

| | |
|--|---|
| Committee: Police: Economic Crime Board | Date: 7 th June 2013 |
| Subject: National Lead Force: Yearly Performance Report 2012-13 | Public |
| Report of: Commissioner of Police Pol 27/13 | For Information |

Summary

Members have received reports on the progress of the National Lead Force (NLF) throughout the 2012/13 reporting year. This final performance report to your Economic Crime Board summarises the 2012/13 annual achievements of National Lead Force (NLF) against its agreed Key Performance Areas (KPAs) and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Where there is a target, it is possible to show achievement, however in a number of the measures, owing to the nature of those measures- the update is shown as a narrative in Appendix A.

The framework has been reviewed and refined with improvements made to a number of areas going forward into the next performance year including the quality assurance function and stakeholder survey process.

A summary of this year's achievements is shown below and Appendix A provides fuller details of the performance overview for Q4 and the 2012/13 reporting year including direction of travel for actual target measures, which Members requested at your last Board meeting. A revised proposed framework for 2013/14 is at Appendix B.

| NLF objective | Comment on progress |
|---|---|
| KPA 1 Preventing and reducing the harm caused by economic crime | |
| KPI 1.1 To increase the value of future economic crime disrupted by intervening against enablers of fraud | Target Achieved |
| KPI 1.2 To increase economic crime public awareness and stakeholder prevention | Target Achieved |
| KPI 1.3 To increase victim self-protection and reduce repeat victimisation | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for % outcome |
| KPA 2 Enriching the national economic crime threat assessment and intelligence picture | |
| KPI 2.1 To extend the impact and reach of strategic intelligence dissemination | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for % outcome. |

| | |
|---|--|
| KPI 2.2 To extend the impact and reach of operational intelligence dissemination | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for narrative details. |
| KPI 2.3 To extend the impact and reach of organised crime group intelligence dissemination | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for narrative details. |
| KPA 3 Enforcing and disrupting economic crime at the local, regional and national levels | |
| KPI 3.1 To increase the value of criminal asset denial through to recovery (end to end process) | Target Achieved |
| KPI 3.2 To increase the value of future fraud disrupted by NLF enforcement cases | No previous annual baseline for number of cases. See Appendix A for narrative details. |
| KPI 3.3 To reduce the intent and capability of the most serious Organised Crime Groups perpetrating fraud | Target Achieved |
| KPI 3.4 To improve the quality of investigation and thereby enhance judicial outcomes | See Appendix A for narrative details. |
| KPA 4 Raising the standard of economic crime prevention and investigation nationally by providing education and awareness to the counter fraud community | |
| KPI 4.1 To improve the impact and reach of training strategy and delivery | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for % outcome. |
| KPI 4.2 To enhance the impact and reach of standard setting and dissemination of best practice guidance | No previous annual baseline. See Appendix A for % outcome. |
| KPA 5 Delivering value and reassurance to our community and partners in industry | |
| KPI 5.1 To increase return on investment in NLF (£saved per £spent) | Target Achieved |
| KPI 5.2 To improve overall satisfaction of community (including victims) and partners in industry with NLF economic crime services | Target Achieved |
| KPI 5.3 To increase the £value and % of leveraged partnership funding | Target Achieved |

The report also highlights some performance successes including positive performance in production and dissemination of National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB) products; disruption of fraud enablers and disruption of Organised Crime Groups. There are still some performance challenges to overcome, including measuring the quality of investigations and judicial outcomes.

Recommendation

It is recommended that your board receives this report and notes its contents.

Main Report

Background

1. At the February board meeting Members received a report detailing National Lead Force (NLF) performance during the third quarter of the financial year (2012/13), set against an agreed performance framework. This report provides details of NLF performance to date, changes to the 2013/14 NLF framework and strategies to further embed the performance within NLF.

Current Position

2. As Members may recall, the current NLF performance framework was introduced in April 2012, the framework differed significantly from previous years attributing value to qualitative measures stretching in its ambition. The previous 12 months has seen the embedding of the framework accompanied by a significant shift in the performance culture of the NLF.
3. As the NLF Framework has progressed through the operational phase the Business Performance Team (BPT) have undertaken extensive work to establish and refine the mechanisms for collecting performance data and to identify baselines in all cases. A data bible provides an excellent reference tool detailing all data streams across the NLF and their contribution to each Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Key Performance Area (KPA).
4. A review of the 2012/13 framework has led the BPT to refocus activity and streamline the framework reducing the number of KPIs from 15 to 13. The reworded KPIs have been simplified and accurately reflect the key indicators that are required to achieve the overall objective of each KPA. A revised framework is attached at Appendix B for your information.
5. The review also instigated positive improvements in measurement processes and mechanisms detailed below:
 - a. The introduction of a quality assurance function to ensure the quality and accuracy of victim and crime information on the force crime system.

- b. Improvements to the current stakeholder survey process including a reduction in the frequency of surveys to one per annum and the introduction of tailored questioning to achieve accurate feedback from business critical stakeholders.
- c. Effective planning to utilise the results of the annual stakeholder survey to inform the setting of the following year's strategy plans and measures targets to become truly customer focus and deliver against the needs of all our customers.
- d. The amalgamation of the force victim survey and fraud victim survey to quantify the true impact of fraud crime comparative with other crime types.

Current performance Summary

- 6. In summary, as shown in the Summary to this report, where there is an actual target measure, the KPI's have been achieved. Board Members are referred to Appendix A, which provides fuller detail of the performance overview for Q4 and the 2012/13 reporting.

Performance Successes

- 7. The NFIB maintained the range of Stakeholders receiving their strategic products at 555 and ended the year having disseminated 954 alerts to Stakeholders compared with only 184 in 2011/12¹. In a final Stakeholder satisfaction survey 94% of Stakeholders agreed that NFIB alerts are of a high quality².
- 8. The disruption of fraud enablers is a significant aspect of fraud prevention and the NFIB continue to exceed the annual target. Disruption of technological and financial Fraud enablers continues to increase with NFIB achieving 1104 disruptions in 2012-13 compared with 672 in 2011-12 and exceeding its target (874) by 63.8%³.
- 9. Despite earlier concerns about achieving our target to disrupt 24 OCGs NLF ended the year having disrupted 32 OCGs (as measured by a reduction in tier)⁴. NLF worked closely with the Force Intelligence

¹ National Fraud Intelligence Bureau

² SPA Stakeholder survey summary

³ National Fraud Intelligence Bureau

⁴ Organised Crime Group Management – national tracker

Bureau (FIB) to introduce an independent disruption mechanism which is a more reliable and descriptive measure.

10. NLF increased the £ value of future fraud disrupted by enforcement from £318 million in 2011-12 to £531 million in 2012-13 with this year seeing the inclusion of Dedicated Cheque and Plastic Card Unit (DCPCU) and Insurance Fraud Enforcement Department (IFED) enforcement cases⁵.
11. The Asset Recovery Team has exceeded its targets in respect of the volume of Confiscation orders which was 31 and cash seizures 50, NLF recovered assets were valued at £5,094,108.71⁶.
12. The Fraud Academy has maintained its high standard in respect of the quality of the courses delivered; 95% of delegates have found the content and quality of Academy courses to be either, excellent, very good or good, exceeding the target of 85%⁷.
13. The NLF Return on investment for 2012-13 was £32 saved per £1 spent compared with £24 in 2011-12. However, again the figure should be approached with a degree of caution as a number of the component parts of the calculation are subjective (no national guidance available) and this presents a performance challenge for 2013/2014⁸.

Performance Challenges

14. As the Stakeholder survey process matured during 2012-13 reporting year, periodic reviews identified opportunities to refine the survey questions to improve the quality and usefulness of the results. The sample needed to be more reflective of the information sought at a strategic level and therefore increase the response rate. A co-ordinated approach has been adopted for the 2013/14 reporting year with significant research and consultation taking place to ensure the right questions and asked of the right people to obtain more meaningful results. A tactical level feedback process further supplements the survey results to provide a holistic insight.
15. Measuring the quality of fraud investigations and judicial outcomes remains a challenging process. Extensive engagement with CPS Central Fraud Division has enabled the instigation of a joint initiative to measure

⁵ UNIFI database

⁶ JARD database

⁷ Fraud Academy end of course survey – Fraud Academy

⁸ UNIFI database

the quality of NLF investigations through an integrated IT solution. The IT solution is currently in the testing phase strongly indicating success and back record conversion phase is due to commence. It is anticipated the IT solution will be fully operational in the second quarter 2013-14.

16. As referenced, return on investment (ROI) calculations are to an extent subjective and require further refinement and validation.

Planned strategies for service delivery

17. The introduction of a governance structure to manage ECD and national contribution to the NLF framework.
18. Further enhancement of the performance management cycle by refining reporting methods, extending SMT roles and responsibilities and targeting action to contribute to the overall delivery of each KPA
19. The BPT has been enhanced to improve the end to end management of performance. See Appendix C for the new structure of the Business and Performance Team.

Conclusion

20. During this time of economic uncertainty the NLF retain challenging ambitions for service delivery, setting the standard for national police response to crime. The NLF framework is a proven performance management mechanism with the ability to manage national performance. NLF has continued to rise to the challenge and perform at consistently high level offering excellent customer service. The NLF continues to refine measurement mechanisms to ensure our stakeholders and customers remain at the heart of all our activity.

Background Papers:

- Appendix A - National Lead Force Performance Outcomes – Quarter 4 Overview Report
- Appendix B - The 2013/14 Framework
- Appendix C – The Business Performance Team Structure

Contact:

*T/ Chief Inspector Amanda Lowe,
Performance and Quality Assurance Manager
Amanda.lowe@cityoflondon.police.uk
0207 601 8124*