

**POLICE PERFORMANCE AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SUB COMMITTEE**

08 February 2013

**Minutes of the meeting of the POLICE PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT SUB COMMITTEE held at Guildhall, EC2 on FRIDAY, 8th
FEBRUARY 2013 at 12.30 pm.**

Present

Members

Deputy Douglas Barrow, Chairman
Deputy Keith Knowles
Kenneth Ludlam

Officers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Neil Davies | Head of Corporate Performance and Development, Town Clerk's Department |
| Alex Orme | Town Clerk's Department |
| Ignacio Falcon | Town Clerk's Department |
| Suzanne Jones | Business Support Director, Chamberlain's Department |

City of London Police

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Wayne Chance | Temporary Commander, Operational Policing |
| Eric Nisbett | Director of Corporate Services |
| Hayley Williams | Chief of Staff |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Bob Duffield and Don Randall.

**2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL
INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

None were received.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 14 November 2012 were approved.

MATTERS ARISING

(1) Business Continuity Audit Exercise – The Commander confirmed that the exercise had been held on 10th December 2012 and it had been very successful.

4. **HMIC: VFM PROFILES AND CRIME AND POLICE COMPARATORS**

The Sub-committee received a report of the Commissioner on the most recent version of the HMIC's Vfm Profiles.

The Director of Corporate Services pointed out that the City Police was an 'outlier' in the Profiles because of a number of factors for example its location within the City meant that higher than average accommodation costs are being incurred .

There was a general discussion about the VFM profiles and why the City of Police was such a high cost service in many of its delivery areas. There had been an expectation that the Force's City First Change Programme would address many of the areas where the force was a significant outlier.

Members noted that in some instances the projected City First cost was given as a comparison with current cost.

Members wanted to be reassured that City Of London Police services were delivering VFM and therefore asked for more comparative information (either by using other bodies of similar size as comparators or by using a "scaling" methodology). Members also asked for more work to be done on justifying the Force's uniqueness and on explaining why the City of London Police was such a high spender in many areas particularly in terms of support service functions.

Members also requested further analysis about the following profiled costs:

- Police staff costs per head of population – The City of London Police ranking had gone from 13th in 2010/11 to 2nd in 2012.
- Support functions cost per head of population – The City of London Police was ranked 1st in all areas (except training – 2nd) for 2012.
- Administrative Support – the City of London Police (£11.6 per head of population) was significantly above the average (£2.7)
- Human Resources – the City of London Police ranking had gone from 5th in 2010/11 to 1st in 2012.
- Professional Standards - the City of London Police ranking had gone from 7th in 2010/11 to 1st in 2012.

In addition, it was noted that not all relevant cost profiles had a City First figure e.g. supplies and services as a percentage of the workforce costs.

Members also asked for more information on how the City of London Police was responding to the recommendations coming out of the various HMIC inspection reports. In order to track the progress made and ensure that there was a clear link between this Sub-Committee and the Audit and Risk Management Committee, Members requested a report for the next meeting on

all HMIC inspection activity during 2012/13, including an update on progress in implementing HMIC recommendations.

RESOLVED – That:-

- a) a further report be produced for the next meeting explaining why the City Police had significantly higher comparative costs in some areas, including its support service functions. and
- b) a report be produced for the next meeting setting out the progress made in responding to the recommendations from the HMIC inspection reports published in 2012-2013.

5. PERFORMANCE AGAINST POLICING PLAN TARGETS 2012 – 1ST 2ND AND 3RD QUARTER

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner summarising performance against the Policing Plan 2012-15 for the period between 1 April and 31 December 2012.

By the end of the third quarter, of the 18 policing plan targets, 1 target had been met (WHITE), 16 were assessed as on track to meet the target by the due date (GREEN), 1 was deemed behind target, but could still meet the target by the due date (AMBER) and none were classed as targets not met or unlikely to be met (RED).

Members raised concerns about achieving Target 11 – a reduction in victim-based violent crime by the end of quarter 4. The Commander stated that he was confident that the current operational measures will go some way to achieving the target. He outlined some of the initiatives that should see an improvement in the figures by the end of quarter 4, including Operation Blitzen and the targeting of violent crimes taking place around licensed premises.

Joint CoLP and CoL initiatives to address issues relating to the increase in Night Time Economy were also discussed.

RESOLVED – That the report be received and its contents noted.

6. POLICING PLAN TARGETS 2013

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Commissioner setting out the proposed measures which would support delivery of the Policing Plan 2013 – 2016. The Plan would be presented to the Police Committee at its February meeting.

The Sub-Committee commented on the proposed measures in detail:-

| Measure | Comments |
|------------------------|--|
| Counter-Terrorism (CT) | AGREED with no change although there was a discussion about the lack of a qualitative measure. It was agreed that |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Measure 1 | any feedback from these engagement events would be reported to the Police Performance Management Group. |
| CT Measure 2 | AGREED with no change. |
| CT Measure 3 | AGREED with no change. |
| CT Measure 4 | AGREED with no change, although Members raised concerns about the level of stretch with the setting of a 90% target, especially as the Police have consistently achieved over 95% in the past. |
| Economic Crime (EC) Measure 1 | AGREED with no change, although Members would like to ensure that the Force identifies and targets those organisations whose input are crucial to further reducing fraud. |
| EC Measure 2 | AGREED with no change. |
| EC Measure 3 | AGREED with no change. Members commented that this was a good example of the Force responding effectively to member feedback. |
| EC Measure 4 | AGREED with no change. |
| EC Measure 5 | AGREED with no change. |
| EC Measure 6 | AGREED with no change. |
| Public Order (PO) Measure 1 | AGREED with no change. |
| PO Measure 2 | AGREED with no change. The Commander agreed that the number of complaints or action taken against the Police following the policing of a major event should be reported to the Police Performance Management Group and the Performance and Resource Management Sub (Police) Committee (as a measurement of success). |
| PO Measure 3 | AGREED with no change. |
| Crime Reduction (CR) Measure 1 | AGREED with no change, although there was a discussion about the level of challenge (stretch) for the Force from setting a target of reducing victim based violent crime compared to 2011-12 (as figures for 2011-12 are already high). |
| CR Measure 2 | AGREED with no change. There was a discussion about whether the City First change programme is having an impact on front-line service delivery, as the Force has repeatedly stated that staffing reductions would not affect service delivery because resources are being used more effectively. The Commander confirmed that service delivery has/will be affected because of the staffing reductions and stated that there has been a reduction in the number of ward officers. |
| Roads Policing (RP) Measure 1 | AGREED with no change. |
| RP Measure 2 | AGREED with no change. The number of uninsured vehicles seized and unlicensed drivers figures will be reported separately. |
| RP Measure 3 | AGREED with no change. The number of referrals to the Safer Cycle scheme and the Driver Alert Scheme will be |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | reported separately. |
| Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Measure 1 | AGREED with no change. The Force confirmed that the ASB measure should read as follows: “to ensure that at least 90% of those reporting anti-social behaviour are satisfied with the way police handled the case”. There was a discussion about revising the measure to include satisfaction levels for the victims of ASB and also a debate about whether there should be a specific headline measure for reducing ASB associated with the NTE. The Police stated that they will consider developing a measurable ASB target once they have started collecting the appropriate information. |
| ASB Measure 2 | AGREED with no change although there was a discussion about the merits of having this target as one of the main ASB measures. Members were unclear why this was being treated as an ASB priority. It was agreed that the target should match the Community and Children’s Services Departmental business plan target for 2013/14. |
| ASB Measure 3 | AGREED with no change. |
| ASB Measure 4 | AGREED with no change. |
| Satisfaction Measure | AGREED with no change. |
| Response Measure | AGREED with no change. |

RESOLVED – That:-

- a) the proposed measures presented in the Rationale document, as amended above, be adopted by principal measures for the Policing Plan 2013-16; and
- b) performance against the measures be reported to the Sub-Committee quarterly.

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

In response to a question by the Chairman, Members agreed that the timing and format of the meeting were appropriate.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was a brief update by the Chairman about the charitable fundraising campaign led by the Commissioner.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involved the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

| Item No. | Exempt Paragraphs |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 11- 12 | 7 |
| 13 – 14 | - |

SUMMARY OF ITEMS CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC WERE EXCLUDED

10. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2012 were agreed.

11. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

12. URGENT ITEMS CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC WERE EXCLUDED

There were none.

The meeting closed at 2.00 pm

CHAIRMAN

**Contact Officer: Alex Orme
tel. no. 020 7332 1397
e-mail: alex.orme@cityoflondon.gov.uk**