

PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SUB (POLICE) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 May 2017

Minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Resource Management Sub (Police) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)	Kenneth Ludlam
Nicholas Bensted-Smith	Lucy Sandford (External Member)
Alderman Alison Gowman	Deputy Keith Bottomley

Officers:

Paul Adams	-	City of London Police
Jane Gyford	-	T/Commander, City of London Police
Andrew Ricketts	-	City of London Police
Hayley Williams	-	City of London Police
Neil Davies	-	Town Clerk's Department
George Fraser	-	Town Clerk's Department
Charlotte Taffel	-	Town Clerk's Department
Alex Orme	-	Town Clerk's Department
Jeremy Mullins	-	Chamberlain
Pat Stothard	-	Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management
Caroline Al-Beyerty	-	Deputy Chamberlain

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Douglas Barrow and Caroline Mawhood.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting to be amended to read "Professional Standards & Integrity Sub (Police) Committee" on page 5. (1)

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2017 be approved.

4. ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing a list of actions taken with relevance to the Sub-Committee since the last meeting.

A Member gave feedback to the Sub-committee on Operation Mass attended on 3 May in Bishopsgate. The Member explained that the event was very well

received and productive, providing opportunities to meet and discuss issues with members of the public, as well as gaining their useful feedback. The Chairman encouraged Sub-Committee Members to take part in future exercises if they can.

The Sub-Committee discussed the relevance of this particular report in conjunction with outstanding references, and all agreed that it created unnecessary duplication of information and was therefore redundant. The Committee agreed to omit this from all future agendas for the Sub-Committee.
(2)

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

5. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing a list of Outstanding References from the last meeting.

Item 3. 2nd Quarter Performance Against Measures

A Member raised concern over the large cost of undertaking surveys, and that this might be a point for consideration for the Sub-Committee going forward. The Commissioner explained that a report for Information will be sent to the next meeting in September that explains the decision process undertaken on the various options.

Item 4. HMIC Inspection Update

The Commissioner updated the Sub-Committee on the action plan drawn up to address shortcomings in Crime Data.

Item 8. 2nd Quarter Performance Against Measures

The Commissioner explained to the Sub-Committee the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) reporting definitions and standards, and agreed to consider how best to present ASB data to Members on in the future.

The Lead Member for ASB agreed to work with the Force to look into the guidelines surrounding ASB data (personal nuisance, environmental) to see whether the data could be presented in a more useful format to aid Members understanding. (3)

Item 23. One Safe City Programme

The Commissioner explained that the Force undertakes desktop testing exercises regularly which would include the JCCR, once it has been established where the JCCR will be located. In the meantime, there are adequate separate Business Continuity plans in place for the existing Command and Control Room and the CoLP/ CoL switchboard.

RESOLVED – That the list of Outstanding References be noted and updated.

6. **4TH QUARTER PERFORMANCE AGAINST MEASURES SET OUT IN THE POLICING PLAN 2016-19**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner summarising performance against measures set out in the Policing Plan 2016-19 for the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017.

The Chairman noted that the sub descriptors/ qualifiers within the appendix were inconsistent with those used in the summary page. The Chairman requested that these be made consistent throughout the documentation. (4)

Measure 2 - The percentage of those surveyed who are confident that the City of London is protected from terrorism

A Member asked, with reference to the poor response rate, what the best course of action would be to ensure surveys are effective. The Commissioner explained that they had suffered from survey fatigue, and were looking for ways to improve targeting using bespoke surveys with Corporate Communications, and an update report would be shared with the sub-committee in due course once it had been submitted for Decision at the Police Committee.

A Member suggested that as the majority of the population of the City were only present between 9am-5pm, it is important to ensure that the correct audience were being targeted for these surveys.

Measure 3 – The education and enforcement activities delivered to support the City of London Corporation’s casualty reduction target

A Member posed a question relating to the statistics detailed within Measure 3 that stated a return of 15 offences logged from 17 vehicle checks. The Member asked whether or not this would suggest it appropriate to carry out a higher number of vehicle checks, given the high rate of offences identified. The Commissioner explained that this high rate of return was due to the checks being targeted.

Measure 4 – The number of disposals from manned enforcement activities

A Member questioned the accuracy of the data within this dataset, given that they were aware of disposals within the Community Road Watch category that took place in March 2017, though this was documented as “0” within the report. Members sought assurance that data quality was maintained. The Commissioner noted that data was linked with that of Transport for London; and assurance would be requested to ensure the data presented was correct. (5)

Measure 6 – The level of victim-based violent crime

The Commissioner explained that a visible rise in Victim-Based Violent Crimes statistics was attributable in part to the inclusion of incidents in which victims are involved in initial altercations, such as security guards, despite being no consequent injury. Such incidents have to be recorded within this assessment which plays a role in the rising numbers.

Measure 7 - The level of victim-based acquisitive crime

A Member noted that, in reference to the associated table within Appendix A - Performance Summary, the trend should be “Deteriorating” rather than “Stable” or “Stable/Negative”. The Member declared that this data needed to be

consistently aligned. A Member suggested that it might be useful to include PMG ratings within the Appendices for these reports. The Commissioner agreed to resolve the discrepancies within the report.

A Member noted that the most recent figure recorded, for March 2017, was the highest rate to date. The Commissioner explained various issues with premises involved not having working CCTV in operation during incidents/CCTV installed in the right places, and emphasised the need to promote responsibility amongst property owners in this regard. A Member suggested that appropriate levels of CCTV should be included be taken into consideration when granting licences for new premises in the City. (6)

The Commissioner also explained that steps are being taken to develop offender profiling to address these incidents.

Measure 9 – The level of Anti-Social Behaviour Incidents

The Commissioner explained that ASB reporting had changed to comply with correct reporting standards, and this is reflected by increases since September 2016. The Commissioner also explained that reporting was predominantly done by security guards and third parties, rather than City residents. The Commissioner noted that the collection of ASB data should improve when the new Crime and Intelligence reporting system goes live..

A Member questioned where the data was to support the assertion that ASB levels remain low in the City compared to surrounding Boroughs. The Commissioner commented that any comparison with the surrounding MPS boroughs would not be particularly useful owing to the very different demographic, but added from their own experience and perspective of working in the MPS, the volumes experienced in the City are low.

Measure 10 – The percentage of victims of fraud investigated by the Economic Crime Directorate who are satisfied with the service provided

A Member commented that this data looked to be positive.

Measure 13 – The attrition rate of crimes reported to Action Fraud

A Member requested the Commissioner to ensure the reporting data was correct due the discrepancies between the figures of complaints against reports, and crimes reported under measure 14. A note would be sent to the Member in order to clarify the figures presented.(7)

Measure 17 – The level of satisfaction of victims of crime with the service provided by the City of London Police

A Member asked for detail on the number of responses compared to the total number of victims. The Commissioner explained that the survey carried out into the level of satisfaction of victims was ineffective, and that they had seen negligible change in the results since last year.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. HMIC UPDATE REPORT

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner on HMIC Inspections.

The Commissioner updated the Sub-Committee on activity undertaken since the last meeting with reference to HMIC inspection reports. The Commissioner explained that there had been significant focus on Skills Capability to determine what skills gaps exist. Role profiles have been listed, though they are waiting on the work of the Demand and Value for Money review to be completed in two weeks' time, on 16th June. A Member asked for assurances that the conclusions of the review would be implemented into the strategic workforce plan. The Commissioner explained that due consideration would be given to the findings of the review and any accepted proposals would be included in relevant force plans and strategies, including the STRA process.

The Commissioner explained that the STRA process aimed to take into account what operational leads needed in terms of demand level, predicted demand level and services within each directorate. Following this, documents were produced and a strategic assessment made. The STRA report made 21 recommendations and was deemed to be very effective in identifying operational and strategic requirements. This will happen on an annual basis going forward. The next report would take place in August, pending the completion of the Demand and Value for Money review. The Sub-Committee agreed that the findings of the Demand and Value for Money review should go to Grand Committee with a view to formulating a deep dive group to focus on it.

The Commissioner gave a verbal update on the HMIC's PEEL: Police Effectiveness 2016 report. The Commissioner explained that the results were due to go through a process of regional and national moderation as is normal practice. A Member declared that due to the lengthy delay in receiving the reports, it was very useful to obtain regular updates so that the Sub-Committee is kept up to date.

A Member questioned various areas that are categorised as RED status within the table of recommendations. The Commissioner explained that in a number of cases GREEN status is pending quality assurance checks to be signed off within CoLP, such as Legitimacy No.1,4, and a number are pending completion of the Demand and Value for Money review, such as Efficiency No.2,3,4,5. Members also requested that estimated completion dates are given for all RED status recommendations in the next and future updates.

A Member expressed concern at the RED status of one of the recommendations within the Inspection update on "In harm's Way- the role of the police in keeping children safe". A Member asked that future reports include a forecast for future status changes (for example in 3/6/9 months' time) in order to provide more useful information in the table. (8)

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE POLICY OVERSIGHT ANNUAL UPDATE 2016-2017**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner providing an update on Force Policies and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

The Commissioner explained that the number of documents requiring review was reduced to 42, and this was a relatively low number. The Commissioner explained that many of these documents were marked as requiring review only due to a process of scheduling reviews automatically, and that it did not mean that the Authorised Professional Practice or SOP was out of date. The Chair requested an update report be produced for the next meeting that highlighted which areas had turned RED within the last period (9)

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

9. **HUMAN RESOURCES MONITORING INFORMATION 1ST APRIL 2016 - 31ST MARCH 2017**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police on Human Resources Monitoring from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017.

A Member requested that further information on resignations be included in the next update; particularly with regard to those who resigned after serving for a short period of time as these often point to critical issues that require addressing. The Commissioner noted that this information was required but was not in a position to agree to the request until he could check back in force what data was collected by HR. (11)

The Chairman noted that recruitment remained a challenge, and asked the Force to look into the areas that are under-resourced and the methods being used to fill vacancies. It was also noted that the Force needed to continue to look into planning for the impact of highly experienced officers (30 years' service) leaving the Force.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

10. **INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE REPORT**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chamberlain providing an update on the work of Internal Audit that has been undertaken on the CoLP since February 2017. There were two outstanding audits to be completed by 30 June. There were also four outstanding recommendations (three amber and one red), of which three were noted as 'completed' although this had yet to be triangulated by Internal Audit.

A Member noted the issue of fuel cards had been mentioned at the last meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee. This related to a carryover issue in 2015/16 which had now been completed.

The Project Management audit was soon to be completed and a report would be coming to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

11. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

13. 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 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

14. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2017 be approved.

15. ONE SAFE CITY PROGRAMME - REQUEST FOR FUNDING

The Sub-Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner detailing a funding request for June committees to cover the three month period from July to end of September for the One Safe City Programme that now falls within the domain of the City of London Police.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

16. ONE SAFE CITY REPORT ON ACHIEVEMENTS AND RESOURCES

The Sub-Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk, Chamberlain and Commissioner providing information on the One Safe City Programme.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

17. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no non-public urgent business.

The meeting closed at 3.55 pm

Chairman

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