**

- 3.3.1 The third area prioritised for Joint Working is Uniformed Operations which includes firearms, public order, Dog and Mounted sections, search capabilities, air support, Disaster Victim Identification work and contingency/emergency planning. Firearms and public order structures have been proposed as the first areas for review.
- 3.3.2 There are a number of projects underway to look at specific firearms procurement and training issues between individual forces which are at different stages of development. The review of this business area to adopt a regional collaborative solution, however, requires a more fundamental approach including assessments of overall costs and of the existing regional firearms threat with a view to delivering a value for money specialist service.
- 3.3.3 ACC Ian Hopkins (GMP, Chair of the North West Regional Firearms Group) has already commenced the information gathering exercise to support such a review. A 'Firearms Capability' matrix has been circulated to all forces to establish numbers of qualified firearms staff, skill levels, training frequency and overall costs. That information will then be used to inform a radical review of the police firearms structure in the region.

- 3.3.4 That review will consider the role and deployment of Armed Response Vehicles (ARVs) e.g. as a regional asset locally deployed and controlled, with deployment locations based on demand and the ability to access all parts of the region within set timescales. An alternative may be for Forces to maintain a more local ARV capability with training and provision of equipment provided at a Regional level. Their primary role would be to deal with initial firearms incidents with command and control being delivered locally through existing Force structures.
- 3.3.5 The review will look at the specialist firearms capabilities above ARV level and consider the potential to pool resources to be located in syndicates across the Region. Command and control issues would need to be clearly established but there are options to consider in this regard including the potential to form a regional cadre of Tactical Firearms Commanders. Specialist skills to be included in such syndicates may include Dynamic Intervention teams, Rifle Officers, Close Protection Officers, and Tactical Advisors etc.
- 3.3.6 A similar process will be followed in terms of public order equipment, training and deployment. An audit of capability and cost will be followed by a review of structures and threat assessments with a view to seeking regional solutions to the provision of public order cover. Consideration will be given to the regional provision of public order training and regional operational deployment based on an assessment of local demand and the potential to reduce costs.
- 3.3.7 The principles outlined above will be applied to all areas of Uniformed Operations work to determine the potential to establish regional collaborative units to address capacity issues in specialist skill areas at reduced cost.

**Contact Officer:** Ch Supt Jed Manley  
North West Collaboration Coordinator  
01244 612941  
07748 768299

## North West Regional Firearms Group

FORCE			
Force Capability/Annual Deployment			
Capability:	Total Number of Staff or vehicles	Number of times deployed from 1/4/09 to 31/3/10	
		Planned	Initial
Armed Response Vehicles			
Other Firearms Vehicles (Number, type & use)			
ARV (staff)			
Airport AFO's			
SFO's/Ops Team			
MASTS/ Armed Intervention			
Dynamic Intervention			
Rifle Officers			
Close Protection Officers			
Gold (Strategic)			
Silver (Tactical - Initial)			
Silver (Tactical – Cadre)			
Bronze (Operational)			
Tac Advisor			
Police Staff dedicated to Firearms training (Non Operational)			
Peak Months for Deployment:			



# North West Regional Firearms Group

## Total Training Hours per Training Year 1/4/09 to 31/3/10

Skill area:	Number of Hours:
ARV Officers:	
Airport AFO's	
Dynamic Intervention Officers:	
MASTS/Armed Intervention:	
Rifle Officers:	
Close Protection Officers:	

### Daily Force Capability

Force Capability:	Total Number of Staff or vehicles
Armed Response Vehicles	
Other Firearms Vehicles (Number, type & use)	
ARV staff	
Airport AFO's	
MASTS/ Armed Intervention	
Dynamic Intervention	
Rifle Officers	
Close Protection Officers	
Gold (Strategic)	
Silver (Tactical - Initial)	
Silver (Tactical – Cadre)	
Bronze (Operational)	
Tac Advisor	
Police Staff dedicated to Firearms training (Non Operational)	



# North West Regional Firearms Group

## Annual Cost

Breakdown:	Overall spend for year 1/4/09 to 31/3/10		
Firearms officers	PC:	Sgt:	Insp:
Firearms Training			
Operational Overtime (Firearms Related)			
Equipment			
Vehicles			
Other (i.e. Range etc)			
Total Spend			



