

ECONOMIC CRIME BOARD OF THE POLICE COMMITTEE

Friday, 20 October 2017

Minutes of the meeting of the Economic Crime Board of the Police Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Keith Bottomley
Deputy Robert Merrett

Deputy Tom Sleigh

Officers:

| | | |
|---------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| George Fraser | - | Town Clerk's Department |
| Oliver Bolton | - | Town Clerk's Department |
| Glenn Maleary | - | Detective Chief Superintendent, CoLP |
| Pauline Smith | - | Head of Action Fraud, CoLP |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Doug Barrow, Deputy James Thomson, Simon Duckworth, Nicholas Bensted-Smith and Deputy Henry Pollard.

Deputy Tom Sleigh agreed to chair this meeting in Simon Duckworth's absence.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

Members considered the Public Minutes from the last meeting, held on 27 July 2017.

RESOLVED – That the minutes be approved.

4. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

Members received a report of the Town Clerk summarising the outstanding actions from previous meetings.

OR3 – Cyber Training for Members

In light of the example training session provided within the agenda, a Member queried the feasibility of providing training to Members. The Detective Chief Superintendent suggested that it might be beneficial to invite a representative of the Economic Crime Academy to the following meeting in order to present and discuss feasible cyber training provision for Members. (1)

It was also requested that an update be provided to Members on the current provision of cyber training to City Corporation staff. (2)

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

5. ECONOMIC CRIME VICTIM CARE UNIT (ECVCU) PRESENTATION

Members received verbal and written report updates on the Economic Crime Victim Care Unit (ECVCU) from the Commissioner of Police.

The Head of Action Fraud explained that the ECVCU was an initiative run in partnership between the CoLP, MPS and Action Fraud, with the BTPA recently dropping out as a result of having no victims. The service had been funded for the last three years by the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MoPAC).

The Head of Action Fraud explained that the focus was on the 5% most vulnerable victims, and that a survey had been carried out recently to gauge desire for the service. The Head of Action Fraud explained that a 92-year old man had travelled from Surbiton to illustrate his approval of the service. She explained that they had confirmed 18 cases in which the "re-scamming" of victims had been averted when followed up over a year later.

The Head of Action Fraud explained that the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) had provided funding to enable a trial of a national roll-out involving Greater Manchester Police and the West Midlands Police. She explained that there was a desire to ensure the success of the service prior to rolling out under the umbrella of Action Fraud. An evaluation of the service by Age UK will yield findings in April 2018.

A Member asked how this service would link to the Action Fraud Victim Service. The Head of Action Fraud explained that this service was a provision for all those victims that had not received any service. She explained that the Victim Service demands the "soft skills" that victims require in order to feel supported from an emotional perspective, whilst the ECVCU provides the more technical Economic Crime skills and knowledge that needs to be complimented by this. The desire would be to combine the two services, with the support of MOPAC, in order to provide seamless support for victims of economic crime.

The Chairman asked what factors determined that someone would be declared "vulnerable". The Head of Action Fraud explained that they would view that person's current situation in relation to the crime. This includes judging how much the sum of money lost would negatively affect their life. A Member declared that the business case for funding should be centred on victims' vulnerability.

The Chairman asked what the total funding available was for Action Fraud. The Head of Action Fraud explained that it was around £1m, with a possible increase to £1.7 the following year. A Member noted that this was a significant sum, and asked how many staff this covered. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that this made provision for 23 staff Members as well as service costs.

The Chairman asked what could be done by Members to support Action Fraud. The Head of Action Fraud explained that any value added to Policing on a wider basis would help Action Fraud. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that the victim code of conduct dictates that a minimum level of service is provided to victims, and that in order to maintain this standard support of victim care initiatives was crucial. The Town Clerk explained that there has been movement to engage with PCCs and APCC to increase collaboration, towards which there has been Member input. The Chairman stated his approval of this as a good example of pan-London working, and recommended that Members are supportive.

RESOLVED – That the Head of Action Fraud be heard.

6. NATIONAL LEAD FORCE: 2017/18 PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Board received a report of the Commissioner of Police outlining the quantitative and qualitative performance of the City of London Police as the National Lead Force for Fraud between April 2017 and September 2017.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that a 7% Year-to-date (YTD) increase in the number of crimes reported to Action Fraud amounted to 9,000 victims. He explained that all economic crime was under-reported, and so there is an assumption that increased awareness is the basis behind a consistent increase in reported crimes.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that staff retention was an inherent challenge due to the nature of the work and the value of the skills required to tackle Economic Crime.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that an effort to improve the clarity and simplicity of reporting lines was expected to increase lines of enquiry. There has also been a concerted effort to engage nationally, where other forces have met limitations.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that there was a very large volume of targets – approximately 190,000. He explained that the CoLP are leading the world with regards to taking down criminal/fraudulent websites, and there was a strong desire to maintain its footprint beyond the limits of the City of London. He explained that a recent appearance on *Crimewatch* boosted the CoLP's profile. The Chairman explained that *Crimewatch* had recently been cancelled, and suggested that perhaps it would be beneficial for the Police Committee to write a letter to the BBC to show their support of its continued production.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that there had been successful promotional work achieved across social media. The Chairman noted that the summary of engagement levels on social media, as referenced within paragraph 3.2, would benefit from more background information to supplement it. (3)

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that the 7% of victim respondents that were not satisfied with the service, could generally be attributed to those who had not received the outcome they had hoped for. He explained that this was always going to pose a challenge, regardless of service standards, due to the volume of individual cases that don't result in positive outcomes. A Member suggested that it might be useful to alter the question in order to accurately portray the opinions of those with regards to the provision of victim care specifically. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime agreed. (4)

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime proposed that the layout of the reports submitted to the Board be changed to reflect the four priorities: Pursue, Protect, Prepare and Victim Service. The Chairman stated that the reports should be submitted in any format that is determined to be the most effective and useful, and approved this change.

The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that there were currently 4 vacancies, and a Member asked what percentage of the total staff this amounted to. It was explained that this was 4 out of a total 23 positions. The Chairman noted that this seemed to be an urgent matter. A Member asked if there had been any useful Deloitte recommendations in this area, to which the Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime confirmed that there were, and also stated that there needed to be awareness of the value in seeking external resources to cover costs rather than circulating costs within the City Corporation.

The Chairman noted an error in paragraph 5.3, where it stated there had been an increase of 56% in survey respondents. The figures included within the report illustrate that this was in fact a decrease of 36% from the previous period.

A Member queried the correspondence between the data in the "Total Outcomes Recorded" graph, and the following tables within the report, citing the total of approximately 11,000 Total Outcomes recorded in Q2 within the graph. Members discussed the use of cumulative recording of data, and all agreed that it would be best to refrain from using this method in the future when reporting ECD data. (5)

A Member asked for results-based evidence of progress made in these areas. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that they had shown improvements by reducing the number of KPI areas marked as RED down to just one, illustrating significant improvement.

A Member queried the root cause of the small number of final outcomes from total investigations. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that they were commencing new cases immediately as previous cases are finished, and due to lack of information in many instances these cases were not marked as "complete".

A Member queried the absence of data under the heading for “Value for Money”. The Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime confirmed that this would be available at the next meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

The Board received a report of the Commissioner of Police providing an update on the Economic Crime Victim Care Unit.

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Board considered the minutes from the last meeting, held on 27 July 2017.

RESOLVED – That the minutes be approved.

11. **RESTRICTED ACTIVITY UPDATE**

The Board received a report of the Commissioner of Police that summarised notable Policing activity not for publication that is being delivered by the City of London Police in its capacity as the National Lead Force.

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

12. **ECONOMIC CRIME ACADEMY UPDATE**

The Board received a report of the Commissioner of Police updating Members on the developments of the Economic Crime Academy.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

14. **ANY OTHER NON-PUBLIC BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no further business.

The meeting closed at 12.17 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: George Fraser
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174
george.fraser@cityoflondon.gov.uk