



PARTNERSHIPS FORUM

26 NOVEMBER 2008 AT 10.00AM
IN CABINET ROOM C, COUNTY HALL, PRESTON

NB If you have any queries regarding the Agenda papers or require any further information, please contact Ian Dickinson on 01772 533462.

AGENDA

PART I (OPEN TO PRESS AND PUBLIC)

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Members are asked to consider any personal/prejudicial interests they may have to disclose to the meeting in relation to any matters under consideration on the Agenda in accordance with the law, the Authority's Standing Orders and the Member Code of Conduct.

- 3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 JULY 2008**

Copy enclosed for confirmation at item 3.

- 4. MATTERS ARISING**

ITEMS FOR DECISION

- 5. POLICE AUTHORITY COMMUNITY MEETINGS**

The Police Authority has agreed that the Police Authority Community Meetings were to cease after the September and October cycle. Attached at item 5 are the issues raised at the meetings of Police Authority Community Meetings held during September and October 2008.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

6. POLICE AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

An oral report on the Police Authority's Community Engagement and Consultation activity will be presented at the meeting.

7. HOME OFFICE GREEN PAPER – LANCASHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY'S FINAL RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

The Authority's proposed final response to the consultation exercise on the Green Paper: 'From the Neighbourhood to the National' is attached at Item 7 for information.

8. URGENT BUSINESS

An item of urgent business may only be considered under this heading where, by reason of special circumstances to be recorded in the Minutes, the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency. Wherever possible, the Chief Executive should be given advance warning of any Member's intention to raise a matter under this heading.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

This is the last meeting of the Partnerships Forum following the cessation of the Police Authority Community Meetings. Details on future arrangements will be discussed at item 6 on the Agenda.

Miranda Carruthers-Watt
CHIEF EXECUTIVE



PARTNERSHIPS FORUM

WEDNESDAY 15 JULY 2008 AT 2.00PM AT COUNTY HALL, PRESTON

MINUTES

PRESENT

County Councillor D Whipp - Chair

LANCASHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY

County Councillor N Penney

LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

County Councillor T Aldridge
County Councillor R Shepherd
County Councillor D Yates.

BOROUGH/DISTRICT COUNCILS

Councillor B Roberts
Councillor Mrs K Calder

CHAIR/VICE CHAIR OF POLICE AUTHORITY COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Mr E Fewings – Blackpool
Councillor Mrs D Prestwich – Fylde
Councillor Mrs A Cheetham – Rossendale
Councillor D Dickinson – Chorley
County Councillor D O’Toole – West Lancashire
Mr G Dykes – West Lancashire
County Councillor A Thornton – Lancaster
Councillor H Taylor – Wyre
Mr A Marsh - Wyre

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

The Forum noted that at its meeting on the 15 July 2008, the Police Authority had agreed that County Councillor Whipp be appointed Chair of the Partnerships Forum for the ensuing year.

APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

The Forum noted that at its meeting on the 15 July 2008, the Police Authority had agreed that Miss S Afzal be appointed Vice Chair of the Partnerships forum for the ensuing year.

MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Forum noted that the membership of the Forum had been deferred until the next meeting in November. In the interim period, the existing appointments to the Forum would continue.

The Forum noted the Terms of Reference of the Forum, as agreed by the Police Authority at its meeting on the 21 May 2008.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 APRIL 2008

01/08 RESOLVED:- That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 9 April 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

POLICE AUTHORITY COMMUNITY MEETINGS

The Forum received the unconfirmed Minutes of the Police Authority Community Meetings held during May and June 2008.

The Vice Chair of the Blackpool PAC, informed the Forum that he had not signed the Minutes of the Blackpool PAC meeting held on 31st January 2008, as he did not deem them to be a correct record. He further informed the Forum that he considered that there were also a number of inaccuracies in the Minutes of the meeting held on the 15 May 2008 and he had written to the Chief Executive of the Police Authority in this regard.

Since it was not possible to ascertain which parts of the Minutes were inaccurate, Mr Dickinson agreed to speak to the Vice Chair of the Blackpool PAC after the meeting.

The Chair of the West Lancashire PAC expressed disappointment that following police encouragement to purchase Speed Indicator Devices, many devices purchased by Parish Councils had not been erected due to Health & Safety issues of training for installation. It was agreed that this matter would be discussed further under the substantive item on Speed Indicator Devices later in the Agenda.

The Forum was informed that the representative of Neighbourhood Watch for Fleetwood understood that the Police Authority was to contribute £20K to the CCTV scheme in Fleetwood and not £40K as mentioned in the Minutes of the Wyre PAC.

The representative for Rossendale Borough Council wished to place on record his thanks to the Lancashire and Greater Manchester Police Forces for the collaborative work in relation to mini moped and quad bike nuisance in the area.

02/08 RESOLVED:- That the unconfirmed Minutes of the Police Authority Community Meetings held during May and June be noted.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF POLICE AUTHORITY COMMUNITY MEETINGS.

The Forum received a progress report on the future role of Police Authority Community Meetings as part of the Community Engagement Strategy.

A copy of the report is set out in the Minute Book.

It was noted that the Police Authority at their meeting on the 15 July, had agreed that the Police Authority Community Meetings would cease after the September/October 2008 cycle of meetings.

The Chair informed the Forum that whilst any future arrangements had not yet been finalised, there were a number of options being explored, including 'face the public' meetings and local policing boards, both of which would continue to provide local accountability. It was noted that an update would be presented to the PACs on the latest position at their meetings in September and October.

Representatives from both the Borough Councils and PACs considered it inappropriate to cease the PAC meetings with no alternative mechanism in place. In response, the Chair informed the Forum that the Constabulary regularly engaged with local people through PACT meetings and that the Authority used Road Shows/Open Days as well as its website to engage with the community. Furthermore, it was recognised that the structures required through statute for 'face the public' events was not in the Authority's gift. However, the Chair assured the Forum that an alternative mechanism, with greater community involvement and accountability, would be introduced.

It was noted that County Councillors in the Lancaster City Council area were not invited to their local PACT meetings. It was agreed that Chief Superintendent Stuart Williams would look into this.

03/08 RESOLVED:- That a update be presented to the PACs on the alternative mechanisms for community engagement.

COMMUNICATIONS TEAM UPDATE

The Forum received a report from the Authority's Communications Team.

04/08 RESOLVED:- That the Report be noted.

SPEED INDICATOR DEVICES (SPIDS)

The Forum received a report on the sighting and operation of Speed Indicator Devices, including Health & Safety aspects, training requirements and formal agreement.

It was noted that the Constabulary was unable to manage every SpID in Lancashire; therefore, a partnership approach had to be adopted. It was noted that LCC currently charged £10 to erect a SpID on behalf of an organisation or Parish Council.

It was suggested that the responsibility for erecting SpIDs could be given to the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership. The Chair of Chorley PAC was concerned that no one was prepared to take ownership of the deployment of the SpID in the Chorley area and agreed to bring this and to the attention of the Borough Council.

05/08 RESOLVED:- That the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership be requested to take ownership of the erection SpIDs.

OPINION

The Forum received a copy of the participant feedback newsletter, Opinion.

06/08 RESOLVED:- That the participant feedback, newsletter, Opinion be noted.

INVESTORS IN POLICING

The Forum received and noted a PowerPoint presentation on the Police Authority's "Investors in Policing" campaign from the Summer Nights Open Day held on the 30th June 2008.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Forum asked whether it would be possible to hold the next meeting at 2pm. The Deputy Chief Executive agreed to look into this.

07/08 RESOLVED:- That the next meeting was scheduled to be held at 10.00am on Wednesday 26th November 2008, at County Hall, Preston.

Miranda Carruthers-Watt
Chief Executive



PARTNERSHIPS FORUM

26 NOVEMBER 2008

PART I

HOME OFFICE GREEN PAPER – LANCASHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY'S FINAL RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

(Appendix A refers)

Issue for Consideration

The Authority's final response to the consultation exercise on the Home Office Green Paper: 'From the Neighbourhood to the National'.

Information

Following the presentation on the Green Paper at the Police Authority Seminar on the 25th September 2008, the Authority's Chief Executive and Chair attended a Regional consultation event held on 2 October 2008 to consider responses to the Green Paper. In addition, there has also been further debate at a national level which has assisted to shape the Authority's proposed final response.

Accordingly, the Police Authority at their meeting on the 8 October approved a final response which is attached at Appendix A for the Forum's information.


Decision Required

The Forum is asked to note the report.

Background Papers

Home Office Green Paper: 'From the Neighbourhood to the National' – July 2008.

Report Author

Name: Stephen Pickup
Organisation: Lancashire Police Authority
 (01772) 533420

Policing Green Paper Consultation Responses
Police Reform Unit
6th Floor, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
LONDON
SW1P 4DF

Please ask for: Stephen Pickup
Telephone: (01772) 533420
Fax: (01772) 768893
Email: Stephen.Pickup@lpa.lancscc.gov.uk
Our Ref: GOV/SLP/JN
Date: 10th October 2008

Dear Sir/Madam

**LANCASHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY
INITIAL RESPONSE TO THE GREEN PAPER 'FROM THE NEIGHBOURHOOD TO THE
NATIONAL: POLICING OUR COMMUNITIES TOGETHER'.**

I am writing to provide Lancashire Police Authority's response to the proposals set out in the above Green Paper.

In general, Lancashire welcomes the Green Paper and supports the increased emphasis on the role of Police Authorities in holding the Police to account on behalf of our communities.

In Lancashire the increased emphasis on local answerability is one which we are trying to develop through an increased emphasis on joint working with our partners.

Lancashire Constabulary covers a reasonably complex administrative area, and we have a raised a number of questions about some of the green paper proposals in this area.

Our detailed views on the Green Paper are set out below.

Chapter 1 – Improving the connection between the public and the police

1.1 Policing Pledge

In principle, the Authority welcomes the clarity of the Pledge and understands that Government wants to make sure that people, wherever they live have an easy understanding of what they can expect from the Police. We have some concerns that the activity needed to meet the numerous quantitative National Standards could compromise the quality of service or adversely impact on local measures to improve confidence and satisfaction. Effectively implementing the pledge will have significant resource implications for Forces/Authorities and these need to be quantified at the earliest opportunity.

The standards seem excessively prescriptive and we feel that they should be agreed with Forces and Authorities. Lancashire would be more supportive of an alternative model of the Pledge such as that suggested by the Association of Police Authorities (APA), where following consultation with local communities, Police Authorities are responsible for setting the level of performance required across a national prescribed framework of standards. This approach would certainly be more in line with the aim of this chapter of the Green Paper; to enable the voice of local people to be heard in setting priorities and influencing action. Forces need to have the capacity to deliver the Pledge across the board if satisfaction and confidence are going to be maintained/increased.

This more localised approach would assist Authorities and Forces to tailor the pledge to their police area. In Lancashire, we have in previous years agreed not to proceed with the proposed response time to emergency incidents. We had grave reservations about potential impact on both police officer and public safety with vehicles speeding to incidents. In addition, it will simply not be feasible for Response Officers to reach isolated rural locations within a 15 minute timescale, without taking artificial steps such as sitting response vehicles in remote locations in case of need – thus tying up officers unnecessarily. We feel that in such cases, it would be more appropriate to agree a local measure.

We need to take care not to constrain our staff inappropriately or introduce unnecessary bureaucracy in support of the pledge when we are trying to reduce it elsewhere. For example, in respect of keeping victims of crime informed of progress, the APA have suggested “If you have been a victim of crime, agree with you how often you would like to be kept informed about the progress of your case” as an alternative to the approach in the Green Paper of “keeping you informed monthly of progress on your case as long as this is useful”. Monthly contact requires a resource commitment from police forces, but might not be relevant for every victim. In terms of implementation on the ground, we commend the APA approach to the Home Office because it ensures that standards for contact are in place but it allows flexibility to meet individual victims’ needs.

1.2 **Provision of more crime information**

This appears to be based on an underlying principle that increased information on crime will result in an increase in public reassurance. However, the evidence for this assumption needs to be carefully examined to ensure that:

- 1.2.1 the public do have a desire for such additional information. As the ‘In for Questioning’ SOLACE paper points out, the public may not require too much detail of how the job is being done they simply want the service delivered effectively.
- 1.2.2 the information provided will have the desired effect and not risk increasing fear of crime with a consequent reduction in confidence.

The APA comments regarding ensuring any such information is of direct relevance to local communities and about ensuring greater co-ordination of community engagement activities amongst partners are also supported. The level of detail provided in interactive ways (such as crime maps) needs to be carefully considered to ensure this does not risk unwittingly providing criminals with information to aid them in committing offences. For example, crime maps might highlight a particular business park with inadequate levels of security which could, in turn, lead to a further proliferation of business crimes in that area.

1.3 **Greater alignment of Neighbourhood Policing and Neighbourhood Management**

Lancashire Constabulary are assessed as national leaders in this area and welcomes the proposal from the Government.

Whilst we support the concept of participatory budgeting, we don't feel that this proposal should be seen in isolation from the proposed Community Safety Fund Budgets and any arrangements needs to take into account the totality of resources used in Community Safety. We would welcome guidance from the Home Office on an innovative and comprehensive approach to resource mapping in this area.

We would ask that Police Authorities are fully involved in the pilot process and independent evaluation is undertaken and the Home Office to fund any associated costs.

At an operational level, we have some concerns regarding participatory budgeting principles being applied to the use of the Police proportion of monies recovered through POCA. The current Home Office criteria only enables this funding to be used in a limited number of specific areas and Lancashire has historically used these funds to improve the Force's financial investigation capabilities, with a view to increasing subsequent POCA seizures. If participatory budgeting principles were applied to POCA funding, it is unlikely that local people would want to continue investing this money to finance recurring expenditure on financial investigator posts. This would then result in a 'vicious circle' whereby financial investigation capacity would be reduced, resulting in fewer POCA seizures, which would then have an adverse impact on future levels of money available to support participatory budgeting.

1.4 **Strengthening Local Accountability**

The Police Authority welcomes moves to ensure greater local answerability and moves designed to close the democratic deficit.

We do feel, however, that the role of Police Authorities in delivering continuing improvements in policing performance in recent years: increasing satisfaction and confidence in policing services as well as sustained reductions in crime levels are not fully recognised.

The Authority is also concerned that some of the complexities of the local situation in Lancashire are not fully reflected by the proposals. Lancashire is made up of one Shire County and twelve District Councils as well as two unitary authorities. The current arrangements are that each of the upper tier authorities are represented on the Police Authority with 7 members from the County Council and 1 from each of the Unitaries.

All of the districts have CDRPS, as do the two Unitaries, and they range in population size from 58,000 to 143,000. The Authority notes the position with regard to proposals for elected CPR members, but has reservations on the work that would need to be done to identify the appropriate constituencies for the new CPRs and also the cost to the Government of these additional elections.

The Authority also has significant reservations about the practical implications of the CPR proposals, in terms of:

- financial resources
- administrative resources
- constituency sizes

In respect of financing election costs, based on the full Lancashire County Council elections, we estimate that the cost for direct elections to the Police Authority would be in

the region of £800,000. Even if the Home Office funds the initial set up costs of the accountability structure, this would still represent a recurring expenditure commitment every four years and would place a significant additional burden on the police funding system. On a national level, we question how the extra funds for elections will be secured in the medium to long term, particularly given the Government's commitment to keep local council tax increases below 5% each year. In Lancashire, this amount of money would equate to a 2% increase on Council Tax or approximately 20 Police Officers.

We are sceptical about how rough parity between the constituency sizes of Crime and Policing Representatives will be achieved in practice. Lancashire already has 14 CDRP areas, so to further divide areas to create comparable constituency sizes would add significant numbers to the Authority, with the associated Member support costs diverting further resources away from policing activities. Conversely, combining CDRP areas would not automatically achieve parity in constituency sizes and would risk losing the current co-terminosity with BCU boundaries in Lancashire.

In 2005/06, a number of Police Authorities conducted pilot projects with the objective of strengthening accountability structures, particularly at BCU level. These pilot projects were evaluated by the University of Birmingham, but the results of these pilots and the conclusions from the independent evaluation do not appear to have been considered in the Green Paper. These results might usefully be drawn upon to further inform the debate on accountability.

We feel that the Scrutiny arrangements within Local Authorities could be further developed and that all of the bodies involved in CDRPs are answerable at a local level and would welcome a role for Police Authorities as part of that scrutiny arrangement.

The Authority welcomes the suggestion of emphasising the separation of Police Authorities and the Police Service and sees that this could be achieved through the development of Independent Local Policing Boards, with a strengthening of the role of elected members of the Board and retaining the independent members who add so much in respect of diversity and skills to the current police authority arrangements.

We have grave reservations that any system of separate elections could prove to have a number of disadvantages, but few benefits. The current Police Authority staff arrangements would not have sufficient capacity to run an election process and there would be a need in many areas for some legislation to harmonise the election arrangements. Lancashire has particular concerns regarding the politicisation of policing and potential for extremist groups to secure representation on Police Authorities. Extremist political views are present within the county and the election of individuals from such groups could seriously damage community cohesion and police credibility, whilst also creating tension within the Police Authority. Hence, Lancashire subscribes to the view that any amendments to the current accountability structure should retain the current freedom from political dominance.

Chapter 2 – Reducing Bureaucracy and developing technology

2.1 Activity Based Costing (ABC)

The review of ABC is welcomed provided that Authorities and Forces are actively involved in identifying an alternative which reduces costs, is easily used and provides accurate and timely data which can be used to drive improvements in productivity.

The use of Airwave to undertake activity sampling is advocated as this negates the need for Officers to complete paper forms. Lancashire has already begun work on this area using the data recorded on the Duty States Management system and we would encourage the Home Office to look at the practices that are being developed.

However, a replacement is unlikely to be available for several years and it would be helpful if the Home Office could clarify the timescale for this review and what will happen to ABC in the meantime.

2.2 **Stop and Account**

We support the Association of Police Authorities view that any changes to Stop and Account should not undermine trust and confidence amongst communities.

2.3 **More effective use of IT**

The general aim of achieving a more co-ordinated approach to IT across the Police service is supported. However, extreme care must be taken to ensure that this does not result in Forces being mandated to migrate from effective and efficient local IT programmes to national products that offer inferior levels of performance. Previous attempts to implement national systems have been poor and greater effort should be placed on developing effective protocols and secure interfaces between local and national systems. The Authority would welcome an increased emphasis on mandating standards and interoperability across forces to allow for future convergence and welcomes the role of the NPIA in this.

Chapter 3 – Defining roles and leadership in the police service

3.1 **ACPO Appointment process**

We support the need for the current arrangements for ACPO appointments to be reviewed whilst acknowledging that the broad framework for appointment remains right, with Police Authorities responsible for the final appointment. We also welcome the recognition that more needs to be done to ensure a sufficient supply of quality applicants to match demand at ACPO level.

The Green Paper does not appear to recognise the complexity of drivers behind applications for ACPO appointments (such as geography, family commitments, salary differentials). We have reservations that the development of national cadre arrangements is potentially divisive and discriminatory and could force people into following “national” promotion arrangements. To take account of such drivers, we suggest that better talent management must operate equally well throughout the Country. Police Authorities have a role to play at a local level in helping SAP to identify officers with future leadership potential.

We fully support a formal and active role for the Chief Constable in the appointment of Deputy and Assistant Chief Constables. This has been the practice in Lancashire and has worked well, with the Chief Constable acting as an advisor to give his professional view on operational matters and ‘fit’ with the current ACPO team.

3.2 **Role of SAP/Leadership College**

The strengthened role for SAP and the greater degree of independence in its composition is supported. However, we consider that there is some potential for confusion over the role of SAP and the proposed new National College of Police Leadership. Clarification needs to

be provided on the exact role of each body and arrangements put in place to ensure effective partnership working between them. In addition, an appropriate level of Police Authority representation on the College Board should be secured to enable the needs of Police Authorities to be properly represented.

The appropriateness of the new college providing for the development needs of Police Authority members and staff is questioned. How would this impact upon the APA's role to support Police Authorities for example? Further details of the Home Office's proposals on this aspect of the College would be helpful.

3.3 **Sergeants**

We welcome the work in relation to Sergeant rank.

Chapter 4 – Focusing on Development and Deployment

4.1 **Better Development and Deployment**

The Authority fully supports the approach outlined in this section to develop and deploy the right mix of staff to provide the best possible service to our diverse communities. Getting the right mix of officers and staff will be a challenge for Police Forces and Authorities. We will need to have regard to the PCSO roles which are part funded through partnership arrangements. Initial work on the QUEST pilots will be an important consideration here.

4.2 **Customer Service**

The Authority welcomes and supports the simplification and improvement of the Performance and Development Review processes. Work has already started in Lancashire to simplify the bureaucracy, but more needs to be done to make this a more effective management tool. For example, the development of IT PDR systems which management can use to inform the annual learning and development plans. We would urge the NPIA to work with Authorities as well as staff and managers in forces in taking this review forward.

We welcome the review of quality of service training provided during the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme (IDLDP). A review of IPLDP is already underway in Lancashire involving a rewrite of all lesson plans. We would encourage the NPIA to look at good practice across the country. It will be particularly important to give attention to the equality dimensions in delivering the service – meeting individual needs in an appropriate way to deliver a good quality service.

4.3 **Working with the frontline to improve service**

The Authority welcomes the development of the frontline practitioners group.

4.4 **A Diverse Police Service working with People from every Community**

In the development of equality standards for policing the Authority would urge the NPIA to keep their approach simple and straightforward, with the minimum of supporting bureaucracy.

At their heart, the equality standards need to be focused on delivering a good quality service to the community and providing appropriate support and development opportunity for staff making proportionate adjustments to meet individuals' needs as appropriate.

The involvement of staff side representatives will be crucial in developing this area. Community views would also be crucial and police authorities could usefully consult. We would also encourage the involvement of a wide range of practitioners within forces who have to implement the standards in different parts of the service.

It would be useful to have further information about which particular exceptions to equality legislation the Government is referring to in connection with the development of the Equality Bill (4.21 – page 60).

It would be more appropriate for realistic employment targets to be set at local level. However, a national standard could usefully be maintained which was open to local interpretation across the country, for example, proportional representation of the workforce comparative to the working population.

There has, quite rightly, been extensive focus on the recruitment mix in recent years but the opportunity should be taken, in setting equality standards to encourage police forces and authorities to give more attention to retention and progression across all equality strands. We must cater for all staff types including special constables.

The Authority supports the inclusion of the seven strands (4.22) and welcomes the initial ideas under the Leadership Strategy. Care needs to be taken however to develop an inclusive approach. Seven strands are identified for the standards, so we need to ensure this follows through in the Leadership Strategy. Initiatives should be, and be seen to be, for the benefit of all minority staff, not just ethnic minorities and women.

4.5 Deployment to match demand

This lies at the heart of effective operational policing. It would be beneficial if relevant national partners developed guidance for police authorities' oversight of this area of business.

4.6 **Workforce Mix**

We agree that workforce mix is best decided locally, led by Basic Command Unit Managers and the Chief Officer Team with oversight from the Authority. This would need to be kept under regular review to ensure the mix kept pace with changes in the population and service demand and priorities over time. We are concerned that specifically Police Officer numbers can be used as a proxy measure for problems and would stress that workforce mix should not be used to make political capital.

Chapter 5 – Co-ordinate change in policing

5.1 **Decisions at the right level**

We are generally supportive of the proposals to ensure that decisions are made at the right level: nationally, regionally or locally. We do have concerns that the necessary focus on local accountability means that decisions that need to be taken on a whole force, regional and national basis can sometimes conflict with what are seen as important local priorities. One example of this is the need for emphasis on serious and organised crime – much of which can have a huge impact at the neighbourhood level but is, often for good reason, not as visible to both communities and stakeholders.

5.2 **Central Mandation**

We consider that any proposals for central mandate should be carefully considered to ensure that the solution concerned can be properly implemented and will achieve the desired outcomes across the whole Country. As noted in our comments regarding IT collaboration in Chapter 2, care needs to be taken to ensure that Forces are not mandated to use solutions which will result in inferior performance when compared to their current arrangements. We would prefer to see any such arrangements focussed on outcomes.

Chapter 6 – Reinforcing collaboration between forces

6.1 **Force Mergers**

The issue relating to funding has not changed, therefore voluntary mergers will continue to be an unrealistic proposition without significant additional funding from the Home Office. However, even if extra resources materialised, the issue of precept equalisation would remain, leaving a significant barrier to voluntary mergers.

6.2 **Further Legislation**

New legislation to clarify the governance and legal framework that underpins joint-working is supported as this will enable Police Authorities to better fulfil their statutory duty to ensure Forces collaborate. Greater reward and recognition for effective collaboration is also welcomed but clarity is sought on how the Home Office proposes to do this. Mechanisms should be put in place to ensure details of successful collaborative efforts are widely disseminated.

The principle of centrally mandating collaboration for some areas of protective services is opposed. We consider that creating an environment and culture within the service that facilitates greater collaboration at a local level would be much more helpful.

6.3 **International Assistance**

The creation of an International Police Assistance Board to focus the contribution that UK policing makes overseas seems sensible.

Chapter 7 – Improving performance in policing

7.1 **Home Office Role**

The refocusing of the Home Office's role on strategic issues and the removal of top down targets is welcomed as this will facilitate delivery of a policing service which is better tailored to local needs and priorities and will increase local accountability.

7.2 **Police Authority Capacity**

The Authority welcomes the enhancement of Police Authorities roles and the need to ensure that authorities must have the capacity and capability to deliver their role and functions for the benefit of communities. The Authority would draw the attention of the Home Secretary to the comprehensive resource programme that has supported this work for Local Authorities

In 2003, some £100m jointly funded a Capacity Building Programme in local authorities, in collaboration with partners such as the Audit Commission, IDeA, the Local Government Association and the regional Employers' Organisation and regional improvement & efficiency organisations. Additional funding was secured in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2004, which has extended the programme to 2008. Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships are also continuing to support local authorities through the comprehensive area assessment process. The Authority accepts that the 43 authorities represent a smaller proposition but would suggest that consideration be given to similar programmes to enhance the existing capacity and capabilities of police authorities.

7.3 **Single Top Down Target on Confidence**

Whilst it is acknowledged that confidence is a key outcome for policing, is this the right measure for the Home Office to focus on? It must be acknowledged that policing activity only has a limited influence on confidence levels. Amongst others, the activities of partners, media coverage and experience of the police service in other countries can all impact on public confidence.

This concern is heightened by the need to ensure that the different confidence measures of partners, for example through the place-shaping survey carried out by local authority partners are linked together. We would welcome indications from HMIC that these and other valid local measures of confidence would form part of a basket of indicators that could be used when measuring confidence. At the same time we are concerned that the similar confidence measure for the Criminal Justice System has not been entirely successful.

If the Home Office does decide to pursue this performance measure, to enable confidence levels to be usefully benchmarked across the Country, a unified approach to the collection of local confidence data will be required.

As part of each individual force/authorities confidence surveys it is also suggested that information should be collected on issues which have affected a respondents reported level of confidence. This will enable local/national/international events and other matters which

have impacted in confidence to be identified. This should be reflected when reporting back to communities.

We hope you will find these views useful.

Yours sincerely

Miranda Carruthers-Watt
CHIEF EXECUTIVE