

## **PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SUB (POLICE) COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 30 November 2017**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Resource Management Sub (Police) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.30 am**

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)	Deputy Keith Bottomley
Nicholas Bensted-Smith	Alderman Alison Gowman
Tijs Broeke	Caroline Mawhood (Audit & Risk)(External)

#### **Officers:**

George Fraser	-	Town Clerk's Department
Alex Orme	-	Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	-	Deputy Chamberlain
Pat Stothard	-	Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management
Sean Green	-	Director of IT
Alistair Sutherland	-	Assistant Commissioner, CoLP
Paul Adams	-	City of London Police
T/ CI Jon Munton	-	City of London Police
Stuart Phoenix	-	City of London Police
Hayley Williams	-	City of London Police

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Deputy Doug Barrow, Kenneth Ludlam and Lucy Sandford.

The Chairman confirmed that Alderman Alison Gowman would be stepping down from the Sub-Committee after this meeting. Members thanked her for her service and valuable contributions to the Sub-Committee.

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

There were no declarations.

### **3. MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the minutes from the last meeting, held on 26 September 2017.

It was agreed that the attendance list required amendments to include the Deputy Chamberlain, who was in attendance.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes be approved.

### **4. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk that summarised the outstanding actions from the previous meetings.

#### **OR5 – IT Transformation Report**

The Director of IT provided Members with a verbal update on the IT transformation programme, and outlined the structural changes that were taking place. He explained that there had been significant investment in “IT Hygiene”, and that the programme had progressed from design and strategy into mobilisation and delivery.

He explained that the Phase II programme was now being defined, for which a separate report had been produced. A Member asked whether the Phase II transformation was in line and coordinated at this stage. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that it was all on track. The Member requested that the Phase II report be forwarded from IT Sub (Finance) Committee to the next meeting. (1)

A Member stated that the Audit & Risk Management Committee had discussed the IT Transformation Programme at their last meeting on 28 November as it was perceived to be a serious risk, and confirmed that they had commented very positively on it. The Chairman noted this and explained that it was very helpful to hear of their approval.

#### **OR9 – Operation Mass**

The Assistant Commissioner explained that the planned dates for 2018 “Operation Mass” events were now available. The Chairman requested that these be circulated to Members via email. (2)

#### **OR15 – Licensee Responsibility for CCTV**

The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that he had spoken with the Superintendent of Communities and Partnerships about licence applications. He explained that once licence applications are made, meetings with owners are routine. He explained that in almost all cases conditions are placed on licenced premises, such as a restriction on promoted events and CCTV placement. He explained that most applicants offer to install CCTV as part of their application regardless. He also confirmed that it was not legal to enforce CCTV installation, so this aspect was reliant on negotiation with premises owners. It was also explained that the licensing regulator and authority were responsible for any decision to include CCTV as a condition, and as such that this could not be determined by the CoLP. The Assistant Commissioner explained that CoLP were going to look at the last 6 months of licensing applications to analyse the decisions made in each case with regards to CCTV conditions.

The Chairman noted that it was evident that, although there were over 600 licensed premises within the City of London, only a percentage of these would be perceived as premises for which CCTV would be deemed crucial. A Member explained that there was a requirement for a dialogue between the CoLP and the Licensing Committee to increase understanding of how licensing make decisions on the imposition of conditions, or the exception of CCTV

conditions for some premises. The Chairman suggested that it may be related to government advice against imposing a blanket CCTV condition.

The Assistant Commissioner reiterated that the CoLP would wish to convey the two key benefits of CCTV conditions on licenced premises to the Licensing Committee:

1. Tackling local crime and disorder
2. Investigation of hostile reconnaissance

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

## 5. **INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE REPORT**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chamberlain that provided Members with an update on the work of Internal Audit that has been undertaken for the City of London Police since the last report in September 2017.

The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that all audits from 2016-17 had now been completed except for *Budget Monitoring* and *Income Streams & Income Generation*, which were both at final report stage. He explained that Audit were now in discussion with the Commissioner regarding issues for 2017-18 audits. He also explained that there was a further exercise to identify outstanding actions and bring back in January/February 2018.

A Member requested a clarification of the concerns referenced in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report, regarding Police Project Management. The Chairman explained that a major area of concern was the communication difficulties between secure and insecure environments, particularly causing difficulties between the CoLP and the City Surveyor's department. The Member asked whether these concerns were limited to internal communication, and asked for reassurance that there were no external risks. The Head of Audit & Risk Management confirmed that these were just internal issues, and that they were currently being addressed. The Deputy Chamberlain explained that, as the CoLP used a separate IT system to other departments, there was a challenge in overcoming the firewall to communicate effectively, and that this was a well-known issue.

A Member confirmed that this issue was also raised at the Audit & Risk Management Committee, where it was asked why there appeared to be a communication breakdown between the CoLP and the City Surveyors. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the issues were not simply due to IT systems themselves, but also difficulties in determining which recipients have security clearance to receive information. The Chairman noted that this vetting issue had been raised previously, regarding the transmission of critical information. He requested reassurance that this was being resolved as an imperative. (3)

A Member asked for an explanation of the RED status marked on "*Police Seized Goods*" within the report. The Chairman agreed that this was needed, and he also explained that there was no clear action plan illustrated within the

report. The Commissioner explained that these processes were now being handled in-house through the newly implemented NICHE system, rather than through Audit. This has enabled issues to be addressed locally. He explained that although they were able to action procedural changes, the resource to implement many of the recommended changes was not available. The Assistant Commissioner explained that they had increased from monthly audit meetings to bi-monthly, from which they feedback to Audit department. He confirmed that if they had been unable to action resolutions to any risks, then this would appear in the update that is submitted to this Sub-Committee.

A Member conceded that resource was an issue, but stated that this was not a valid excuse for elements not being checked, fed-back, tracked or audited sufficiently.

The Assistant Commissioner explained that in some cases, the CoLP were awaiting feedback on why elements were still being marked as risks. The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that a meeting was planned in the week commencing 4 December to confirm these.

The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that there was a quarterly review of the recommendations and an upgrade of the audit software which enabled "auto-checking". This allowed live access to recommendations with the ability to upload information detailing why recommendations have been raised, and to respond with requests to approve sign off from Audit.

The Chairman asked for a list schedule to be included for recommendations to be checked off. (4) The Assistant Commissioner explained that in cases where ratings don't match up, sometimes discussion is required prior to its submission to this Sub-Committee.

The Chairman requested an explanation as to the issues highlighted in paragraph 5 surrounding budgetary performance monitoring. The Deputy Chamberlain stated that there was a need to improve forecasting significantly. The Assistant Commissioner explained that it was also necessary to recognise that Police work was inherently unpredictable, and that this would present unique budget forecasting challenges.

It was agreed that there would be a future meeting involving the Chairman, Police Authority, CoLP Chief Officers, Chamberlain and Deputy Chamberlain to discuss future scrutiny direction of this Sub-Committee in parallel to the Grand Committee. The Deputy Chamberlain explained that this scrutiny could then feed into the Medium Term Financial Plan to ensure that funding was more predictable. (5)

The Chairman enquired as to whether areas with multiple risks marked as "AMBER" should be considered "RED" automatically. The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that it was very difficult to draw this conclusion by looking at the numbers. He explained that the overall risk was determined by a holistic analysis of each area, and this ensured "RED" status was always appropriately issued.

The Chairman enquired as to how the overpayment of salaries had occurred, and requested reassurance that CoLP were confident that these types of errors were not still occurring. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the old system on which the errors had occurred was very rigid, and assured Members that the new system was far more fluid so as to avoid these types of errors. A Member stated that they were fairly surprised by these basic errors, and the Chairman agreed. The Member clarified that the assurance Members sought was related not just to software capabilities, but rather to cultural approaches and procedures. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the error referenced within the report was due to a mistake made by a new member of staff which was then not followed up in that instance. The Deputy Chamberlain noted that budget monitoring improvements would be able to identify these errors, so it should remain something perceived to be a process issue. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the error was in fact highlighted, so the CoLP were aware of it, but it was simply not followed up. He suggested that it was a behavioural error, rather than a procedural issue.

The Chairman enquired as to the status of the Programme Management report, and asked if this report could be recirculated to ensure that all Members received it. The Assistant Commissioner explained that it was not yet finalised. The Town Clerk illustrated their confusion at the report being submitted to Audit & Risk Management Committee if it was not final. The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that since being submitted to the Audit & Risk Management Committee they were looking at incorporating comments and amendments before it would be considered a true final draft. It could then be submitted to the next meeting of the sub-committee on 1 February. (6)

The Assistant Commissioner asked if it would be beneficial to ensure that a representative of the Programme Office attended the next meeting of this Sub-Committee on 1 February 2018 to give an overview of the current programmes and projects underway. Members all agreed. (7)

A Member noted that the report highlighted the communications issue between the CoLP and the City Surveyors. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the issues arising from the project gateway process, meeting schedule and governance procedure not interacting effectively on Police projects was now widely recognised. The Assistant Commissioner explained that this would be addressed at the next meeting of Policy & Resources Committee, as it had been argued that Police Accommodation and similar projects require alternative structure and governance. He also noted that there had been difficulty in providing information to Members on important project developments via Member briefings. The Town Clerk questioned whether the Project Management report should be perceived as an “AMBER” risk, as it was stated within the report. The Head of Audit & Risk Management explained that although some of the risks were considered “RED”, the majority were “AMBER” and overall it was still considered “AMBER”.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

6. **Q2 PERFORMANCE VS MEASURES SET OUT IN THE POLICING PLAN 2017-20**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that summarised performance against measures in the Policing Plan 2017-20 for the period 1 April – 30 September 2017.

The Chairman noted the new format of the report, illustrated his approval, and thanked the team for making the significant improvements over the previous format. He explained that it was useful to know the outcome in all areas, and suggested that for some this detail was perhaps lacking.

In reference to **Measure 1 – *The number of crimes committed in the City***, the Chairman explained that it was important to recognise and articulate positives in the update when they occur, such as in the case of vehicle crime which has significantly reduced. The Assistant Commissioner explained that some measures bucked the national negative trend, and so this illustrated good work achieved.

In reference to **Measure 2 – *The capability and impact the Force is having against countering terrorist activity***, the Chairman explained that he was surprised not to see response to London Bridge included. The Assistant Commissioner explained that this occurred in Q1 and this report related to Q2.

In reference to **Measure 3 – *The capability and impact the force is having against countering fraud***, the Chairman asked for a clarification of the source of the figures. The T/Chief Inspector of Economic Crime explained that these referrals were all from within the Square Mile. He explained that most were from businesses, and the number of victims that were residents within the City was very small.

A Member asked if there had been repercussions of legal outcomes from previous failed cash seizures which meant that officers were disincentivised to make seizures. The T/Chief Inspector of Economic Crime denied that this was the case. He explained that lessons had been learned, but willingness to act had not been affected. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the Force had now refreshed communications and processes around cash seizures.

In reference to **Measure 4 – *The capability and impact the Force is having against countering fraud***, the Chairman noted the consistently good satisfaction ratings. The T/ Chief Inspector of Economic Crime explained that the newly implemented online system has enabled the CoLP to monitor feedback, but only when the case has been completed, and in some cases, this can mean conclusions are delayed by more than a year as Fraud investigations are notoriously protracted. He explained that they are now considering methods to monitor feedback in real-time.

A Member asked about the health of funding for victim care, and the T/Chief Inspector of Economic Crime explained that they were hopeful to receive increased funding, but that this had not been confirmed as of yet. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had only been one single repeat

victim of economic crime, highlighting the good work done by the Victim Care Unit.

In reference to **Measure 5 – *The capability and impact the Force is having in safeguarding and protecting vulnerable people***, the Chairman noted that the number of suicides had increased and requested that any further trend is monitored and commented upon in the narrative. (8)

In reference to **Measure 7 – *The capability and impact the Force is having in policing City roads***, a Member asked about the comment in the narrative that there was a lack of trained officers able to use tachographs. The Assistant Commissioner acknowledged this and stated that he would check how it was being addressed. (9) Another Member asked if we were able to ascertain who had been involved in which incidents (e.g. Car vs Cyclist vs Pedestrian). The Assistant Commissioner explained that this data was all available and is sourced from TfL. The Member stated his approval at this, and thanked the CoLP for their work done leading to improvements following feedback given on cycle safety operation.

The Chairman noted that the number of total casualties marked within the table incorrectly stated “0”.

In reference to **Measure 8 - Public Order and Protective Security**, the Chairman noted that the issue with the current number of trained Public Order officers was being addressed positively by the Force. Members requested assurance that resourcing of upcoming events had been sufficiently considered. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that the Force was still able to resource current local and national demand but ideally wished to increase resilience in this area. Members asked for an update at subsequent meetings on this issue. (10)

In reference to **Measure 11 – *The percentage of people surveyed who believe the police in the City of London are doing a good or excellent job***, the Assistant Commissioner explained that surveys had provided similar results to last year, but with approximately twice the number of respondents.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

## 7. **HMICFRS INSPECTION UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that provided Members with an overview of activity undertaken within the last reporting period, since the last meeting on 26 September, in response to reports published by HMICFRS.

The Chairman noted that the skills audit was a reoccurring issue. The Assistant Commissioner explained that this became a recommendation in 2015, with a 5-year plan subsequently implemented. He explained that they were now just over halfway through the Police staff audit, but with its conclusion now expected in the first half of 2018. He explained that the new HR Origins system being implemented will help in this regard. The Chairman noted that

the latest updates on this had been positive, and the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that there had been 10 new areas marked “GREEN” and two new areas marked “RED”. The Assistant Commissioner explained that following an inspection in early November, 3 areas had been marked as outstanding: Vulnerable Victims, Victim Care in ECD and Internal Vulnerable Individuals.

A Member asked for confirmation of when the PEEL Legitimacy report would be published. The Assistant Commissioner explained that this publication date had been pushed back by HMICFRS to 12 December 2017.

A Member asked whether the CoLP were implementing changes by the deadlines because they are encouraged by the HMICFRS, or vice versa. The Assistant Commissioner explained that these deadlines were sometimes given by HMICFRS following inspections, and sometimes no deadline is given and they are set internally. The Member stated that the dates and deadlines were unclear for some of the recommendations, and that there appeared to be a number which over ran. The Assistant Commissioner clarified that this was often because of dependencies on other deliverables so slippage did occur.

The Chairman enquired as to whether vulnerability was an area of concern. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that there was a Vulnerability Action Plan in place. The T/ Chief Inspector of Economic Crime confirmed that he had attended the Force Vulnerability Steering Group. This monitored the delivery of the action plan and was highly productive. It was noted that the Lead member for Vulnerability and Safeguarding was a Member of this Group.

Members illustrated their disappointment at the delay in updating the website to include “you said, we did” section, with the deadline for completion moved from April 2017 to February 2018.

A Member asked whether the CoLP website was compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). They emphasised that if it was not, then it would pose a significant challenge to do so. The Assistant Commissioner said he would confirm. (11) Another Member explained that the GDPR requirements were presented at the last meeting of the Audit & Risk Management Committee on 28 November.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

**8. HUMAN RESOURCES MONITORING INFORMATION (1ST APRIL 2017 - 30TH SEPTEMBER 2017)**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that set out the City of London Police Human Resources monitoring data for the period 1 April - 30 September 2017.

A Member illustrated their surprise at the fact that exit interviews were not employed as the routine method of gaining information from leaving staff. They emphasised that the information gained would be more useful than that gained by completion of a form. The Assistant Commissioner explained that exit interviews cannot be made mandatory, and if staff do not want to divulge any

information then that is their prerogative. He explained that an effective method of gaining the insight of exiting staff, currently being promoted by the Force, was by carrying out these interviews when staff come to leave their possessions with HR (ID card, mobile devices etc), at which point they are found to be more receptive to discussion.

A Member noted that the CoLP were several police officers/staff below the full establishment and enquired as to whether carrying this vacancy factor was a deliberate way of managing efficiency savings. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that the Force was currently under establishment, but that this was being addressed by a rolling recruitment campaign. He explained that the total number of CoLP officers would be in excess of 700 when transferees were included. He explained that the number of CoLP civilian staff was currently being reviewed, but was unlikely to go above the current number at this stage. The Deputy Chamberlain explained that, as to be detailed within the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), there appears to be significant scope for efficiency savings around this area.

A Member enquired as to the recording and analysis of reasons given for staff members leaving CoLP. They emphasised the importance of understanding the reasons staff had for leaving within 12 months of joining, as CoLP would bear significant training costs in these cases. The Assistant Commissioner explained that he had been involved in exit interviews personally, and in those that he attended, the reason for leaving was always for financial rewards available in the private sector. The Member explained that this information was crucial as it demonstrated that these cases were not caused by a failure of the recruitment process. They requested that such insight be included within reports. The Chairman agreed that the omission of HR reports meant strategic insights were being missed. The Assistant Commissioner suggested that the CoLP and any interested Members sit down to develop an updated template for this report. (12)

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

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

There were no questions

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

There was no further business

11. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded.

12. **ONE SAFE CITY UPDATE [POLICE REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2017]**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police, originally submitted to the Police Grand Committee, that updated Members on the Ring of Steel and Secure City Programme (Formerly known as One Safe City).

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

**a) VALUE FOR MONEY UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee heard a verbal update from the Assistant Commissioner of Police that updated Members on developments made in response to Value for Money scrutiny.

**RESOLVED** – That the Assistant Commissioner be heard.

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

There were no questions

**14. 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 further business

**The meeting closed at 1.24 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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