



City of London Police Authority Board

Date: MONDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2020
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: VIRTUAL MEETING – ACCESSIBLE REMOTELY

Members: Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)
Doug Barrow (Deputy Chairman)
Caroline Addy
Munsur Ali
Nick Bensted-Smith
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Emma Edhem
Alderman Alison Gowman
Alderman Tim Hailes
Dawn Wright
Andrew Lentin (External Member)
Deborah Oliver (External Member)

Enquiries: Polly Dunn
Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

<https://youtu.be/S2NIYcdymQM>

Recordings of Meetings

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

Future Meeting Dates

16 December 2020, 10.00am – 12.00pm
7 January 2021, 10.00am – 12.00pm
17 February 2021, 2.00pm – 4.00pm
25 March 2021, 10.00am – 12.00pm
16 April 2021, 10.00am – 12.00pm
20 April 2021, 10.00am – 12.00pm

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES - 1 OCTOBER 2020**
To approve the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 1 October 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 2)
4. **MINUTES - 6 OCTOBER 2020**
To approve the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 6 October 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 16)
5. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**
Joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner.

For Information
(Pages 17 - 20)
6. **MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**
 - a) **Professional Standards and Integrity**
To receive the draft minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 14 September 2020.

For Information
(Pages 21 - 30)
 - b) **Police Pensions Board**
To receive the draft public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 9 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 31 - 36)

c) **Economic Crime Committee**

To receive the draft public minutes and non-public summary of the Economic Crime Committee meeting held on 12 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 37 - 40)

d) **Performance and Resource Management**

To receive the draft public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 16 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 41 - 52)

7. **CHAIRMAN'S PUBLIC UPDATE**

The Chairman to be heard.

For Information

8. **COMMISSONER'S PUBLIC UPDATE**

The Commissioner & Chief Officers to be heard.

For Information

9. **NATIONAL LEAD FORCE**

The Commissioner & Chief Officers to be heard.

For Information

10. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY – GOVERNANCE**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 53 - 64)

11. **INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITING SCHEME ANNUAL REPORT 2019/20**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 65 - 78)

12. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

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

14. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - 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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

15. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 79 - 84)

16. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Joint Report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner.

For Information
(Pages 85 - 86)

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

a) **Professional Standards and Integrity**

To receive the draft non-public minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2020.

For Information
(Pages 87 - 90)

b) **Police Pensions Board**

To receive the draft non-public minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 91 - 92)

c) **Economic Crime Committee**

To receive the draft non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 93 - 100)

d) **Performance and Resource Management**

To receive the draft non-public minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 101 - 104)

18. **CHAIRMAN'S NON-PUBLIC UPDATE**

The Chairman to be heard.

For Information

19. **COMMISSIONER'S NON-PUBLIC UPDATE**

The Commissioner & Chief Officers to be heard.

For Information

20. **NATIONAL LEAD FORCE**
The Commissioner & Chief Officers to be heard.
For Information
21. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE TRANSFORM PROGRAMME**
The Commissioner & Chief Officers to be heard.
For Information
22. **FRAUD AND CYBER CRIME REPORTING AND ANALYSIS SERVICE - STAGE 1 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY REPORT**
Joint report of the Chamberlain and the Commissioner.
For Decision
(Pages 105 - 150)
23. **FORENSIC COLLISION INVESTIGATION NETWORK (FCIN) S22A COLLABORATION AGREEMENT**
Report of the Commissioner.
For Decision
(Pages 151 - 154)
24. **GATEWAY 1/2: POLICE ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY: PHASE 3G MOUNTED UNIT**
Joint report of the Commissioner and City Surveyor.
For Information
(Pages 155 - 236)
25. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**
26. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda - Circulated Separately

27. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES - 1 OCTOBER 2020**
To approve the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2020.
For Decision
28. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES - 6 OCTOBER 2020**
To approve the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2020.
For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD **Thursday, 1 October 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the City of London Police Authority Board held at Microsoft Teams on Thursday, 1 October 2020 at 4.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)
Douglas Barrow (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Emma Edhem
Alderman Alison Gowman
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Dawn Wright
Andrew Lentin (External Member)
Deborah Oliver (External Member)

City of London Police Authority:

Simon Latham	- Deputy Chief Executive
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Tracey Jansen	- Town Clerk's Department (HR)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Nick Bensted-Smith.

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

There were no declarations.

3. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD

There were no questions.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

5. 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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

6. CONFIDENTIAL STAFFING MATTER

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding a confidential staffing matter.

7. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD

There were no questions.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 4.45 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD **Tuesday, 6 October 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the City of London Police Authority Board held on Microsoft Teams with Public Access at <https://youtu.be/MOp6JvA9f-k> on Tuesday, 6 October 2020 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)
Douglas Barrow (Deputy Chairman)
Caroline Addy
Munsur Ali
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Emma Edhem
Alderman Alison Gowman
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Dawn Wright
Andrew Lentin (External Member)
Deborah Oliver (External Member)

City of London Police Authority:

John Barradell	- Chief Executive
Simon Latham	- Deputy Chief Executive
Amanda Mays	- Town Clerk's Department
Alex Orme	- Head of Police Authority Team
Oliver Bolton	- Deputy Head of Police Authority Team
Rachael Waldron	- Compliance Lead
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Chandni Tanna	- Town Clerk's Department
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Joe Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Alistair Cook	- Head of Police Authority Finance
Chris Bell	- Commercial Director
Ellen Wentworth	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Chadha	- Comptroller and City Solicitor

City of London Police Force:

Ian Dyson	- Commissioner
Alistair Sutherland	- Assistant Commissioner
David Evans	- Commander (Operations and Security)
Oliver Shaw	- Detective Superintendent
Cecilie Booth	- Chief Operating and Chief Financial Officer

Teresa La Thangue
Hayley Williams

- Director of Communications
- City of London Police

1. **APOLOGIES**

At the start of the meeting, Members and Officers observed a minute of silence in memory of Sgt Matt Ratana of the Metropolitan Police Service, who had been killed whilst on duty in the early hours of Friday 25 September.

There were no apologies.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 3 September 2020 be approved subject to correction of a typographical error.

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Members considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding outstanding references and the following points were made.

37/2019/P - Bishopsgate Police Station Exercise Yard

The Chief Operating and Chief Financial Officer noted that the report for approval under delegated authority had been submitted to the Town Clerk that morning. The report sought approval for a £105,000 budget for the works, to be met from the Decant budget. The Director of Estates and Support Services would provide a timescale for commencement and completion of works in due course.

A Member, commenting as Special Interest Area Lead for Safeguarding and Public Protection, noted that this was a disappointing update given a year had passed since the Exercise Yard had been identified as a priority arising from a Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) report. The Member noted that an interim budget had been approved for the works in April 2020 and it was stunning to still have no clear works commencement and completion dates. However, it was noted in mitigation that this had been during the nationwide lockdown for COVID-19 which had further delayed the contracts for works being procured and awarded.

The Chairman added that he too had concerns at the speed at which the project had been progressed, and that he was keen to have a firm start and completion date without undue further delay given the delays experienced to date. The Town Clerk committed to advising relevant Members once the delegated authority decision had been completed.

29/2020/P – 30/2020/P – Job Descriptions and Person Specifications for Board Members / Special Interest Areas

The Chairman requested that, notwithstanding the Lisvane Report, these governance items should be completed no later than April 2021.

33/2020/P – Utilisation and Deployment of City of London Police Reserve

The Chairman noted he was not happy regarding the further deferral of this report until November 2020 and, commenting on the recent withdrawal and deferral of reports, noted that this should be avoided as far as possible going forward.

34/2020/P – Road Danger Reduction and Active Travel Progress against HMICFRS

The Chairman noted that this reference was being referred to the Performance and Resource Management Committee.

39/2020/P – Independent Advisory and Scrutiny Group Engagement

The Chairman noted that this reference was dependent on feedback from the IASG. He requested a further update at the November 2020 Board meeting.

PRM Committee 2/2020/P – Reserves Policy

The Chairman noted this was a reference he had been seeking since the start of the year and was similarly disappointed its completion has been pushed back until November 2020. He accepted however the Treasurer's reasoning that the policy should be aligned with the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

5. CHAIRMAN'S PUBLIC UPDATE

The Chairman provided an update to the Board in public session and the following points were made.

External Engagement

- The Chairman had been confirmed as Deputy Lead for Fraud on the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners and was hopefully in a good position to be appointed Lead in 2021, noting however that such appointments were political.
- The Chairman had been invited to speak on Action Know Fraud at the APCC & WMPCC National Online Fraud Symposium on 19 October 2020.
- The Chairman was engaging with two think tanks, firstly Royal United Services Institute regarding the future of cyber fraud and secondly the

Police Foundation regarding a strategic review of policing and emerging risks including fraud and cyber.

Internal Engagement

- The Chairman thanked the Assistant Commissioner for delivering the Member Briefing on Counter-Terrorism on 23 September 2020 which had been attended by over 35 Members. The next session would cover the emerging Policing Plan.

Appointment of new Assistant Commissioner for Fraud and Cyber Crime

- The Chairman had been involved, alongside the Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner and Martin Hewitt of the National Police Chiefs' Council, in the appointment of Angela McLaren from Police Scotland as the new Assistant Commissioner responsible for fraud and cyber crime. ACC McLaren had been selected from among a strong field of candidates and the Chairman noted he was delighted with her appointment.

City of London Police Authority Matters

- The Chairman noted that the increasing levels of COVID-19 had led to COVID GOLD command structures being reactivated. The Chairman had been working to emphasise the Force's phased approach to engagement, education and enforcement through encouraging City of London Corporation services to issue aligned guidance, given countering COVID was not just a police matter.
- The Chairman noted that the Commissioner and Deputy Chief Executive were liaising to improve the information flow and reporting to the City of London Police Authority Board in light of the new monthly meeting tempo of the Board, and recent late and withdrawn Board papers.

City of London Police Authority Governance and the Lisvane Report

- The Chairman noted that the Board had commenced reviewing its own governance around 18 months ago during which time it had introduced some changes – such as the introduction of term limits – and a number of other work items such as job descriptions and a review of the Board's committees were underway. The Chairman did not wish the Lisvane Report to slow this work down, although evidently some work was dependent on the City of London Corporation's wider response to the report and this could be discussed later on the agenda.

6. COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC UPDATE

The Commissioner and his Chief Officers provided an update in public session and the following points were made.

- The Commissioner noted the Chairman's comments regarding the need to improve information flow and reporting the Board in light of its new monthly meeting tempo. The Commissioner asked the indulgence of the Board given the Force was in the early days of this increased reporting rhythm which required building up a central Force capability through the Transform programme.
- The Commander (Operations and Security) confirmed that the London Strategic Coordination Group had been reformed to reflect the current tempo of activity to counter COVID. The Force had also reinstituted its own GOLD Command structure in response to a small outbreak of cases within a critical service of the organisation a fortnight previously. Effective track and trace procedures had enabled the Force to prevent the outbreak progressing further, and absentee levels were now returning to pre-COVID levels.
- The Commander (Operations and Security) noted there had been significant national coverage on COVID enforcement by police and partners, and that work between the Force and the City of London Corporation had led, broadly, to the Force focusing on public spaces and groups of persons and the City of London Corporation focusing on licensed premises. On the first evening of the introduction of 10.00pm closing time the Force had worked with the City's Licensing Team to good effect.
- In terms of COVID enforcement, the Force had not issued any COVID Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) since 4 September 2020. The Force had a robust stance on education and encouragement but nevertheless rarely felt the need to escalate to enforcement stage.
- The Force had seen a reduced footfall in the City since the introduction of more stringent COVID measures. There was a reduced number of offences on the same point last year – 2576 offences, a 57% decrease – which led to a reduced policing demand. Nevertheless some crime types remained persistently high namely an increase in drug arrests reflective of officers being out on the ground and proactive. Moreover arrests for burglary and pedal cycle theft had increased, the latter reflective of new COVID-influenced travel habits and proactive policing by probationary officers.
- In response to a question, the Commander (Operations and Security) noted that COVID marshals were a local authority resource that was at an early stage of development, pending confirmation of funding. In the meantime the partnership approach between the Force and the City was proving effective.
- In response to a question, the Commander (Operations and Security) committed to providing an update outside of the meeting regarding the operation of the Independent Custody Visiting Scheme during COVID (41/2020/P).

7. NATIONAL LEAD FORCE

The Commissioner was heard regarding National Lead Force matters and the following points were made.

- The Commissioner highlighted the work being undertaken by the Force with the Home Office and other partners to build a systemic improvement in countering fraud. As National Lead Force, the Force was well positioned to contribute to that work. It was difficult to brief Members on detailed proposals at present given those proposals were subject to the forthcoming spending review. It was recognised by all stakeholders that investment in the National Lead Force was an important strand of the wider approach to countering fraud.
- The Force had been working with government to highlight COVID-related fraud. Figures up to the end of August 2020 demonstrated COVID fraud represented 0.1% overall, although overall fraud and cyber crime had increased 11% on year. There had been a marked increase in the last six months in online shopping fraud, romance fraud, and investment fraud.
- The Force continued to work on the implementation of recommendations arising from the Mackey Review. Of the 15 recommendations, 8 had been completed with the remaining scheduled for completion by end of the calendar year, where they were not dependent on the procurement of a new fraud reporting system. A report on Mackey Review implementation would be made to the Economic Crime Committee. The Chairman requested the Committee also give good scrutiny to the National Lead Force Performance report including time taken to answer call/rate of dropped calls to the Action Know Fraud call centre (42/2020/P).

8. APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVE - CITY OF LONDON POLICE PENSIONS BOARD

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding the appointment of an Employer Representative to the City of London Police Pensions Board.

RESOLVED, that the Chairman of the City of London Police Pensions Board's recommendation that Henry Colthurst CC be appointed as an Employer Representative to the Pensions Board be agreed.

9. THE LISVANE REVIEW - SUMMARY OF CITY OF LONDON POLICE-SPECIFIC ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding The Lisvane Review – Summary of City of London Police-specific Issues and Recommendations and the following points were made.

- The Chairman noted that the overall recommendations of the Review would be discussed at an informal Member meeting on 14 October 2020 and at the informal meeting of the Court of Common Council on 12 November 2020. The Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources)

Committee had been appointed the reference sub-committee responsible for considering the recommendation and would be meeting between now and December 2020 with a view to making quick-win recommendations to the Court of Common Council in January 2021.

- Members of the Board were invited to review the Police-specific issues and recommendations outlined within the report and make any comments, with a view to a fuller report being made to a future meeting of the Board. The Chairman reiterated his comments made earlier in the meeting that the Board had, pre-Lisvane Review – been reviewing its own governance including term limits, job descriptions, and the bifurcation of the Performance and Resource Management Committee. The Chairman expressed the hope that items such as this need not be delayed by the consideration of the Lisvane Review, and could instead be recommended to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee as among the quick-wins recommended to Court of Common Council.
- A Member noted that among the Lisvane recommendation was one that the Board should be composed of a majority of independent members and queried, given the time demand on such a role, whether independent members of other police authorities were remunerated. The Chairman requested that remuneration be covered in the forthcoming report to the Board.
- A Member welcomed the Lisvane Review and agreed that the Board should nevertheless press ahead with its current governance changes where possible. The Member felt it was interesting that Lord Lisvane had chosen not to recommend that a sole Member of the Court of Common Council be appointed, in effect, a Police and Crime Commissioner which perhaps reflected the importance of ensuring a collective oversight of the Force's National Lead Force function.
- A Member noted that any governance changes should address the glacial speed of decision making within the City of London Corporation – not necessarily restricted to the Board - through granting the Board greater ownership of decision-making on Police matters, referencing the delay in budget approval for the Bishopsgate Police Station Exercise Yard. The Chairman endorsed this comment, noting that there had been mission creep in oversight of the Force from other City of London Corporation committees, which he had sought to address in part through co-opting Members from other Committees on to the Board's own Committees. There was a case to simplify and better define levels of decision making that sat with the Board and peer Committees across the City of London Corporation.
- A Member noted that he welcomed some of Lord Lisvane's recommendations, but not all. He questioned in particular not having a majority of Common Councillors serving on the Board. He felt that the Board needed to consider what was required to improve its own effectiveness and perhaps go further than what had been recommended

by Lord Lisvane – and signal this approach to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. It was key that democratic oversight was maintained over the City of London Police.

- The Chairman noted that he would welcome an increase in independent Members on the Board.
- A Member noted that the Court of Common Council was the City of London Police Authority and felt it unlikely that the Board would be converted into a majority of independent Members. He suggested a Member workshop to consider emerging detail on governance proposals ahead of a report being made back to the Board. The Chairman concurred with this proposal, noting that the Board oversaw a complex area where it was necessary to be cognisant of statutory issues and stakeholders such as the APCC, CIPFA etc (43/2020/P).
- Members noted that it was important to ensure adequate opportunities for residents and businesses to engage with the work of the Board. The Chairman concurred, noting the recently refreshed IASG.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

10. Q1 BUDGET MONITORING 2020/21

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Q1 Budget Monitoring 2020/21 and the following points were made.

- The Chief Operating and Chief Financial Officer (COFO) introduced the report, noting that the Force was predicting a £4m underspend for the year which would be applied to Action Know Fraud. The report set out underspends, particularly relating to the timing of recruitment. These were also broken down by Directorates, and Members were asked to note that all probationers were deployed to Uniformed Policing but not into substantive posts, which gave rise to the vacancy factor of almost 50.
- The report also contained a backward and forward look on workforce projections, which was a difficult exercise given the time lag between recruitment, vetting, appointment and confirmation in post made it difficult to make an accurate projection. The report sought to provide a split between the 44 posts provided through national uplift, and the 67 posts provided by the City's local uplift.
- The report also dealt with sources of income, with the COFO being confident that income streams would be met, although there was some risk around TfL funding, and income received from international training given recent COVID restrictions. Nevertheless training demand remained strong and it could be delivered if COVID restrictions were lifted.

- The capital programme was set out as an appendix and at this point of the year no variances were reported. The COFO did not expect this to change in Q2 but a more detailed picture would emerge in Q3.
- The Force had seen a significant improvement in accounts payable following a new appointment within the Force Finance Team. There were no bad debtors. In terms of overtime, the Force was on track to spend on budget although it was difficult to predict the outturn.
- A savings tracker was provided as an appendix, with the tracker being subject to a monthly working group within the Force. The main risk was the deferral of the £1m National Enabling Programme. The COFO was looking to set up a holding grant for this financial year with vacant posts. Members were asked to note that Item 9 (Commercial) within the tracker was rated Amber.
- In response to a question, the Commissioner replied that the Force monitored staff and overtime on a monthly basis, and that Force recruitment was proceeding at pace. To give Members an idea of scale, if the Commissioner had been asked to comment 18 months previously, he would have expressed concern at where the Force was at in terms of recruitment. Now, however, with the national and local uplift the Force had embarked on an ambitious recruitment programme with 113 officers and staff joining between April-August compared to 41 leaving. The Force would be up to establishment by end of the calendar year and at present was operating way beyond the normal rhythm of recruitment, with all the attendant national, medical and vetting requirements that had to be met. Nevertheless the Commissioner was comfortable with where the Force was as compared to a year ago.
- In response to a question, the Commissioner acknowledged that the Force had experienced some real pressure points on overtime in the past 18 months particularly around specialist skills, and so overtime was used to maintain the mandated requirement of those skills. Nevertheless demand had relaxed during the COVID period and so overtime was now being better managed. There were no concerns regarding staff wellbeing at present.
- The Assistant Commissioner reiterated the answer provided by the Commissioner, noting the Force had a monthly GOLD HR meeting to support forecasting, recruitment and workforce planning. The Force had indeed been under pressure over the last few years during which time between 6,500-7,000 rest days had been accrued. These were being worked through, although there was an issue regarding firearms, public order and detectives, with the Force competing with other Forces in the London and South East area. The Force had appointed a new welfare lead, and with regards to vetting had reached an agreement with Warwickshire Police to increase capacity.

- The Chairman noted that the concern for the welfare of officers, as well as being expressed at the Board, was also being monitored by the Performance and Resource Management Committee given prior to the onset of COVID there had been overtime, sickness and time off in lieu pressures due to operational commitments to policing Extinction Rebellion.
- In response to a question, the COFO noted that Action Know Fraud was a one-off cost that would be met from the one-off £4m underspend. All recurring costs were catered for in the Force's base budget.
- On the issue of recruitment, the COFO noted that the Force's Finance and Human Resources teams were closely aligned to ensure the timing of recruitment was appropriate. Savings had been made through the recruitment of probationers offset against the retirement of experienced officers, balancing all the while the maintenance of service levels.
- On the issue of overtime, the COFO added that she chaired the Force's Strategic Finance Board where overtime reporting was overseen and broken down into directorates, individual projects and budget managers. This enabled the Board to identify top earners of overtime and track workload and welfare.
- On the issue of quarterly reporting the COFO noted that ordinarily she could make Q1 reporting to Members in mid-August and so, with recess in mind, Q1 reporting could be submitted to September meetings of the Performance and Resource Management Committee and City of London Police Authority Board. That said, it was difficult to comment in September on outturn at the end of June. Month 6 reporting had just been finished and the £4m underspend remained intact.
- On the issue of the capital programme the COFO acknowledged that the whole programme would probably not be delivered on time and on budget, and this was in line with performance in any public sector organisation. For a number of projects the Force had been unable to access funding, which had led to the projects being stalled. Members would be provided with a more accurate overview at Q3.
- In response to comments made, the COFO committed to providing a more comprehensive narrative on the capital programme and variances in the Q2 report (44/2020/P).

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

11. CITY OF LONDON POLICE RESERVES (FINANCE) POLICY

The Town Clerk noted that this item had been withdrawn.

12. USE OF ALGORITHMS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE WITHIN CITY OF LONDON POLICE

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the use of algorithms and artificial intelligence within the City of London Police and the following points were made.

- The Chairman noted that data handling was an area that could be better overseen by the Board and suggested an annual report to the Board on any planned proposals, ethics and relevant inspections. This was noted by the Commissioner and would be added to the list of regular annual reports to the Board.
- The Commissioner noted that the Force's approach to the use of algorithms and AI in particular was limited at present and in line with regulations and inspection regimes. If the Force were to adopt any AI capability it would first report to the Board.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

13. CITY OF LONDON POLICE SPECIALS AND RESERVE - UTILISATION AND DEPLOYMENT

The Town Clerk noted that this item had been withdrawn.

14. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD

There were no questions.

**15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT
Clerk to the Board's Last Meeting**

- The Chairman and Commissioner, on behalf of the Board and the Force, noted this was the Clerk to the Board's last meeting prior to leaving the City of London Corporation and placed on record their thanks for his work in support of the Board.

16. 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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

17. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2020 be approved.

18. NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

Members considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding non-public outstanding references.

19. CHAIRMAN'S NON-PUBLIC UPDATE

The Chairman noted that he had no non-public update to provide the Board.

20. **COMMISSIONER'S NON-PUBLIC UPDATE**

The Commissioner and Chief Officers provided a non-public update to the Board.

21. **NATIONAL LEAD FORCE**

The Commissioner provided a non-public update on the National Lead Force function.

1a. **National Lead Force Plan 2020-22**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the National Lead Force Plan 2020-2022.

22. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE ETHICAL PARTNERSHIPS**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding City of London Police Ethical Partnerships.

23. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE TRANSFORM PROGRAMME**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the City of London Police Transform Programme.

At this point of the meeting, two hours having elapsed, Members agreed to extend the meeting until the conclusion of all items of business on the agenda in line with Standing Order 40 of the Court of Common Council.

24. **SHARED SERVICES**

Members considered reports of the Commissioner and the Town Clerk regarding Shared Services.

1a. **City of London Corporation and City of London Police Shared Services [City of London Police Force]**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding City of London Corporation and City of London Police Shared Services [City of London Police Force].

2a. **City of London Corporation - City of London Police Shared Services [City of London Police Authority]**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding City of London Corporation – City of London Police Shared Services [City of London Police Authority].

25. **BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE AND CITY OF LONDON POLICE STRATEGIC ALLIANCE AND MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND COUNTER CORRUPTION SERVICES**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding a British Transport Police and City of London Police Strategic Alliance and Memorandum of Agreement for Professional Standards and Counter Corruption Services.

26. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

There were no questions.

27. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no other business.

28. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2020 be approved.

29. **CONFIDENTIAL ITEM**

The Chairman was heard in confidential session.

The meeting ended at 4.03 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Police Authority Board – Public Outstanding References

15/2018/P	Item 4 Outstanding References	Barbican CCTV will form part of Secure City Programme when CCTV is reviewed in the round.	Commissioner of Police	DUE SIX MONTHS POST-CROSSRAIL OPENING
37/2019/P	November 2019 Item 9 – Annual Update on Custody of Vulnerable Persons	Police Authority Board to be updated on progress on options for provision of exercise yard at Bishopsgate Police Station and firm start / completion dates to be provided.	Commissioner of Police	IN PROGRESS Budget agreed under urgency procedure by Town Clerk in consultation with Chairman and Deputy Chair Capital Buildings Committee on 12 October 2020. Director of Estates and Support Services has provided the first weekly update to SIA Member for Safeguarding and Public Protection on project progress. Estimated Start / completion dates Start: Last week November 2020 End: Second week February 2021
25/2020/P	22 June 2020 HR Monitoring Report	Future iterations to include (a) attrition rate of officers/staff by department and rank/grade (2) table breakdown of tribunals opened, in-flight, and closed during the year.	Commissioner of Police	IN PROGRESS The next 6 monthly HR Monitoring report is due to the 11 th November 2020 P&RM Committee
29/2020/P	29 July 2020 City of London Police Authority Board and its Committees 2020/21	Job descriptions and person specifications for Board and Committee Chairmen and Members to be refreshed.	Chief Executive	IN PROGRESS Under review following publication of Lisvane Review – to be in place in advance of April 2021

30/2020/P	29 July 2020 Special Interest Area Scheme 2020/21	Note on expectations regarding Special Interest Area Scheme operation to be provided to the Board.	Chief Executive	IN PROGRESS Under review following publication of Lisvane Review - to be in place in advance of April 2021
33/2020/P	29 July 2020 City of London Police Reserve – Strength and Composition	Further report on deployment and utilisation to be provided to September 2020 meeting.	Commissioner	COMPLETE Report on Agenda
34/2020/P	29 July 2020 Road Danger Reduction and Active Travel Plan	Action Plan due in Autumn 2020 to resolve issue of disjoint in underlying data sets and provide Force's response to HMICFRS report <i>Roads Policing: Not optional</i> . Report to also provide breakdown of repeat locations (as per 31/2019/P).	Director of the Built Environment / Commissioner	COMPLETE - An update on this was given at the P&RM Committee on the 16 th October. This is being taken forward under the HMICFRS action plan for 'Roads Policing- Not optional' and will continue to report to the P&RM Committee until the recommendations are delivered. Alderman Gowman will be updated on progress as part of her regular meetings with the Supt for Roads Policing.
38/2020/P	3 September 2020 IASG Update	IASG terms of reference, appointment, membership and meeting dates to be circulated to Board.	Assistant Commissioner	COMPLETE - These details have been forwarded to the Clerk for circulation to Members. The next IASG meeting is in December and the Chairman and Deputy are due to attend as guests.

39/2020/P	3 September 2020 IASG Update	Chairman/Deputy Chairman/SIAs to attend IASG meeting(s) / IASG Members to observe COLPAB meetings	Town Clerk	IN PROGRESS To be completed once December 2020 meeting date is confirmed.
41/2020/P	6 October 2020 Commissioner's Public Update	Update on operation of Independent Custody Visitor Scheme during time of COVID restrictions to be provided to the Board.	Commander (Operations and Security)	COMPLETE - Cdr Ops confirms that the ICV scheme was operating as normal throughout the COVID-19 lockdown period and beyond. There were 27 visits recorded from 1 st April – 30 th September 2020. The ICV coordinator maintains records on behalf of the Scheme.
42/2020/P	6 October 2020 National Lead Force Update	Mackey Review Update Report at Economic Crime Committee plus scrutiny to be given on NLF Performance update for time taken to answer calls/number of dropped calls to Action Know Fraud	Commissioner	COMPLETE - An update report on the Mackey Review recommendations and AF call waiting and drop off times (as part of the standing item on National Lead Force Performance) were reported to the October 12th Economic Crime Committee and are a standing item at each ECC.
43/2020/P	6 October 2020 Lisvane Review	Report on City of London Police Authority governance to be submitted to November 2020 meeting – to be accompanied by Member workshop to scrutinise draft report. Report to include detail on remuneration of Members at peer Authorities.	Police Authority Team	COMPLETE Report on Agenda

44/2020/P	6 October 2020 Q1 Budget Monitoring	For Q2 report – more comprehensive narrative to be provided on capital programme, and commentary on variances, risks and opportunities.	Chief Financial and Chief Operating Officer	COMPLETE- Q2 Budget update has taken this all on board and is due to be presented to the 11 th November P&RM Committee and to follow on to the December PAB
45/2020/P	6 October 2020 Algorithms and AI in City of London Police	Report to be submitted to Professional Standards and Integrity Committee	Town Clerk	IN PROGRESS Due to be reported to PSI on 26 November 2020.

Chairman requested the below be added to PAB ORs

P&RM Committee 2/2020/P	P&RM Committee 7 February 2020 Item 5 – Budget Monitoring Q3	Force Reserves Policy to be developed.	Commissioner of Police/ Treasurer	COMPLETE- Head of PA Finance confirms this is due at the P&RM Committee on the 11th November
---------------------------------------	---	--	--------------------------------------	---

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND INTEGRITY COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF
LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD
Monday, 14 September 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the Professional Standards and Integrity Committee of the
City of London Police Authority Board held via Microsoft Teams on Monday, 14
September 2020 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Alderman Alison Gowman (Chair)
Douglas Barrow
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Tijs Broeke
Mary Durcan
Alderman Emma Edhem
Deborah Oliver

Observing:

Natasha Lloyd-Owen

City of London Police Authority:

Oliver Bolton	- Deputy Head of Police Authority Team
Rachael Waldron	- Compliance Lead
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Richard Holt	- Town Clerk's Department
Ellen Wentworth	- Chamberlain's Department
Tarjinder Phull	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department

City of London Police Force:

Alistair Sutherland	- Assistant Commissioner
Angie Rogers	- Head of Professional Standards Directorate
Richard Galvin	- Police Inspector

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Caroline Addy and Deputy James Thomson.

The Chair welcomed the appointment of Mary Durcan and Alderman Greg Jones to the Committee, and placed on record the Committee's thanks to Mia Campbell, who had stepped down as external Member.

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

There were no declarations.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

RESOLVED, that the terms of reference of the Committee as agreed by the City of London Police Authority Board at its 29 July 2020 meeting be received.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 29 November 2019 be approved.

5. **REFERENCES**

Members considered a late joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding references and the following points were made.

8/2019/P – Force Communications Plan to be reviewed to reassure public regarding Stop and Search

- The Assistant Commissioner noted that both the Force internal and external communications plans incorporated data on the use of stop and search. Moreover there was a report later on the agenda that gave a breakdown of stop and search statistics.
- A Member Observer noted that a quarterly public report on the Force website noted that there was a technical error preventing the display of data with regards to ethnicity. The Assistant Commissioner committed to rectifying the issue in time for the November 2020 meeting of the Committee.
- Members noted that the reference had arisen as a means to provide public reassurance on the use of stop and search, and that it could now be closed.

12/2020/P – Response on potential use of predictive policing methods

- The Assistant Commissioner noted that the Force did not use predictive policing or artificial intelligence at present and there would be consultation with the Authority in advance of those methods being adopted. Members were asked to note, nevertheless, that there was some discussion nationally regarding the ethics of predictive policing.
- A Member highlighted a 11 August 2020 decision by the Court of Appeal against South Wales Police's use of automated facial recognition and encouraged the Force to ensure issues within that judgement be factored into the decision making process towards adoption of any predictive policing methods.
- Members agreed that the reference could be closed.

14/2019/P – Future meeting dates of London Police Challenge Forum

- In response to a question, the Assistant Commissioner replied that the Forum was a joint meeting between London Forces and partners, which the Force's Head of Strategic Development led on. Meetings of the

Forum had been disrupted by COVID-19 and when further information was available this would be provided to the Committee.

17/2019/P – New Review Panel process to be reviewed after three months

- The Chair noted that the new process was in operation, with an update report later on the agenda. Members agreed that, due to COVID-19, the review should be deferred until January 2021.

18/19/2019/P – File failure rate and analysis to be provided outside of meeting

- The Town Clerk noted that a detailed report on this issue had been submitted to the inquorate March 2020 meeting. Members agreed that the report be made available on request, alongside 1:1 debriefs by the Force, and that the reference could be closed.

20/2019/P – Ethical Economic Partnerships Report

- The Deputy Head of the Police Authority noted that a report at the October 2020 meeting of the City of London Police Authority Board would go into some detail on ethical economic partnerships that the Force was involved in. the report would then come to the November 2020 meetings of this Committee.
- In response to a request, the Deputy Head of the Police Authority committed to reviewing the report and feeding back on whether it included an overview of the process through which partnerships were agreed.

1/2020/P – London Police Challenge Forum Case Studies

- The Chair noted that the Forum had not been meeting due to COVID-19 and therefore there was no update under this reference.

2/2020/P – Victim Satisfaction Survey

- The Chair noted the next survey would be conducted in November 2020 with a report to this Committee in early 2021.

3/2020/P – Statistics on temporary promotions at all levels of Force

- Members noted that this reference would be dealt with at the November 2020 meeting.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

6. COVID-19 FIXED PENALTY NOTICES

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding COVID-19 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).

- The Chair noted that the figure on FPNs given at the Court of Common Council meeting in early September 2020 was different, in the number of FPNs issued had been revised down to 19. However since the report had been produced a further 8 FPNs had been issued during Extinction Rebellion protests in the City, all to white males. In total this meant 27 FPNs had been issued.
- A Member requested that the way in which data was presented be reviewed. It was not clear to him whether the data referred to Force officers, but acting wider than the City area. A more detailed breakdown on officer-based and geographical-based data would be welcome.
- A Member welcomed the data, noting that it showed interesting patterns emerging. Specifically it appeared that outside of the City it was more likely for BAME persons to be issued fines, and the Member queried why this was the case. Moreover if both fines and warning figures were combined that BAME were typically given fines whereas older white persons typically received a warning. It would be interesting to have some context on why this might be the case.
- The Assistant Commissioner replied that the demographics of fines and warnings reflected areas of London where the Force was typically deployed in support of partners. For example the boroughs surrounding the City were very diverse and it was therefore more likely to encounter BAME persons. On the issue of fines versus warnings, each encounter with a member of the public was a clear phased process commencing with a request for compliance, with progression through the phases dependent on how the individual reacted.
- A Member queried whether interactions with younger BAME persons were escalating in such a way that prompted fines being issued and noted that the Force and Authority needed to reflect on why this might be the case.
- The Assistant Commissioner noted that there was work ongoing in both the Force, Metropolitan Police and British Transport Police on how Forces engaged and educated the various communities they encountered. The Assistant Commissioner was confident that the Force's approach to COVID FPNs was proportionate.
- In response to a question, the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that the COVID FPNs issued during Extinction Rebellion protests in the City were due to breach of COVID guidelines, and not to counter the individuals' right to protest.
- The Chair highlighted the National Police Chiefs' Council report *Policing the Pandemic* and suggested that the Town Clerk circulate it to Members outside of the meeting. The report confirmed a disparity in the issuing of FPNs to BAME persons compared to other ethnic groups, although NPCC statistics were compiled differently to Force statistics.

- In response to a question the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that Body Worn Video (BWV) was used during encounters that could lead to the issuing of a COVID FPN or warning. The BWV of Force officers recorded passively and therefore captured the prior 30 seconds to any occasion when the officer commenced recording an encounter.
- In response to a question, the Deputy Head of the Police Authority Team confirmed that the 8 COVID FPNs issued recently were the only FPNs issued since the figures detailed within the report on the agenda, which dated to May 2020.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

7. STOP AND SEARCH QUARTER 1 2020/21 - 1 APRIL 2020 - 30 JUNE 2020

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the Stop and Search Quarter 1 2020/21 – 1 April 2020 – 30 June 2020 and the following points were made.

- The Chair noted that the Force's 35% positive outcome rate was significantly more than the national average of 21%, which reflected the fact the Force had worked hard to ensure there were strong grounds for stop and search tactics being used.
- The Assistant Commissioner noted that the conversion rate for Metropolitan Police stop and search tactics during 2019/20 was 15%.
- In response to questions, the Assistant Commissioner replied that of 584 stop and searches, 235 had taken place outside of the City, and agreed to review whether a breakdown in terms of age and ethnicity could be provided for the 235 stops outside the City.
- In response to a question, the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that the Force stop and search statistics incorporated stop and searches conducted by Op Servator trained officers. Not all officers were Servator-trained and the Force was looking at how Servator stop and search techniques could be rolled out among the Force as a whole. The Force's Transform programme involved a consideration of how Servator numbers could be uplifted. Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services had noted that the Servator officers actually had a slightly higher failure rate when completing stop and search paperwork, which was being reviewed.
- The Assistant Commissioner, for the benefit of any members of the public watching the meeting, noted that Servator was a Force initiative dating to 2014 that used behavioural analysis as part of intelligence-led deployments to crime hot spots and areas deemed at high risk of terror attack. It involved both overt and covert deployment of officers, and public communication via leafleting and social media. Servator had been successful and had been rolled out to 27 Forces nationally, as well as giving greater focus to officers and improving stop and search outcomes.

- In response to a question, the Assistant Commissioner replied that over the past eight to nine years the positive outcome rate from stop and search had increased significantly, with more scrutiny, focus, tasking and intelligence-led deployments. Over the same period the number of stop and searches conducted had declined. Stop and search was not an exact science, but it was a tactic that was applied in response to intelligence provided by victims of crime and members of the public. There would of course be occasions when officers would come across suspicious behaviour during the course of routine deployment that would require engagement that could result in a stop and search.
- An Observing Member was heard, noting that she hoped that officers underwent de-escalation training for when they engaged with young people, given the statistics underpinning both COVID FPNs and stop and search. Secondly, there appeared to be differing approaches to statistics within the quarterly report varying between self-identified ethnicity and perceived ethnicity, which could give rise to misleading statistics. There was also a differing approach to using either graphic presentation of data versus narrative descriptions where a direct comparison of like with like would perhaps be more helpful. Thirdly, it would be helpful if data could be presented in a more qualitative way e.g. breaking drug stops down into whether the arrest was for Class A, Class B, and either supply or possession. Lastly, the Member queried how many of the 106 drug stops conducted were done for the reason that cannabis could be smelled, which was bad practice.
- The Chair noted that these points and queries were quite detailed and might benefit from a written response outside of the meeting but invited the Force to provide an initial response at the meeting.
- The Assistant Commissioner agreed to review how best data could be broken down and presented in reporting. In terms of drug stops, the Force did have a stated priority to disrupt the supply of Class A drugs and so officers were tasked accordingly. HMICFRS had assessed 92% of Force stop submissions to be of a high standard, with the reasons for the remaining 8% under review and often for technical reasons. Officers were trained to engage with young persons and moreover in addressing unconscious bias. The Force also convened an independent Stop and Search Scrutiny Group. Lastly, Members were welcome to engage with the Assistant Commissioner directly on stop and search matters although were requested to provide email feedback in the first instance.
- The Town Clerk agreed to ensure the written response to the Member's comments and questions were published in the public domain. The Assistant Commissioner added that the Force's independent Stop and Search Scrutiny Group would also be briefed on the points raised.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

8. **SUMMARY OF RECENT REVIEWS OF POLICE COMPLAINTS**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk providing a summary of recent reviews of Police complaints and the following points were made.

- The Chair noted that a review of the new process had been planned after three months of operation but, due to COVID, would now take place in January 2021. The Review Panel was meeting on a monthly basis and training would be made available to Members.
- The Deputy Head of Police Authority Board highlighted that there was a bias towards reviews of complaints relating to Action Fraud, and not many complaints regarding the Force's core business, which was positive. Of the complaints made regarding Action Fraud, the Review Panel was seeing about a third. The Review Panel generally felt that the Force could make better explanations of the process through which cases were referred on for investigation or not, and that explanations should be presented in layman's terms as far as was possible. Complaint responses were often a comprehensive end to end summary of process, but with scant detail on the key areas concerning the complainant. The Authority would welcome the opportunity to work with the Force to improve this.
- A Member noted he was present at the June 2020 Review Panel and requested the record be updated accordingly.
- The Chair noted that she was concerned that feedback from the Force had not been received on the recommendations put to the Force by the Panel, particularly recommendations arising from the July 2020 panel meeting. This was particularly important as the new process was designed to foster a learning culture rather than one of blame – lack of response from the Force suggested that the learning culture had yet to be embraced. Lastly, a Member of the Panel had flagged the potential GDPR issue around the use of algorithms to analyse crime reports and refer them on for investigation. Timely feedback from the Force on Panel recommendations would be welcome going forward.
- The Head of the Professional Standards Directorate noted that the Directorate had only recently taken on responsibility for managing Action Fraud complaints and recruited a new member of staff for that purpose. Panel recommendations were taken seriously and the Directorate was working with both Action Fraud and the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau to make improvements. The new member of staff would attend the November 2020 meeting to brief Members on their role.
- The Chair requested a report at a future meeting outlining other avenues of appeal open to complainants e.g. the Ombudsman.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

9. **INTEGRITY AND CODE OF ETHICS UPDATE**

Members considered an update report of the Commissioner regarding Integrity and Code of Ethics. The Chair noted that a version of the report had been considered by the City of London Police Authority Board at its July 2020 meeting.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

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

Recruitment of External Member

- In response to a question regarding the process of recruiting an external Member of the Committee, the Town Clerk noted that the intention was to advertise and recruit ahead of the Committee's November 2020 meeting, although this would be offset by wider Authority governance work on drawing up Member role profiles and job descriptions. The process would also be aligned with the work of the City's Tackling Racism Working Party.
- A Member encouraged the Authority to be as creative as possible in advertising the vacancy and cited the example of recruiting young alumni on to Local Governing Bodies of academies in the City of London Academies Trust. The Member suggested that the Committee may benefit from hearing from a speaker from an independent organisation on this issue. Moreover greater use, particularly for recruiting City of London Police Authority Board external Members, could be made of professional head hunters.

External Scrutiny

- In response to a question, the Deputy Head of the Police Authority Team noted that the Community Scrutiny Group and Independent Advisory Group had been amalgamated to form the Independent Advisory and Scrutiny Group (IASG) in December 2019. The new group arrangements were working well, and the Chairman of the City of London Police Authority Board would be attending a meeting of the IASG and vice versa. The Chair of the Professional Standards and Integrity Committee would also be attending a meeting of the IASG to better understand how the work of the two bodies could align. The reports on the work of the IASG that were submitted to the City of London Police Authority Board could also be submitted to the Committee for information.
- The Deputy Head of the Police Authority Team confirmed that the Independent Custody Visitors' Scheme (ICV) was Authority-led whereas the IASG was Force-led.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no questions.
12. **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 of business on the grounds they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
13. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2019 be approved as a correct record.
14. **NOTE OF INQUORATE MEETING - 2 MARCH 2020**
RESOLVED, that the non-public note of the inquorate meeting held on 2 March 2020 be received.
15. **NON-PUBLIC REFERENCES**
Members considered a late joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding non-public references.
16. **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL AND OTHER LEGAL CASES**
Members considered a report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor regarding Employment Tribunal and Other Legal Cases.
17. **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS STATISTICS - QUARTER 1 - 1 APRIL 2020-30 JUNE 2020**
Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Professional Standards Statistics – Quarter 1 – 1 April 2020 – 30 June 2020.
18. **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DIRECTORATE CASES**
Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Professional Standards Directorate Cases.
 - 18.1 **No Case to Answer / Not Upheld**
Members considered cases with no case to answer or were not upheld.
 - 18.2 **Local Resolution**
Members considered cases dealt with by local resolution.
 - 18.3 **Death or Serious Injury**
Members considered cases involving death or serious injury.
 - 18.4 **Cases dealt with under Complaint and Conduct Regulations 2019**
Members considered cases dealt with under Complaint and Conduct Regulations 2019.

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

There were no non-public questions.

20. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 12.58 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

CITY OF LONDON POLICE PENSIONS BOARD

Friday, 9 October 2020

**Minutes of the meeting of the City of London Police Pensions Board held on
Microsoft Teams at 1.45 pm**

Present

Members:

John Todd (Chairman)	Helen Isaac
Alexander Barr (Deputy Chairman)	Mike Reed
Henry Colthurst	

City of London Police Authority / City of London Corporation:

Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Kate Limna	- Chamberlain's Department
Matt Mott	- Chamberlain's Department
Graham Newman	- Chamberlain's Department

City of London Police Force:

Azeem Bhatti	- City of London Police – Finance
Michael Edelstein	- City of London Police – Human Resources

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

The Chairman welcomed Henry Colthurst and Mike Reed to their first meeting.

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

Henry Colthurst declared a non-pecuniary interest as an Employer Member of the Hackney Pension Committee.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members considered the Board's terms of reference.

RESOLVED, that the Board's terms of reference be received.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the public minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2020 be approved, subject to the language used around reference 9/2019/P being amended to make it clear that completion of training modules by Members of the Board was compulsory.

5. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding outstanding references from previous meetings and the following points were made.

2/2019/P – Due Diligence and Market Research

- Members noted that an update on the procurement process was within the Administrator's update, and that this reference could be closed.

9/2019/P – Member Training

- Members agreed that this reference could be closed subject to Member training being incorporated into regular reporting to the Board, including a recommended convention regarding the time in which Members should complete the required training modules once they had joined the Board.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

6. THE CITY OF LONDON: POLICE PENSION SCHEME - UPDATE

Members considered an update report of the Chamberlain regarding the City of London: Police Pension Scheme and the following points were made.

- A Member noted that the deadline for issuing the Pension Saving Statements (Annual Allowance Letters) had been met, albeit with a day to spare. The Member queried whether this was indicative of risks around capacity of the Pensions Team, and whether Members could be provided with a better understanding of the processes and procedures underpinning the preparation of the statements and any contingencies in the events of issues such as human error.
- The Chamberlain was heard in reply, noting that data must first be collected and updated on member records during the year end process. This data is then used for the basis of pension calculations for annual benefits statements, which have a statutory deadline of 31 August, and then the Annual Allowance Pensions Savings Statements which have a statutory deadline of 6 October. It was, therefore, not possible for the Pensions Team to commence work on the savings statements before September each year. Due to the process to prepare the statements being a requirement of HMRC and not pension scheme regulations, it is not supported well enough by software and is largely a manual one and ,therefore, it would be appropriate for this to be factored into the Board's risk register.
- The Member thanked the Chamberlain for his response, noting that inclusion on the risk register would give Members – particularly those new to the Board – a greater understanding of the process involved going forward.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

7. THE CITY OF LONDON: POLICE PENSION SCHEME - MCCLOUD JUDGEMENT UPDATE

Members considered an update report of the Chamberlain regarding the City of London Police Pension Scheme – McCloud Judgement and the following points were made.

- The Chamberlain noted that the McCloud Judgement was probably the biggest challenge facing the Pension Scheme since the reforms of 2014/15. Whilst the details of the implications arising were not clear at present, it was evident that each member of the scheme would be affected by the judgement in some way, and they would need to make choices regarding the nature of their pension entitlement. The Pensions Team would bring further details to the Board over the coming year as more information was made available.
- A Member was heard, noting that communication would be required to both Pension Authorities and Members to allow informed decisions to be made over whether potential members opted into the scheme now, or at a later stage. The Police Federation of England and Wales would not be giving financial advice but it would be assisting its members as far as was possible.
- A Member noted that the Judgement was included within the Risk Register elsewhere on the agenda and added that, whilst the Board was not in a position to give financial advice, it could ensure that the issue was raised consistently with Force Human Resources who in turn could consider whether it would be appropriate to provide scheme members with financial advice, be it independent or otherwise.
- A Member highlighted the guidance at appendix three within the report as particularly helpful for Members.
- The Chamberlain agreed to provide a training session for Members once draft legislation was made available.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

8. THE CITY OF LONDON: POLICE PENSION SCHEME - RISK REGISTER

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding the City of London Police Pension Scheme – Risk Register and the following points were made.

- Members agreed that the recommendation regarding further risks relating to the pension administration overseen by the Board should reference that the Board had considered further risks, rather than Member's confirming that there were no further risks.
- Members agreed, regarding Risk CHB COLP PSB 01 – Actuarial Data, that it was not possible for the Board to influence what data other Forces provided to the Home Office, and therefore the risk impact rating should move one space to the right to err on the side of caution.

- A Member noted the discussion regarding the McCloud ruling earlier on the agenda and queried whether Force Human Resources could be involved in the management of Risk CHB COLP PSB 08c (making preparations for managing expectations for those officers affected by the remedy). In reply, the Director of Human Resources (Force) noted that the Force had links into national police pay bodies that were co-ordinating a response to the ruling from National Police Chiefs' council point of view.
- The Chairman noted that the Board had been conscious for some time of the need to ensure the Force was as proactive as possible in communicating the implications of the McCloud ruling with scheme members, and welcomed therefore the engagement with the Board from the Force Finance and Human Resources representatives to date. The Board was firmly of the view that scheme members were guided as unambiguously as possible, and that they would need professional financial advice.
- The Town Clerk noted that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman were free to liaise with their counterparts on the City of London Police Authority Board to emphasise the points made regarding effective communication to scheme members.

RESOLVED, that subject to the comments made, Members,

- Note the existing risks and actions present on the City of London Police Pensions Board Risk Register, and confirm that appropriate control measures are in place;
- Note that they had considered further potential risks relating to the pension administration overseen by the City of London Police Pensions Board.

9. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**
Active/Deferred/Retired Members

In response to a question, the Chamberlain agreed to provide a headline breakdown of active/deferred/retired members, broken down by the three pension schemes (1987, 2006 and 2015) in future update reports.

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

The Chairman confirmed that he did not have any other items of business in public session, but that he wished to raise an item in non-public session.

Members agreed that, whilst there was no scheduled non-public business on the agenda that day, agendas for future meetings should include a placeholder for the Board to be able to discuss any relevant issues in non-public session.

RESOLVED, that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the

grounds they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

10.1 Any Other Business that the Chairman considers urgent and which the Board agrees should be considered whilst the public are excluded

Members considered one item of non-public other business.

The meeting closed at 2.25 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / 020 7332 1416 /
alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

**ECONOMIC CRIME COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF LONDON POLICE
AUTHORITY BOARD
Monday, 12 October 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the Economic Crime Committee of the City of London Police Authority Board held at Microsoft Teams on Monday, 12 October 2020 at 9.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Emma Edhem
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Andrew Lentin
Deputy Robert Merrett
Benjamin Murphy
James Tumbridge
Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Dawn Wright

City of London Police Authority:

Simon Latham	- Deputy Chief Executive
Oliver Bolton	- Deputy Head of Police Authority Team
Rachael Waldron	- Compliance Lead
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Joe Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department

City of London Police Force:

Becky Riggs	- Detective Chief Superintendent
Chris Felton	- Director of Economic Crime Academy
Chris Glover	- City of London Police
Alix Newbold	- City of London Police

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Nick Bensted-Smith. The Town Clerk noted that Alderman Emma Edhem would be arriving late.

The Chairman welcomed those Members who had joined the Committee for 2020/21 and thanked Nick Bensted-Smith for his work as past Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman also welcomed Detective Chief Superintendent Becky Riggs to her first meeting since joining the Force.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 27 January 2020 be approved.

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

Lisvane Review

The Chairman noted the review by Lord Lisvane into the City of London Corporation's governance, particularly its observations and recommendations around governance of the City of London Police Authority. The Chairman noted that he would be recommending that the Economic Crime Committee continue given the importance of the Force's National Lead function. There was a broader question over an increase in the number of external members appointed to both the City of London Police Authority Board, and the Economic Crime Committee which Members were welcome to provide feedback on either at this meeting, or outside of the meeting.

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

There were no questions.

6. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2020 be approved.

8. **NON-PUBLIC REFERENCES**

Members considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding non-public references.

8.1 **Case Studies of artificial intelligence (AI) support for National Lead Force**

Members considered a report of the T/Commander (Economic Crime) regarding case studies of artificial intelligence (AI) support for the National Lead Force.

8.2 **Mackey/Savill Review Implementation Plan**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the Mackey/Savill Review Implementation Plan.

8.3 **Interpol/Europol - PIPCU Engagement**

Members considered a report of the T/Commander (Economic Crime) regarding Interpol/Europol – PIPCU Engagement.

8.4 Performance Framework Update

Members considered an update report of the T/Commander (Economic Crime) regarding the Performance Framework.

9. **NATIONAL LEAD FORCE PLAN 2020-22**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the National Lead Force Plan 2020-2022.

10. **ECONOMIC CRIME DIRECTORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT Q1: APRIL-JUNE 2020**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Economic Crime Directorate Performance Q1 April – June 2020.

11. **UPDATE - RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM HMCIFRS INSPECTION - FRAUD: A TIME TO CHOOSE**

Members considered an update report of the Commissioner regarding recommendations arising from the Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services (HMCIFRS) Inspection – *Fraud: A Time to Choose*.

12. **ECONOMIC CRIME ACADEMY UPDATE**

Members considered an update report of the T/Commander (Economic Crime) regarding the Economic Crime Academy.

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no other non-public business.

The meeting ended at 10.45 am

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / 020 7332 1416 /
alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

**PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE CITY
OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD
Friday, 16 October 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Resource Management Committee of the City of London Police Authority Board held at Microsoft Teams on Friday, 16 October 2020 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Douglas Barrow (Chairman)
Tijs Broeke
Helen Fentimen
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Jamie Ingham-Clark
Andrew Lentin
Deborah Oliver
Graham Packham
Deputy James Thomson

City of London Police Authority:

Simon Latham	- Deputy Chief Executive
Alex Orme	- Head of Police Authority Team
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Alistair Cook	- Head of Police Authority Finance
Matt Lock	- Head of Audit and Risk Management
Aqib Hussein	- Chamberlain's Department

City of London Police Force:

Alistair Sutherland	- Assistant Commissioner
Cecilie Booth	- Chief Operating and Chief Financial Officer
Paul Adams	- Head of Governance and Assurance
Stuart Phoenix	- Head of Strategic Development
Oliver Shaw	- Detective Superintendent
Hayley Williams	- City of London Police

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley and Caroline Mawhood. The Town Clerk noted that Alderman Hailes and Andrew Lentin would be leaving the meeting at midday.

The Chairman welcomed Members to the second meeting of the Committee that year, noting that during the height of the pandemic oversight of Committee matters had been undertaken by the City of London Police Authority Board.

The Chairman welcomed Jamie Ingham-Clark, Helen Fentimen, Graham Packham and Alderman Tim Hailes to their first meeting and welcomed the appointment of Dan Worsley.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Members considered the Committee's terms of reference, noting that the future iteration should make clear the frequency of meetings and the fact that the co-opted Finance Committee Member should be the Finance Committee's Chairman, or their nominee.

A Member commented that the terms of reference were split between Policing Plan and performance, and finance, asset management and change. The reasoning behind this split was to reflect these were significant areas of work in terms of scrutiny.

RESOLVED, that the terms of reference be received.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 7 February 2020 be approved.

5. **REFERENCES**

Members considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding references and the following points were made.

25/2019/P – Recruitment Projections to be embedded in Medium-Term Financial Plan & 1/2020/P Non-Pay Elements in Medium Term Financial Plan & 4/2020/P Medium Term Financial Plan to include workforce assumptions

- The Assistant Commissioner noted that the MTFP report was due in November 2020 and all the necessary data to support MTFP forecasting was in place. The Force was in a good position with regards to its projections, with monthly recruitment monitoring reports that were within 5% accuracy. The Force was forecasting a younger mix of staff including a greater number of probationers, which would in turn affect Force financials.

6/2020/P – Deep Dive on Community Policing

- Members noted that the new Sector Policing Model would be adopted from 19 October 2020 which would make a deep dive on Community Policing redundant. Instead Members requested a six-month update report on Sector Policing in mid-2021.

7/2020/P – Staff Survey to be benchmarked against 2017 Staff Survey

- The Assistant Commissioner noted that the current survey had gone live and that a report on its outcome would be available from February 2021.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

6. Q1 BUDGET MONITORING 2020/21

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Q1 Budget Monitoring 2020/21 and the following points were made.

- The Chief Financial and Chief Operating Officer (COFO) noted that the report had already been submitted to the City of London Police Authority Board. The headline of the report was that the Force was anticipating a £4m underspend in the current financial year. Work to finalise Q2 figures was ongoing, and it was likely that the underspend would rise to £5m. This was due to the Force receiving more Home Office funding than had been anticipated, and as well as the Force generating more income than had been forecast. At present, the figures within the report were the COFO's best assessment of year-end.
- The COFO continued, noting that the Force had significantly reduced overtime spend and was on track to be within overtime budget at the end Q2. The report provided a directorate breakdown of financial position, with more forecasting detail being provided in future quarterly reports and the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- The COFO noted that there were at present no variances within the capital programme at end Q1, but that this was likely due to it being so early in the financial year. The capital programme would be looked at in greater detail at Q2 but it was likely that a clearer picture would only be available from Q3.
- The COFO noted that there had been a significant improvement in transactional finance, largely due to a staff appointment that had been effective in dealing with a legacy transactional finance position.
- The COFO concluded by noting that an appendix set out a savings tracker for the Force, with savings being monitored monthly in-Force which gave the COFO a high degree of confidence that the £5.7m savings target would be met, although perhaps not on a line-by-line basis as some savings would be achieved in other areas, such as the delay in the National Enabling Programme roll-out.
- In response to a comment, the Assistant Commissioner noted that the Police Accommodation Programme had a number of delays built into it which had meant some savings had yet to be realised e.g. the delay in moving out of Wood Street Police Station. The Force was reviewing savings across its estate but ultimately was reliant on the Accommodation Programme being delivered.

- A Member raised a number of queries, noting that staff numbers had been provided up until June 2020 but not thereafter, presumably due to lead-in times around between vetting and appointment. He was concerned regarding the human as well as financial impact of the scale of accrued holiday. Finally, noting that the workforce plan was on the non-public side of the agenda, the Member queried whether pay varied across ranks and trained skills-sets and noted that he would welcome more robust linking between people, pay and budget.
- The Assistant Commissioner was heard in reply, noting that the figures were true as at end Q1. The Assistant Commissioner received weekly recruitment updates and moreover the issue of recruitment was reviewed at strategic workforce planning meetings. Currently the Force had 829 officers and 477.5 staff on strength. On the question of accrued rest days, the Assistant Commissioner emphasised these were rest days rather than holidays, and the total accrual had stood at nearly 7000 days, which could be correlated with the Force's overtime spend. The accruals were in areas where the Force struggled to recruit to, including Firearms and Public Order. There were little variations in pay on trained skills-sets but rather on service bandwidths e.g. probationers who were currently on lower pay bands.
- The Assistant Commissioner concluded by noting that the Committee would likely see the workforce plan earlier in future as the Force was conducting a further Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA) to ensure it was meeting Corporate Plan ambitions. The STRA would also likely be influenced by COVID and result in strengthened capability in different areas than at present e.g. Economic Crime Directorate. The report on the new STRA would be available within six months.
- In response to Member concerns around the human impact of accrued rest days, the Assistant Commissioner replied that there was a newly appointed welfare lead who held Chief Superintendent rank, whose brief was to oversee the delivery of a rolling programme of support. Individuals with a disproportionate entitlement to accrued rest days were being supported, and the issue was expected to decline in line with the financial uplift that was allowing the Force to recruit and upskill staff. The Chairman noted that he had attended a meeting with the Force that week that had demonstrated the Force was engaged with relevant national welfare programmes.
- A Member commented on the presentation of data within the report as there was varying use of red text and brackets. Moreover there was a lack of narrative to explain variances within a given table, and it was difficult to gain a read-across between tables e.g. how actual and forecast workforce numbers at table 5 tallied with figures at table 2.

- A Member supported these comments noting that it would be useful to have definitions of what RAG ratings in quarterly reporting equated to. Moreover it would be useful to have an aggregate of RAG savings.
- The COFO replied, noting that generally red text in brackets equated to credit. That said, quarterly reporting was reliant on the import of data from spreadsheets which sometimes resulted in errors. In terms of narrative, the COFO noted that the report was already lengthy and she was concerned that further narrative would obscure the core purpose of the report. Definitions of RAG ratings would be provided in future quarterly reporting and for the time being, Green represented savings that had been achieved, Amber where there was a high level of confidence they would be achieved, and Red where it was known that they would not be achieved e.g. the delayed National Enabling Programme. An aggregation of savings could be provided in future reporting.
- On the issue of difficulty reading across data between tables within the report, the Member clarified her query, asking whether the projected numbers of FTE by year end in table 5 were reflected in table 2 i.e. were all posts funded and what impact did that have on projected savings within the Medium-Term Financial Plan. The COFO replied, noting that it was difficult to predict staffing numbers given, as a crude example, 20 persons appointed on the same date could take up their appointments on widely different dates within the forthcoming year due to factors such as vetting etc. The COFO had tried to give an idea of forecasted numbers within the report alongside this caveat, and so would revisit this issue at Q2. Members were asked to note that there were no vacancies in Uniformed Policing as there were a number of probationers who had yet to take up establishment posts.
- A Member queried whether international training that had been paused due to COVID could be delivered via alternative means i.e. virtually. Secondly, he voiced caution over the fact that the City was obligated to collect the Late Night Levy from city venues despite their widespread closure/reduced operation due to COVID. This could be a reputational issue for the Force. The COFO noted that virtual training had been adopted and some training could be delivered in person in COVID secure settings in London.
- The COFO highlighted the Force's range of memorabilia which was selling well online. The Town Clerk agreed to provide Members with the link.
- A Member commented that he had requested greater focus on non-pay items and would therefore welcome more narrative in the Q2 report around table 2 and the narrative provided at 1.5. He would welcome greater liaison between Force and Authority, in particular in the area of Human Resources, to ensure Force headcount was accurately reflected in the Medium Term Financial Plan. Moreover it was important that the

costs of the Next Generation Service Action Know Fraud procurement were not lost sight of.

- In closing, the Member requested numbers and commentary around risk and opportunity e.g. more around section 12.1 in the report and separate columns or risk and opportunity in the existing table, alongside commentary on how they would be managed. As an example, it would be useful to have a couple of lines around how deferred leave was being mitigated, recognising that it would be difficult to provide this level of detail in areas such as Events Policing. Consideration could be given to using red and green text to aid presentation. Lastly, national policing was being asked to make submissions to the Home Office around loss of income and he was keen that the whole Force engaged in this exercise, not just the Economic Crime Directorate. The COFO agreed to incorporate the comments made into the Q2 report, although any figures submitted to the Home Office would be reported at Q3.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

7. POLICING PLAN 2020-23 - PERFORMANCE AGAINST MEASURES FOR END Q1 FOR THE YEAR 2020-21

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding Policing Plan 2020-23 – Performance against measures for end Q1 for the year 2020/21 and the following points were made.

- The Assistant Commissioner noted that Counter Terrorism Measure 3 (increased number of hostile reconnaissance reports) was listed as requiring action. This measure stated that a high number of reports undergoing investigation was positive, which had been impacted by the fact the footfall in the City had significantly reduced since the outset of COVID. Overall the measure was out of the Force's control given the Force was reliant on intelligence from trained security staff in City premises. The Force was keeping the measure under review, and continued to investigate a number of reports.
- The Assistant Commissioner noted that Neighbourhood Policing Measure 3 (public order positive outcomes following arrest) was listed as requiring action as the number of arrests associated with the Night Time Economy and demonstrations had declined.
- The Assistant Commissioner concluded by noting that the Force was number one in the country in terms of detecting crime. Under the Transform Programme the Force now had a new Silver role to co-ordinate Force response in real time. This had resulted in the last week of the arrest of a repeat offender within a minute of them committing a crime, leading to the detection of both that crime and 17 other crimes associated with that offender. The Force was also taking the opportunity presented by COVID to seek and arrest wanted persons who were more likely to be found in at a fixed address due to lockdown.

- In response to a question, the Assistant Commissioner replied that at the outset of lockdown he had anticipated that the Force would have been able to deal with legacy issues but in reality the Force had embarked on more arrests and charges alongside increased demand in COVID enforcement. As a result there had been little opportunity to focus on legacy issues. Indeed, a minor outbreak of COVID amongst a specialist function within the Force had significantly reduced capability in that area.
- In response to a question, the Commissioner noted that the community survey had been carried out by an external company using the electoral register and social media. There had been increased engagement that year and a report on the outcome of the survey was expected in mid-November 2020.
- A Member noted that crime trends in the City had undergone an unwelcome uplift over the past two years, admittedly from a low base. Nevertheless it was concerning particularly given the increases were in areas such as violent and acquisitive crime. The Member was keen to promote a measurable performance-led approach to crime reduction and saw a clear link with Transform. Notwithstanding constraints it should be acknowledged that the Force was relatively well resourced for policing a square mile and he was therefore keen to target the increased areas of crime swiftly.
- The Assistant Commissioner replied, noting that the Force had been carrying a large vacancy factor for the past few years which contributed to the uplift in crime. At one point, the Force had been 80 officers short of its 720 establishment. Moreover the City was a honeypot for thieves from across the whole of the Metropolitan area, and there had been a significant increase in licensed premises in the last four years – from 720 to 945. Added to this, in response to the more rigorous in depth inspections by HMICFRS that commenced in 2016, the Force had significantly improved the way in which it identified and recorded crime, which led to increased reporting.
- The Assistant Commissioner continued, noting that going forward under the Sector Policing model the City would be divided into East and West sectors, each under a Chief Inspector. The new model allowed senior officers to drill down and review individual officer performance. Finally, the Assistant Commissioner assured Members that the Force was not complacent regarding crime figures and that he would be personally embarrassed if figures increased to their former levels.
- In response to comment from a Member regarding the level of disruption carried out against fraud and serious organised crime, the Assistant Commissioner noted that the two areas were linked as disruption activity directed at fraud impacted serious organised crime groups' ability to conduct their illegal activity. In Q1, the Force's ability to disrupt fraud was impacted by the banking sector's move towards home working during lockdown, which came at a time when fraud reporting increased by 70%

in April 2020. The situation around access had since improved and therefore there should be an improvement in disruption during Q2 and Q3.

- Members noted that they would welcome a workshop on Policing Plan measures to enable them to better understand the governance and compliance assessments underpinning the reporting made to Committee.
- The Chairman and Assistant Commissioner encouraged Members of the Committee to approach and engage officers on the beat to gain grass-roots perspectives of policing in the City.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

8. HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTOR OF CONSTABULARY, FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES (HMICFRS) INSPECTION UPDATE

Members considered an update report of the Commissioner regarding Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) Inspection reports and the following points were made.

- In response to a question from a Member raised earlier in the meeting, the Chairman replied that HMICFRS did not take into account cost implications for the Force when making recommendations. Moreover the Force was not obliged to adopt HMICFRS recommendations, but in the event of not doing so, the Force's reasons for not doing so should be robust and reasonable. A regular dialogue with HMICFRS was maintained.
- A Member welcome the progress made towards the recommendation regarding child protection.
- A Member commented that, compared to the plentiful number of red recommendations the Force faced a number of years ago, he was pleased to see that in spite of COVID there was a strong focus in the Force on dealing with HMICFRS recommendations and so credit was due to the Assistant Commissioner and his team.
- In response to a question regarding recommendation 5 (child protections - management of sex offenders and violent offenders) the Assistant Commissioner noted that the Force had focused on meeting the recommendation and would review the structures and processes involved once they were working in practice. He highlighted the wider work the Force was undertaking on child protection, including joint working with the British Transport Police to monitor activity around stations and hotels.
- The Commissioner noted that the update reporting was necessarily concise given it was designed to give Members a summary oversight, and assured Members that the Force took the recommendations

seriously and indeed perhaps held them as red for longer than external observers, including HMICFRS, would deem necessary.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

9. INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE REPORT

Members considered an Internal Audit update report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management and the following points were made.

- The Head of Audit and Risk Management (ARM) noted that in addition to the update provided within the report three other items of internal audit work were underway which he planned to update Members on in more detail at a future meeting. With regards to reference 5/2020/P (Internal Audit to be benchmarked against peer Forces/Authorities) the Head of ARM noted that a peer network existed for this purpose and baselining would take place as part of the pre-planning process for next year's internal audit programme. Pre-planning would commence in November 2020.
- In response to a question regarding the skills-set of the Internal Audit Team, the Head of ARM noted that the City has a small in-house team covering the City of London Corporation's local authority functions, one of whom had been with the team for over 20 years. That particular member of staff was retiring in March 2021 so work was ongoing to conduct knowledge transfer. In addition, the Internal Audit Team worked with Mazars to provide extra audit capability. To date this had not benefited the internal audit of the Force but Mazars could offer Force audit expertise going forward. The Head of ARM was confident his team could offer value on strategic issues but he would look to Mazars for support on specialist areas of work.
- In response to a question regarding how engagement was sought from the Force on internal audit matters, the Head of ARM noted that internal audit followed an iterative planning process that commenced with the Assistant Commissioner and the Force's senior leadership team, where engagement was positive. Engagement could become more challenging at the fieldwork stage, where internal audit activity risked clashing with delivery of business as usual activity. The Head of ARM had been encouraging his team to make more timely escalations when agreed timescales risked being delivered properly.
- The Commissioner noted that the Force's Strategic Development function was engaged with the Internal Audit Team and was able to facilitate contacts, and monitor implications of holiday and work commitments within the Force.
- A Member commented that he was very supportive of internal audit and in his experience so was the Force, acknowledging that the Force was subject to scrutiny and audit by a number of bodies. As per the internal audit work programme summary within the report, the intention was to

audit items that were of strategic importance to the Force at the present time, and to look forward rather than adopt a retrospective outlook. The Member considered internal audit as a key element of driving improvement in key risk areas facing the Force.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

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

There were no questions.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
Reporting Request – City of London Police IT Programme & Discrete Funding

The Chairman requested regular reporting on the City of London Police IT Programme, and discrete accounts to understand City of London Corporation funding aside from its core funding.

Thanks to outgoing Clerk

The Chairman thanked the Committee Clerk for his work supporting the Committee prior to his leaving the City of London Corporation.

12. **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 they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

13. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2020 be approved.

14. **NON-PUBLIC REFERENCES**

Members considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding non-public references.

15. **WORKFORCE PLAN 2018-2023 - REFRESH**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the Workforce Plan 2018-2023 – Refresh.

16. **TRANSFORM PROGRAMME: UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFICIENCIES**

Members considered a report of the Commissioner regarding the Transform Programme: Update on Implementation and Efficiencies.

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

There was one non-public question.

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

There was no other business in non-public session.

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / 020 7332 1416
alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date:
Police Authority Board	9 November, 2020
Subject: City of London Police Authority – Governance	Public
Report of: Town Clerk & Chief Executive	For Decision
Report author: Simon Latham, City of London Police Authority	

Summary

This report provides background on the powers of the City of London Police Authority (PA) within the City of London Corporation (City Corporation) and sets out proposals to enhance the governance arrangements for the PA in light of the recent publication of the Lisvane Review into City Corporation governance. These proposals fall into three categories: reviewing the structures of the Police Authority Board (PAB) and its sub-committees; developing a framework of policies for PAB to drive challenge and scrutiny of the City of London Police (CoLP), and; creating a robust platform for PA operations.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve the proposals set out in this report; and
- Note that further reports will be brought to this Committee in due course as recommendations are progressed.

Introduction

1. The role of the City of London Police Authority (PA) is to provide scrutiny and challenge to the work of the City of London Police (CoLP), acting as one part of a multi-tiered system of ‘checks and balances’. In discharging more than 60 statutory duties, the PA must ensure that CoLP delivers efficient and effective policing for the public within a sustainable medium-term financial plan (MTFP), and hold the City of London Police Commissioner to account for the delivery of policing within the Square Mile and in its capacity as the national lead force for economic crime. In fulfilling its role, the PA must be mindful of public confidence in policing, as well as CoLP’s capacity to reduce threat, risk, and harm in a context of increasingly pressured resources.
2. The Lisvane Review of corporate governance of the City of London Corporation (City Corporation) was published on 15 September 2020. The report will be scrutinised by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee in the coming months, with recommendations arising considered by the Policy and Resources Committee and final decision(s) being made by the Court of Common Council. Chairs of affected Committees and Members of the Court will have the opportunity input into final recommendations put to Court, with the scheduled 12 November 2020 informal Court meeting being utilised as a forum to debate and review the report. Depending on the length of time that Resource Allocation Sub-

Committee feels it is necessary to reach its conclusions, recommendations could be put to Policy and Resources Committee in November or December 2020 and final recommendations put to the Court of Common Council in January 2021.

Background

3. Policing arrangements for the City of London are governed by private legislation. The City is exceptional in retaining a police authority in the form of the Court of Common Council, acting through the City of London Police Authority Board (PAB) to which the Common Council has delegated its general functions of superintendence. The current arrangements are the result of an agreement between the (then) government and the City when police authorities were reformed by the Police and Magistrates' Courts Act 1994 by which the City of London Corporation mirrored the principles of the national governance arrangements in its oversight of the City of London Police put in place by that Act. The same principle was applied when police authorities were replaced in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.
4. By virtue of these arrangements, it has been possible to mimic the government's general policy within the City's general constitutional framework and in particular to provide that the City's primary business electoral franchise is properly reflected in the oversight of the City of London Police. Accordingly, PAB provides a directly elected scrutiny body mirroring the model deployed for Police & Crime Commissioners. The Board and its Committees further benefit from the addition of independent members recruited for their particular background and expertise in relevant areas of the Board's focus.
5. Local governance arrangements remain under constant review to ensure these remain in step with government policy in this area, including most recently through proposals put to PAB in January 2019 (see background papers). The work of the Policy Authority Board is bolstered by a number of specialist sub-committees. At the present juncture, such bodies exist to oversee the City of London Police's activities as National Lead Force (NLF) for economic crime, professional standards and integrity, resource management, and police performance. The Police Authority is also active within the Association of Police & Crime Commissioners, including membership of the APCC Board of Directors and the Chairman's role as Deputy Lead for the APCC Fraud Portfolio.

Proposals

6. In light of the recent publication of the Lisvane Review into City Corporation governance, it is proposed to enhance the governance arrangements for the PA in three ways: first, to review the structures of the Police Authority Board (PAB) and its sub-committees; second, developing a framework of policies for PAB to drive challenge and scrutiny of the City of London Police (CoLP), and; third, creating a robust platform for PA operations.
7. It is proposed that the following changes be made to the governance arrangements for the PA.

- 7.1. A review of PAB's Terms of Reference (ToRs), in light of the Lisvane Review, to ensure that PAB and its sub-committees undertakes effectively all of the functions of the PA delegated to it by the Court of Common Council; to reduce the scrutiny provided by other City Corporation Committees of PA matters (where this duplicates the work of PAB) and provide greater clarity to CoLP about which City Corporation Committees would regularly be expected to provide scrutiny of CoLP business on behalf of PAB. This should also ensure that the current term limits for PA Members remain consistent with the way in which the Lisvane Review is implemented.
- 7.2. The bifurcation of Performance & Resource Management (P&RM) into two separate sub-committees in April 2021: one committee to focus on the City Policing Plan and CoLP performance; the other committee to focus on finance, risk, CoLP accommodation and change programmes. This would ensure a proportionate and complementary distribution of responsibilities for PA scrutiny of key CoLP activities.
- 7.3. A review of the Economic Crime Committee (ECC) ToRs to widen its remit to cover the CoLP NLF Plan, Action Fraud and National Fraud Investigation Bureau (NFIB) performance, CoLP's private sector partnerships in this area, Cyber Griffin, and the newly acquired National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) Cyber Portfolio.
- 7.4. The creation of Job Descriptions (JDs) for the PAB Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Sub-Committee Chairmen, role profiles for PAB Members and SIA Leads, and SIA guidance notes. These will help to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of PAB Members and PA officers, particularly where there is a need for external influence, and help to enhance capacity within the PA to oversee and scrutinise CoLP.
- 7.5. The introduction of an annual skills audit for PAB and its sub-committees prior to the Spring Court of Common Council elections for new PAB Members. This will help to inform annual Member voting onto PAB and the need for co-opted external Members by identifying where PAB needs to develop the requisite knowledge and skills to help maximise the PA's effectiveness.
- 7.6. The co-option of additional external Members, including two external Members onto PAB and where appropriate up to two external Members on each of the various sub-committees. This will help to address any skills gaps within the PA.
- 7.7. Increased engagement for PAB and its sub-committees, as well as wider Members of the Court of Common Council, in the development of the City's Policing Plan. This would ensure that all Members can represent the views of their communities and wards in the way in which the plan is developed, and ensure wider City Corporation engagement with CoLP's specialisms for fraud, cyber and protective security and role in ensuring the Square Mile is a safe place to live and work.

- 7.8. The creation of a PA Governance Handbook, which would consolidate the legislative background, policy frameworks, and best practice guidance, governing the work of the PA, as well as clarifying the various roles and statutory responsibilities of PA officers. This would be a particular help in improving the induction of new Members onto PAB.
8. It is proposed that a framework of overarching policies (or policy positions) be developed for the PA to provide PAB and relevant sub-committees with the opportunity to drive challenge and scrutiny on specific issues affecting CoLP over the medium-term. This would include the introduction of the following policies in the first instance.
 - 8.1. Financial Oversight. This would help to govern the PA's relationship with CoLP on financial matters and provide for clearer financial reporting to PAB and other relevant City Corporation Committees, especially with regards to CoLP funding.
 - 8.2. Financial Reserves. The purpose of this policy would be to incentivise greater efficiency in CoLP's financial planning as part of the work to maintain a sustainable MTFP and help to reduce the demand on the City Corporation's reserves in unforeseen or exceptional circumstances.
 - 8.3. Diversity (or Equality and Inclusion). The purpose of this policy would be PAB to consider how to transpose recommendations arising from the City Corporation's Tackling Racism Taskforce into the work of the PA, particularly in respect of the CoLP workforce and the Force's wider community engagement.
 - 8.4. Crime Prevention and Reduction. This would help to clarify the PA's approach to crime prevention and its reduction in a measurable way, with input from the City Corporation's Community Safety Team, specifically in terms of how it engages with the SCP and Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee, and allow for greater engagement on behalf of City businesses on anti-social behaviour and related crime types.
 - 8.5. Future of Policing. This would help to develop the PA's priorities in respect of the Force's business and operational effectiveness, in order to support CoLP's work in this area through Transform and related programmes.
9. It is proposed that a more robust platform be created for PA operations in the following ways.
 - 9.1. To consider whether formal roles need to be created for PA Deputy Chief Executive and PA Deputy Treasurer as part of the implementation of the City Corporation's TOM, including whether any formal delegations should be provided to each post by the PA Chief Executive and Treasurer.
 - 9.2. The introduction of a (high-level) PA Business Plan, supported by a discrete PA Budget and PA Risk Register, to be presented annually to PAB. This would allow PA activities and expenditure to be monitored by relevant

Committees and benchmarked against neighbouring and similar external bodies (e.g. the British Transport Police Authority (BTPA) and Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime (MOPAC)).

- 9.3. The implementation of a joint communications and engagement plan across City Corporation and COLP to support the work of the PA. Particular focus would be given to augmenting awareness of CoLP's NLF activities, specialist protective security programmes, and community engagement, as well as linking CoLP priorities with those of the City's promotional and policy activity through the Mayoralty and Policy Chair. This would be agreed annually by PAB and would also cover the PA's internal communications plan and online presence.
 - 9.4. PAB be given greater visibility of the City Corporation's Internal Audit Plan for CoLP and, where appropriate, the reports of any key investigations. This would allow for greater alignment with PAB's scrutiny functions and widen Members' knowledge base of CoLP operations and performance levels.
 - 9.5. The introduction of service agreements between the PA and key City Corporation services to provide surety of professional support for PAB, particularly the PAB Chairman, sub-Committee Chairmen and SIA Leads.
10. In achieving the above, there needs to be far greater clarity about what constitutes an appropriate level of challenge and scrutiny of CoLP by the PAB, both in terms of operational policing and non-operational matters – and the extent to which the PAB expects this to take place by Police Authority officers.

Conclusion

11. The role of the City of London PA is to provide scrutiny and challenge to the work of the CoLP, ensuring that the Force delivers efficient and effective policing for the public within a sustainable MTFP, and holding the City of London Police Commissioner to account for the delivery of policing within the Square Mile and as the national lead force for economic crime. The proposals set out in this report seek to further enhance this role and strengthen the ability of PA Members to scrutinise and oversee the work of CoLP.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Summary of City of London Police-specific reflections and recommendations arising from a report of a review of corporate governance of the City of London Corporation by The Lord Lisvane KCB DL.
- Appendix 2 – Phase 2 Timetable

Background Papers

- A report of a review of corporate governance of the City of London Corporation by The Lord Lisvane KCB DL (appended to report of Town Clerk

- to the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee)
- Police Authority Governance Report, Police Committee, 24 January 2019.

Simon Latham,
City of London Police Authority

T: 020 7332 1402

E: simon.latham@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Serial	Section	Page / Paragraph	Reflection	Recommendation
1	4. Corporation's Strengths and Weaknesses / Strengths / Richness of Texture	p.22 paragraphs 88-90	The Force is one element that makes up the City's texture – it offers extraordinary opportunity for cross-fertilisation, enhancing experience of all who come into contact with City, and demonstrating that whole is more than sum of parts: nevertheless the variety of activities prompts question of whether Corporation should continue to own/run everything it does currently.	
2	7. Committees / Restructuring / Multiple Membership	p.59 paragraph 275		Membership of the Police Authority Board should not count towards the recommended limit of a Member serving on no more than two Committees.
3	7. Committees / Restructuring / Chair Terms	p.60 paragraph 277		All Chair terms should be four years.
4	7. Committees / The New Committee Structure / The Policy and Resources Committee	p.63 paragraph 290		Chair of Police Authority Board should be ex-officio of Policy Committee
5	7. Committees / The New Committee Structure / Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee	p.69 paragraph 323		Appropriate utilisation of statutory Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee to be re-examined
6	9. Devolution and Demerger / Common Problems / Governance	p. 94 paragraphs 454-458	Appointment of Members is by the Court and is opaque – there is no certainty or probability that Members appointed to PAB will have the necessary skills and experience that makes for an effective Board.	
7	9. Devolution and Demerger / The City of London Police	p.104 paragraphs 495-498	Force is well regarded, and high visibility is welcomed by business and residents. Governance however is anomalous when compared with national arrangements.	
8	9. Devolution and Demerger / The Police Authority Board	pp. 105-106 paragraphs 499-506	Renamed to PAB in 2019 to better reflect Members' statutory responsibilities but remains a Corporation Committee. Board is of reasonable size but appointment by election by the Court gives no sure means of securing Members will relevant skills and experience. Adoption of term limits in July 2020 is welcomed but falls short of ideal of maximum total term of 8 years. SIA scheme lacked engagement – 7 Members for 11 areas, with some Members not involved at all. There is a lack of clarity on split between strategic issues, and operational matters that are responsibility of Commissioner and his staff.	
9	9. Devolution and Demerger / Governance Recommendations	p.106 paragraph 509		Direct appointment to PAB by Court of Common Council should continue, with two changes: (a) the number of Common Councillors should not be a majority on the Board (i.e. no more than six) and (b) they should be put forward for election by the Governance and Nominations Committee, taking full account of their skills and experience, and overall skills mix required.

10	9. Devolution and Demerger / Governance Recommendations	p. 106 paragraph 510		External members of PAB should be appointed following an open advertisement and selection process.
11	9. Devolution and Demerger / Governance Recommendations	p.107 paragraph 511		(a) Board Members should serve a term of four years, renewable once, with no re-appointment during the four years then ensuing (b) A Chair should leave the Board at the end of their term of office.
12	9. Devolution and Demerger / Governance Recommendations	p. 107 paragraph 512		Chair's involvement in appraisal of Commissioner should be consistent with PCC/national policing generally.
13	9. Devolution and Demerger / Control of COLP Staff	p. 108 paragraph 520		A scheme should be devised to allow Commissioner to recruit and deploy staff according to the requirements of the Force; even though those staff would be employees of the Corporation. It is essential for Commissioner to be able to recruit on terms which meet the operational requirements of the Force, rather than being bound by employment policies of wider application (e.g. rest of Corporation).
14	9. Devolution and Demerger / Management Processes	p. 110 paragraph 527	There is a split between uniformed staff employed by Commissioner and civilian staff employed by Corporation. The Commissioner does not have flexibility to recruit in specialised and competitive market nor freedom to deploy staff fully to meet operational requirements	
15	9. Devolution and Demerger / Management Processes	p. 110 paragraph 529	PAB has its own PRM Committee but its finances and financial processes are also scrutinised by Finance Committee, Procurement Sub-Committee and Audit and Risk Committee.	
16	9. Devolution and Demerger / Management Processes	p.110 paragraph 533	Centralised procurement contracts may not meet Force's needs, as well as being more expensive.	

Police Authority Governance Arrangements – Phase 2 Timetable (09/11/2020)

Ref	Task	Lead	By	Comments
Governance				
1	A review of PAB's Terms of Reference (ToRs), in light of the Lisvane Review	Polly Dunn (PD)	Feb 2021	To provide greater clarity to CoLP about which City Corporation Committees would regularly be expected to provide scrutiny of CoLP business on behalf of PAB. This should also consider the question of term limits for PA Members as set out in the Lisvane Review NB Review of COLPAB TOR should happen no later than February PAB so that amendments can be recommended to March Policy/April Court.
2	The bifurcation of Performance & Resource Management (P&RM) into two separate sub-committees: one committee to focus on the City Policing Plan and CoLP performance; the other committee to focus on finance, risk, CoLP accommodation and change programmes	PD	Feb 2021	N.B Committee TORs can be reviewed by Committees themselves at their Q3 meetings (February) and considered by COLPAB at its March meeting. The new Committees with their finalised TORs will be appointed by COLPAB at its April 2021 meeting.
3	A review of the Economic Crime Committee (ECC) ToRs	PD	Feb 2021	To widen its remit to cover the CoLP NLF Plan, CoLP's private sector partnerships in this area, Cyber Griffin, and the newly acquired National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) Cyber Portfolio. (N.B Please see comments box - ref 2 – for timings)
4	Co-option of additional external Members (with a specific background in policing and/or law enforcement), including two external Members onto PAB and where appropriate up to two external Members on each of the various sub-committees.	PD	Feb 2021	Additional external members on COLPAB needs to be considered at Feb COLPAB and recommended to March Policy and April Court as per Ref 1. Additional external members on Committees is within the gift of COLPAB and it can amend Committee TORs accordingly as per the timeline outlined above at Ref 2 and Ref 3.
5	Introduce an annual skills audit prior to the Spring Court of Common Council elections for new PAB Members	PD	Jan 2021	The skills audit should be conducted across both COLPAB and its Committees in January 2021 to avoid cutting across the work undertaken on terms of references.
6	Creation of JDs for PAB Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Sub-Committee Chairmen, and a generic role profile for a PAB Member	PD/AO/SL	Nov 2020	Need to develop JD's for external members (e.g. ECC external member, PSI external member). Will need to combine current Committee Service External Member JD & PAB Member Role Profile

7	Ensure reporting of the Transform Programme meets the requirements of the PA Board	AL/SL/AC	Nov 2020	A standing item at PAB & P & RM Committee. Need to ensure regular & effective reporting of the 6 strands, benefits, timeframes etc and end state
8	Refresh the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee - to scrutinise the delivery of the SCP Strategy for 2020/21	CST/DCCS	Sept 2021	Will include the Chairman of the SCP, Deputy Chairman & the appropriate SIA Lead (s)
9	Introduce a Financial Reserves Policy	PK/AC	Nov 2020	
10	Introduce a Finance Oversight framework – to clarify the PA/COLP Roles & Responsibilities (lines of demarcation)	PK/AC	Nov 2020	
11	Ensure all SIA Leads have an opportunity to provide early input to and feedback on the formulation of the CoLP Policing Plan.	AO/SL	Aug 2021	Propose to have the first Policing Plan Workshop in Mid - September and then November. Supporting information for the workshop will be provided by Corporation Officers by Mid Aug
Member knowledge framework (Support, Guidance & Advice)				
12	Compile an induction pack for new PAB members	PD/PAT	Ongoing	The pack will cover legislative background, policies, guidance notes, PAT Jd's/role profiles.
13	Develop guidance pack for SIA Leads	SL/AO/CLO's	End of Dec 2020	The pack includes SIA role profile and bespoke information sheet developed by the Corporation Lead Officer (CLO)
14	Develop a robust PA monitoring framework to strengthen the oversight & scrutiny of the Transform Programme in terms of measuring progress, delivery & outcomes	AL/AC/SL	End of Nov 2020	To ensure better visibility of the programme and improve the scrutiny of progress, costs & delivery.
Policy Development				
15	Develop Police Authority Equality & Inclusion Strategy (aligned with TRT)	RW/AO	End of March	
16	Input into the Corporation/SCP Strategic Needs Assessment for 2020/21	CST/DCCS	TBA	
17	Input into the Safer City Partnership Strategy for 2021/22 & the development of the Corporation's crime prevention strategy	CST/DCCS	TBA	
18	Develop a PA Future of Policing policy	PAT	End of March	
PAB Communications				
19	Review of the current COLPA website and implement changes – so that meets the requirements of the Joint Communications & Engagement Plan/mirrors other policing bodies sites	PAT/ Internal Comms	March 2021	
20	Implementation of a Joint Communication & Engagement Plan plus Community Engagement Plan to support the work of the PA.	BR/SL/TLT CSP Team	TBA	Key areas of focus raising awareness of CoLP's NLF activities and specialist protective security programmes, as well as community engagement

Police Authority – Operational Arrangements				
21	The creation of formal roles for PA Deputy Chief Executive and PA Deputy Treasurer as part of the implementation of the City Corporation's TOM, including whether any formal delegations should be provided to each post by the PA Chief Executive and Treasurer	TBA	TBA	
22	Develop a high-level costed Business plan for 21/22 & PA Risk Register	SL/AO	Dec 2020	
23	Request a designated PA budget against which spending on PA activities across the City Corporation can be reported to relevant committees, as well as benchmarked against other police authorities	AC/CAB	Dec 2020	
24	Introduce service level agreements (SLAs) between the PA and key City Corporation Services - including Comptrollers', Human Resources, Corporate Strategy & Performance, Chamberlain's and City Surveyors'.	AO/SL	March 2021	
25	Commission the City Corporation's Corporate Strategy & Performance Team to review performance data and reports on community feedback and provide performance outturn report to Policing Plan Workshop	KS (CSP)	Nov 16th	The City Corporation's Strategy & Performance Team provided a performance outturn for last year's workshop as well as a verbal update on community feedback. This analysis helped to the inform priority setting for the COLP Policing Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Date:
Police Authority Board – for information Independent Custody Visitor Panel – for information	9 November 2020 28 October 2020
Subject: Independent Custody Visiting Scheme Annual Report 2019/20	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Rachael Waldron, ICV Scheme Manager, Town Clerk's Department	

Summary

This report completes the requirement to update Members on the progress of the City of London's Independent Custody Visiting Scheme, presenting the Panel's Annual Report and informing Members of some of the recent issues raised by the ICV Panel in relation to custody provision in the City. Issues raised at the Panel meetings over the past year include reference to outstanding recommendations highlighted in the HMICFRS/HMIP Custody Inspection; and significant challenges presented to the custody environment following the Coronavirus outbreak.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Main Report

Background

1. The current Independent Custody Visiting scheme is well established and has been functioning in its current capacity since November 2007. Members of the Police Committee agreed in May 2009, that a regular report would be presented to the Committee on an annual basis. This report fulfils that requirement.
2. Members may recall that Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs) conduct unannounced visits in pairs to custody suites to monitor and report upon the treatment and conditions of persons held in custody. They check that the rights and entitlements, wellbeing and dignity of detained persons are being observed; and monitor this on an entirely independent and confidential basis. Independent Custody Visitors undertake visits to custody in a voluntary capacity; and are there to look, listen and report on the conditions in custody at the time of their visit. They report their observations to the Force and to the ICV Panel, which is made up of all the visitors.
3. The City Visitors have all been trained in conjunction with the Independent Custody Visiting Association (ICVA) and the Mayor's Office of Policing and

Crime (MOPAC). Further training is provided to the Panel, which meets on a quarterly basis to discuss topical issues relevant to custody practice. The training provided expands upon potential issues of concerns for detainees in custody settings, such as mental health, vulnerability, restraint and use of force and sets out established good practice that Independent Visitors can draw upon and carry forward in their roles.

4. The visits take place on a three in two weeks basis for Bishopsgate Police Station as agreed by the Scheme and City of London Police (CoLP). Developments with the Covid-19 outbreak resulted in a reduction across the frequency of visits, with visits occurring once a week (from March 2019 to the present time). The visitors will also visit Brewery Road Custody (as part of the collaboration with the British Transport Police).
5. Each visit to custody is recorded by the two visitors who fill out a short visiting form and document any areas of concern following interviews with detainees. This form provides Visitors with the opportunity to outline their observations at the time of visiting and can include reference to any matters pertinent to the welfare of the detainee, such as the status of their immediate health following examination from a Healthcare Professional (HCP), adherence to any dietary requests and opportunities to practice any religious observations. Copies of each completed form are then sent to the Custody Manager, ICV Scheme Manager, ICV Scheme Administrator in the Town Clerk's Office and the Superintendent should any further action be required. The Panel should be commended for achieving an 89% visit rate in 2019-20, given the temporary disruption to custody visiting practices (nationally) following the emergence of the Coronavirus Pandemic.
6. Meetings of the ICV Panel continue to take place on a quarterly basis and are attended by all Custody Visitors, alongside colleagues from the Town Clerk's Department, City of London Police (usually the custody manager) and Board representative Deputy Keith Bottomley who continues to provide critical and focused scrutiny on key areas of custody practice in his role as SIA Lead for Safeguarding & Public Protection. It should be noted that adjustments were made across the latter end of Q1 (Jan-March 2020) to ensure meetings of the ICV Panel could be facilitated virtually following subsequent implementation of lockdown measures introduced by the Government.
7. The Panel reviews the records of visits since the last meeting and visitors are able to discuss any issues or areas of good practice as a collective. Visitors are also able to ask detailed questions of the representatives of the Force, including the custody manager, about any areas of concern. The Panel also considers more general aspects of custody practice such as the circulation of visiting rotations and availability. Furthermore, wherever appropriate the Panel also considers matters relevant to effective custody provision and provides feedback on how the conditions in police custody can be improved.
8. The ICV Panel would like to formally record its thanks to Independent Custody Visitors Peter Tihanyi, Stephen Mawson, Justin Su-Wan Yang, John Mead, Harold Ashley and Susan Kellas who have departed the scheme over the

previous year. All remained committed to ensuring the rights, entitlements and wellbeing of detainees were monitored and observed; and have provided valuable contribution to the Scheme across the duration of their time on the Panel.

9. The Panel also records their thanks to departing ICV Scheme Manager Craig Spencer, who maintained the role of Member Director on the National Board for The Independent Custody Visiting Association up until his departure from the CoL Corporation. Craig played a pivotal role in the Scheme achieving a Silver rating following assessment by the National Association.
10. The Panel also records their thanks to Chairman Godfrey Baillon-Bending and Vice Chairman Heather Thomas. Both should be commended for their steadfast commitment and guidance shown to new Panel Members across the year, and throughout the Coronavirus outbreak.

Panel Issues in 2019/20

11. The Panel has produced its tenth Annual Report, which is attached at Appendix A. This reports on the Panel's performance over the last 12 months, provides information about the visits made and issues raised as a result. The report also sets out the Panel's objective for 2020/21. Key issues raised at the Panel meeting include the following:

a) HMICFRS/HMIP Custody Inspection

The primary issues highlighted were poor privacy for detainees across the booking process, lack of adequate provision for children and vulnerable adults, lack of suitable provision for juveniles (charged), unsuitable travel arrangements for detainee's post release and suitable exercise provision available for detainees at Bishopsgate. However, it should be acknowledged that the Force has taken steps to make improvements to the issues highlighted. Particularly with regard to aspects relating to detainee privacy, safe release of detainees following detention in custody and adequate exercise provision. The Panel will work with the CoLP to address some of the more crucial recommendations currently outstanding. Particularly with regard to ensuring adequate exercise provision is completed as scheduled by January 2021.

b) Appropriate Adults

The Panel and the custody manager have been concerned with an outstanding area of concern highlighted in the HMICFRS inspection report. Particularly regarding the provision of appropriate adults (AA) for juveniles and vulnerable individuals in detention out of hours. The contract for the AA service is commissioned by Community & Children's Services (CCS). A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is currently being revised to ensure specific focus is drawn to ensuring the rights and welfare of vulnerable detainees are upheld. The contract will also include reference to the AA

Service facilitating communication and attending police interviews alongside vulnerable persons and juveniles at key moments of the custody process.

c) Coronavirus

The emergence of the Coronavirus pandemic in March 2020 presented a significant challenge to the custody environment. The City of London Scheme continued to uphold its statutory duty across this time to ensure that a balance was struck between the need to monitor police custody and maintain the safety of all. The Chairman, Vice Chair, Scheme Manager and Custody Manager have continued to work collaboratively across this period. Action has been undertaken by all to ensure the treatment, welfare and rights of detainees are upheld at a time of increasingly difficult pressure for police. It should be acknowledged that monitoring has continued throughout the course of the outbreak, however the Scheme Manager will now work with the CoLP to ensure appropriate monitoring practices are in place longer term, should further lockdown periods ensue preventing physical visits to custody.

Legal Implications

12. In accordance with Section 51 of the Police Reform Act (2002), the City Corporation is required to have in place an Independent Visitors Scheme.

Conclusion

13. The City of London ICV Scheme provides an independent assessment across the treatment of detained persons. The commitment and dedication of volunteer visitors ensures a continued and appropriate level of scrutiny of the Force is maintained.

Further updates on this Scheme will continue to be provided to Members on an annual basis.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – ICV Annual Report 2019/20

Background Papers

Annual Custody Report – November 2019 Police Committee
ICV Guidelines – January 2017 Police Committee

Rachael Waldron

ICV Scheme Manager – Town Clerk's Department

T: 0207 332 3419

E: Rachael.Waldron@cityoflondon.gov.uk



City of London

Independent Custody Visiting Scheme

Annual Report
November 2020

Forward, by the Chairman of the ICV Panel, Godfrey Baillon-Bending

In my second year of Chairmanship, the scheme has been severely stretched in the last six months due to Covid-19, but I can report that with the support of the vice-Chairman, Heather Thomas and three other panel members we have been able to provide custody visits on a weekly basis, which many other schemes nationally have been unable to do, my thanks go to them.

We have instigated 'self-assessment declarations', relating to Covid-19, giving reassurance to the Police Force and panel members that we are not suffering any symptoms of the virus. We have had five experienced visitors leave the Panel and they have been replaced by four very enthusiastic volunteers, bringing us up to nearly full strength.

We were awarded the Silver Award last year and I hope that we can maintain that standard. Training given to members were, Use of Force, introduction to Dignity and Children and young persons, Spit guards and leg restraints. The collaboration with the British Transport Police has been suspended temporarily and we hope to resume support for this arrangement in the near future. Report forms are now submitted electronically, which has worked well to reduce a level of workload and errors. MOPAC have now started Virtual training sessions for new and existing volunteers. I give my thanks to my fellow Custody Volunteers for their hard work this year, and particularly in the latter part and our new visitors who have fitted in seamlessly.

My thanks also go out to the City of London Police, particularly the Custody Manager, Custody Police Officers, Civilian Detention Officers and front of office staff for enabling us to successfully carry out our responsibilities in 2019-2020. It is also my privilege to congratulate a Custody Sergeant at the City of London Police Force at Bishopsgate Custody who was awarded, Custody Officer of the Year National Custody Award.

The City of London Police Force main custody suite continues to be located at Bishopsgate Police Station. Following on from the HMICFRS/HMIP inspection, a new exercise yard is well into fruition together with IT transformation. The establishment of a private booking-in facility has been established. With the onset of Covid-19, cells were kept closed for 72 hours, guidelines changed over time and now cells are deep cleaned and reopened within 1 hour. I have also been pleased to see the dietary requirements of detainees catered for; and welcome wider observations from my fellow Panel member which highlight the due attention and care paid to the monitoring of Juveniles in custody, ensuring their welfare and safety remains paramount.

Extinction Rebellion was very active in the London area but did not impact on the city as much.

Great strides have been made in the resilience of the City of London Police Force in being able to respond to changes to the demands made upon it regarding mental health issues and the needs of the vulnerable and ethnic population in our communities, the liaison and diversion service have given excellent support in this area. Unfortunately, the Appropriate Adult Scheme has somewhat been lacking in its effectiveness. Although some Forces have been somewhat lax in their treatment of female detainees, I am pleased report that the City of London Police Force have complied to their statutory requirements, which they were doing before it was statutory. The introduction of the Samaritans service into Custody suites is also a scheme we endeavour to trial in the near future.

I would also like to thank the previous Scheme Manager Craig Spencer and Richard Holt who was Scheme Administrator who have both now moved on. The new scheme Manager, Rachael Waldron couldn't have started at a more difficult and challenging time and I offer my gratitude to how she has coped admirably and has been very supportive.

INTRODUCTION

THE CITY OF LONDON INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITING SCHEME (ICV SCHEME)

The purpose of this report is to provide a thorough overview of work the City of London ICV Scheme in the period of 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020. It aims to:

- report on the Panel's performance;
- provide the local community and the Police Committee with information
- outline issues and concerns that the visits have raised; and
- set out the objectives for 2020/21.

The City of London Corporation, in its role as the police authority for the City of London, is a separate body to that of the City of London Police; and has a statutory duty to ensure the delivery of the Independent Custody Visiting Scheme.

The operation and effective monitoring of the custody visiting scheme is the responsibility of the Police Authority Board Committee.

Independent custody visiting is governed by a range of legislation and guidance including the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984 and Home Office Codes of Practice and National Standards (2013).

Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs) are members of the local and business community who volunteer to visit police stations on an unannounced basis to check on the treatment of detainees and the conditions in which they are held. Independent Custody Visitors play a crucial role in ensuring the rights and entitlements of detainees are observed throughout the duration of the time in custody. ICVs also assess the wellbeing and health of a detainee in addition to auditing the conditions of custody suites across visits.

During the visit, ICVs complete numerous checks, speaking to both custody staff and detainees and file a report based on their findings.

The Scheme monitors conditions in custody to provide transparency and to increase public confidence in police services while offering protection and confidentiality to detainees. The ICV Panel produce quarterly reports that provide a summary of their findings in custody. With regards to eligibility ICVs must:

- be over 18;
- be independent from the police force and policy authority; and
- have no direct involvement in the criminal justice system.

The City of London ICV Panel currently consists of 11 visitors who visit the custody suite situated at Bishopsgate Police Station three times every fortnight. Unannounced visits to Bishopsgate custody commenced to the suite in this manner, up until the point of the Coronavirus outbreak. The subsequent lockdown measures that were implemented in the latter part of March 2020 resulted in visits being conducted to Bishopsgate custody suite on a weekly basis.

The City of London ICV Panel also work in close collaboration with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). Independent custody visitors from the City of London Scheme have undertaken unannounced visits to Brewery Road custody facility; and attended Panel meetings of the Islington ICV Scheme across this period.

A member of the Police Authority Board attends the quarterly Panel meetings along with a representative of the Force to ensure that any questions or concerns that have surfaced from visits to custody can be adequately addressed. The quarterly Panel meetings are supported by employees from the Town Clerk's Department (ICV Scheme Manager; ICV Scheme Administrator and Policy Manager).

THE ROLE OF INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITORS

To ensure the safety and wellbeing of volunteers, it is mandatory for visits to custody to be undertaken in pairs. Visits to custody are made unannounced basis so that ICVs can look, listen and report on conditions in custody at the time of their visit.

The primary objective of all visitors is to observe and report on the treatment and conditions of individual detainees and to check that their rights and entitlements are being observed.

ICVs are accompanied by a custody officer at all times throughout their visit to custody. Each detainee is provided with an opportunity to engage and speak directly to custody visitors. Circumstances may arise where detainees should not be disturbed, particularly when they are asleep during a rest period, or when specific health or safety risks have been identified which prevent an interview from taking place. Detainees may only be interviewed with their consent and may choose not to provide permission.

Visit interviews with detainees are undertaken in clear sight, but outside earshot of the escorting officer so details of what visitors see and hear remain confidential. Strict rules of confidentiality apply so that detainees are identified by their custody numbers only. ICVs remain independent and impartial. They do not provide advice or seek to involve themselves in the process of investigation. In this respect, they are not concerned with any alleged offence and cannot perform tasks on behalf of the detained person.

Custody visitors complete a report after every visit, to record details of the visit. The information included in this report focuses on actions for the Force and the Scheme Manager and can include:

- details of any good practice ICVs have observed across the course of their visit

- reference to any immediate problems encountered and resolved at the time of visiting; or
- details of any matters requiring further action.

Copies of the reports are provided for the Superintendent (if appropriate), the Custody Manager and the Scheme Manager on behalf of the Police Authority Board.

The information provided within each report is followed up and discussed by the ICV Panel at the next review meeting. If necessary, more serious issues can be highlighted directly to the Police Authority Board or dealt with outside the Panel meetings.

PANEL MEETINGS

The quarterly Panel meetings provide Visitors with an opportunity to discuss each visit and raise any issues that have arisen across the previous quarter. Short update and information sessions are also incorporated into each agenda to ensure that Visitors are kept up to date and well informed of national developments regarding the custody environment. Topics discussed this year included:

1. HMICFRS/HMIP INSPECTION – The next PEEL inspection is due to take place in 2021. Significant improvements have been made across many of the recommendations and areas for improvement (AFIs), following the unannounced Custody Joint Inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMICFRS/HMIP) in 2018. The primary issues highlighted were:

- poor privacy for detainees across the booking process
- lack of adequate provision for children and vulnerable adults
- lack of suitable provision for juveniles (charged)
- unsuitable travel arrangements for detainee's post release

- current exercise facilities available within Bishopsgate custody suite.

Whilst it should be acknowledged that action has been taken to make the improvements highlighted, the lack of appropriate exercise provision for detainees continues to be an area of concern. The implementation of the exercise yard has been raised a number of times at the Police Authority Board, by the Special Interest Area (SIA) Lead for Safeguarding.

The joint inspection by HMICFRS/HMIP in 2018 outlined the lack of suitable exercise facility for detainees at Bishopsgate Custody Suite was a cause for concern, as detainees could be held in custody for long periods without having access to time outside or opportunities to exercise.

The force has guaranteed that the provision for this exercise yard will be complete by early January 2021. The implementation of this custody yard will ensure detainees have routine access to fresh air and exercise, which will help their health and wellbeing whilst detained.

Outcome – The Force have taken steps to preserve detainee privacy across the booking in process, through more routine use of a private side room. Additionally, The ICV Scheme has worked with the Custody manager to progress a suitable workaround for the safe release of detainees from custody, by securing the release of funds for travel warrants. The force has also implemented the secure city program which will see a much-needed improvement to CCTV capabilities across Bishopsgate custody suite. The CCTV improvement project will coincide with upgrade works to Bishopsgate Custody Suite Exercise Yard, which is scheduled for completion in early 2021.

The areas for improvement AFIs will continue to be monitored by the Force to ensure that improvements are sustained. The recommendations and AFIs from the report

continue to be included in the regular HMICFRS updates that go to the quarterly Police Performance and Resource Management Committee for Member scrutiny.

2. Appropriate Adults – The Panel and the custody manager have been concerned with an outstanding area of improvement highlighted in the HMICFRS inspection report. Particularly regarding the provision of appropriate adults (AA) for juveniles and vulnerable individuals in detention out of hours. The contract for the AA service is commissioned by the Community & Children's Services committee (CCS)

Outcome – The ICV Scheme Manager has worked with the Custody Manager and Contracts Commissioning Team within the Community & Children's Services Committee (CCS) to draft a new Appropriate Adult (AA) contract, to ensure the provision of the service for vulnerable adults is more suitably addressed. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is being revised to ensure specific focus is drawn to ensuring the rights and welfare of vulnerable detainees are upheld. This is due to be in place by November 2020. The contract will also include reference to the AA Service facilitating communication and attending police interviews alongside vulnerable persons and juveniles at key moments of the custody process. Furthermore, the revisions will ensure AA's are provided without undue delay.

3. National Accreditation – The panel was rated as a Silver Scheme by the National Association, as part of their assessment framework for code compliance, under ICV Scheme Manager Craig Spencer's leadership. This assessment framework was first introduced in 2018. In line with Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) assessment protocols, the scheme continues to work towards more consistent demonstration of best practice in relation to upholding its statutory duties and code compliant

behaviours. The scheme is scheduled to be re-assessed for QAF2 in January 2021.

4. Panel Training – the Panel have received training on children and young persons in custody (April 2019), where components of the Concordat on children in police custody were explained and best practice outlined with regard to their welfare within custody.

Training across use of force has also taken place (July Panel). This focused on the circumstances upon which force is used; and highlighted the framework surrounding reasonable and unreasonable force. The training also included comprehensive discussion upon the training undertaken by the Force to educate Officers on force, severity of force used and the reasons for use. The training provided an opportunity for ICVs to constructively discuss the techniques deployed by officers to minimise risk; and effectively implement de-escalation techniques.

Additionally, ICVs have also received training on dignity in detention (January 2020). The training centred upon ensuring the respectful treatment of people detained in custody and encouraged ICVs to consider potential signs of mistreatment in detention. This training session provided ICVs with the opportunity to share examples of best practice they had observed officers demonstrate in their interactions with detainees. Particular attention was placed on ICVs recognising the need for detainees to be made to feel valued and connected with the people around them, throughout their time in detention.

ICVs will be also be attending future refresher training delivered by MOPAC relating to vulnerability and assertiveness.

5. Coronavirus

The emergence of the Coronavirus pandemic in March 2020 presented a significant challenge to the custody environment.

The City of London Scheme continued to uphold its statutory duty across this time to ensure that a balance was struck between the need to monitor police custody and maintain the safety of all.

The Chairman, Vice Chair, Scheme Manager and Custody Manager have continued to work collaboratively across this period. Action has been undertaken by all to ensure the treatment, welfare and rights of detainees are upheld at a time of increasingly difficult pressure for police.

Detainees have been visited safely by Independent custody visitors across this period. Mandatory and consistent use of risk assessments, social distancing and personal protective equipment (PPE) has allowed for visitation to take place safely.

The City of London Scheme recognises that independent monitoring, oversight and feedback is vital, particularly at this time; and will continue to monitor the welfare of detainees held in custody across the duration of this period.

2021/22

The City of London ICV Panel wanted to ensure that it meets its objectives in scrutinising the custody arrangement in the City of London. It has set itself the following targets for 2021/22:

- to promote and raise awareness of the work of the ICV Panel;
- to maintain awareness of national trends.
- to work with the Independent Custody Visiting Association (ICVA) to improve policing policy and practice:
- to continue to engage with CoLP and CoL Corporation Surveyors Department to ensure that exercise provision is in place at Bishopsgate

- to work with Home Office, National Police Estate Group and wider stakeholders to ensure the CoLP Custody CCTV Project upgrade occurs in line with National Standards.
- To work with CoLP Custody Team to trial the introduction of Samaritans into Bishopsgate Custody Suite.

Conclusion

The City of London ICV Scheme provides an independent assessment across the treatment of detained persons. The commitment and dedication of volunteer visitors ensures a continued and appropriate level of scrutiny of the Force is maintained. In this regard, the scheme continues to offer a level of scrutiny which the Police Authority Board can rely upon.

Visit Statistics

	Total number of detainees in Custody at time of visit	No of detainees offered visit	No. of detainees accepted visit
Bishopsgate Q1	33	29	23
Bishopsgate Q2	56	49	37
Bishopsgate Q3	56	36	35
Bishopsgate Q4	66	44	41
Total	211	158	136

ISSUES AND CONCERNS ARISING FROM VISITS

This list of issues and concerns reflects the range of issues that have been raised by detainees in the City of London in the last year and, in addition, other issues which have been reported by ICV Panels elsewhere for which there has been a nil return in the City of London.

	Bishopsgate
No of Total Visits	71
Report Form with no matters requiring a police response	34
Infrastructure / furnishings / fittings/out of service	29
Comments individual officers - Positive	21
Comments individual officers – negative	1
Cleaning, tidiness and general hygiene - positive	8
Cleaning, tidiness and general hygiene - negative	6
Information Technology	5
Temperature	6
Health related matters	22
Procedures not followed	2
Rights and entitlements seemingly delayed	0
Personal hygiene requests– (showers, washing etc)	5
Requests for phonecalls	4
Perceived risk to detainees	0
Periodic checks (15, 30 minutes) not maintained	0
Requests for food and drink	6
Requests for literature/documents	6

Station	Target No of Visits	Achieved	% of Target
Bishopsgate	79	71	89.8

DAYS OF VISITS

	No of Visits	% (figure expressed to one decimal place)
Monday	8	11.2%
Tuesday	14	19.7%
Wednesday	10	14.0%
Thursday	13	18.3%
Friday	12	16.9%
Saturday	11	15.4%
Sunday	3	4.2%
Total	71	

TIME OF VISITS

00.01 – 06.00	2
06.00 - 12.00	42
12.01 – 18.00	22
18.01 – 00.00	5

DAYS OF VISITS / TIMES – COMBINED

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
00.01 – 06.00	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
06.00 -12.00	5	10	7	8	6	5	1
12.01 – 18.00	3	4	2	4	4	3	2
18.01 – 00.00	0	0	1	1	2	1	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank