

Committee(s)	Dated: February 2021
Committee name Committee name	Professional Standards and Integrity (Police) Committee
Subject: Update Re: Action Fraud and National Fraud Intelligence Bureau complaints.	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	N/A
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: DI Craig Mullish	For Update Re: Action Fraud and NFIB Complaints.
Report author: Det Inspector Craig Mullish	

Background

Complaints relating to Action Fraud (AF) and National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB) have historically been managed between different departments.

As of the 3rd August 2020, The Professional Standards Directorate (PSD) has taken responsibility for managing the complaints, to ensure that the regulatory requirements, set by the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) are adhered to.

PSD's Action Fraud Complaints Team consists of:

1 X Detective Inspector

1 X Grade D

This report is intended to provide an overview of complaints received, and a progress update on the initiatives that have been put in place and being reviewed to improve service delivery.

Main Report

Complaints Re: AF and NFIB

At this time, PSD receive in the region of 55 complaints per month.

In addition, approximately 5 enquiries are received per month from Members of Parliament (MP's), and a further 5 from the Home Office, Fraud Policy Unit, primarily requesting updates for constituents on their complaints.

Themes of complaints received

An analysis of complaints and dissatisfaction reports received over the previous 9 months, has been undertaken, detailed below. The highlighted ones are the top 3, most commonly received.

- **AF has not investigated a report made**
- **NFIB has not investigated a report made**
- **Complainant advised that there are no viable lines of enquiry to investigate their report, when viable lines of enquiries have been provided**
- No update was provided, following report made to AF
- Report disseminated by NFIB has not been investigated by the relevant force
- A report made direct to a local force has not been investigated
- A reported crime is recorded as an Information Report

Within any given complaint, often several of the above are quoted. Circa 95% of complaints are made up of the 3 highlighted areas above, with the remaining 5% across the all others.

Demographics of complainants

There are no common themes of complainants identified, and received from a range of ages, genders, cultural backgrounds, and geographical locations throughout the UK.

Action taken to address above, and reduce complaints

- A Working Group has been set up between AF, NFIB and PSD to review suggestions for improving service.
- To seek an early resolution, where appropriate, and in line with IOPC guidance, PSD correspond at an early stage with complainants, usually by telephone, providing advice and discuss areas of appropriate recourse. Advice on how best to protect themselves on being a further victim of crime is also provided.
- Information has been provided to MP's on the role and function of AF and NFIB, to allow them to respond directly to their constituents. Explaining the process allows MP's to give a lay person an explanation of the processes to their constituents.
- FAQ's updated on AF website.
- Automated letters, following a report made to AF are sent within 28 days, from NFIB, providing generic reasons as to why a report has not been investigated. NFIB have reviewed these, and made relevant amendments, that provide a better explanation of their processes. However, these have not been uploaded as yet, as require sign off, give that there is a cost implication in doing so, therefore understandably, changes are kept to a minimum.

- PSD provide further information to complainants, regarding the NFIB's assessment case criteria, confirming the use of algorithms, collective losses, vulnerability, and how fast a crime is growing.

In addition, further information is provided with regards to what are considered to be viable lines of enquiry, which includes, e-mail addresses, phone numbers, suspect names, and bank account details.

Both of these areas are key elements of complainant's dissatisfaction

Ongoing engagement with NFIB and Police Authority Team (PAT) to scope viability of providing additional information to complainants

PSD continue to engage with NFIB to further discuss and review what additional information that can be included within PSD response letters. PSD are also working with the PAT, to enhance the correspondence sent to complainants, to ensure that as best we can, members of the public have access to a simple, clear overview of the process by which cases are assessed by NFIB.

Conclusion

Significant progress has been made in relation to identifying areas of dissatisfaction, and understanding what is required to address them, with a view of enhancing the service for victims.

A key area of frustration was the lack of information provided to complainants regarding NFIB's case acceptance criteria, and what are considered to be viable lines of enquiry. Both these areas have been addressed.

AF, NFIB, PSD and PAT continue to work together to identify and implement the relevant changes, where possible to do so.

Detective Inspector Craig Mullish

Appendices

Appendix 1: FAQ's on AF'-Link to website: <https://www.actionfraud.police.uk/faq>

Appendices

Appendix 1: FAQ's on AF's website