

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**APPENDIX A**

City of London Police

# Policing Plan Performance Measures 2015-16

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

## Summary Dashboard

MEASURE	ASSESSMENT
1. The level of counter terrorism options tasks that are completed	
2. The level of community confidence that the City of London is protected from terrorism	
3. The level of evidence-based education and enforcement activities, supporting the City of London Corporation's casualty reduction target	
4. The percentage of ANPR activations where vehicles are intercepted by the City of London Police	
5. The percentage of those surveyed who are satisfied with the information provided to them about large scale, pre-planned events and how those events were ultimately policed	
6. The level of victim-based violent crime	
7. The level of victim-based acquisitive crime	
8. The level of antisocial behaviour incidents	
9. The percentage of victims of fraud investigated by the Economic Crime Directorate who are satisfied with the service provided	
10. To ensure City Fraud Crime, investigated by ECD results in a positive action whether through offender disposal, prevention or disruption	
11. The attrition rate of crimes reported to Action Fraud	
12. The number of complaints against Action Fraud	
13. Level of the National Lead Force's return on investment	
14. The value of fraud prevented through interventions	
15. The percentage of victims of fraud who are satisfied with the Action Fraud reporting service	
16. The level of Force compliance with requirements under the Strategic Policing Requirement	
17. The level of satisfaction of victims of crime with the service provided by the city of London police	
18. The percentage of people surveyed who believe the police in the City of London are doing a good or excellent job	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: To protect the City of London from terrorism and extremism</b>	
<b>Measure 1</b>	<b>The level of specific counter terrorism deployments tasked that are completed</b>
<b>Owner</b>	Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	Security Group meets weekly (or as required depending on threat levels) to consider intelligence relating to the threat from terrorism and extremism. Tactical options are considered at and tasked out at that meeting to ensure the Force is doing everything it can to protect the City from the terrorist threat. This measure will assess the level of tasking that are completed by the Force, which together with details of engagement and preventative work, will provide a broad picture of how the Force is supporting delivery of its counter terrorism priority.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	“Counter Terrorism options tasked” are specific actions tasked by Security Group for completion.
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	This measure will be reported against using the percentage of counter terrorism options tasked that are completed (as assessed by Security Group)  <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> All tasked CT deployments are delivered <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 95% - 99% deployments delivered <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> fewer than 95% of deployments delivered  The reported measure will be complemented by information detailing: (1) Visibility – providing details of levels of patrolling or specific events with the community; (2) Information – providing details of education or advice provided;
<b>DATA SOURCES</b>	UPD/I&I/Crime Directorate
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

PRIORITY: To protect the City of London from terrorism and extremism	
Measure 2	The level of community confidence that the City of London is protected from terrorism
Owner	UPD
AIM/RATIONALE	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force with data to allow it to assess the impact its counter terrorism work has on feelings of safety amongst the community and the extent to which they are confident that City is protected from terrorism.
DEFINITIONS	NA
MEASUREMENT	<p>Data for this measure will be provided from the iModus surveys, conducted quarterly. The question asked is “On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being no confidence and 10 being completely confident) how confident are you the City of London is protected from terrorism”. Responses scoring 7 or above will be regarded as ‘confident’. Respondents will be asked they expect from the Force to improve, which can be used to inform operational and communications plans.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> Over the course of 2014-15, the Force recorded levels ranging from 85% to 90% people surveyed. It is valid to use a numerical guide here as what is being measured is peoples’ perception, i.e. no perverse incentives or action can be used to influence performance against this measure</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> 85% - 100% <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 80% – 84% <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> 80% or lower</p>
DATA SOURCE	UPD
CURRENT PERFORMANCE	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Safer Roads</b>	
<b>Measure 3</b>	<b>Levels of evidence-based education and enforcement activities, supporting the City of London Corporation's casualty reduction target</b>
<b>Owner</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	The City of London Corporation is statutorily obliged to lower KSI on the City's roads. The Force has a statutory responsibility to enforce road traffic legislation, which together with its programme of education aimed at road users, should result in safer roads for all.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	An evidence-based enforcement or education activity in any activity aimed at road users (drivers, cyclists, motor cyclists and vulnerable road users (including pedestrians)) intended to educate road users for better or more responsible road use.
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	Reporting against this measure will entail providing details of activities conducted together with the reasons why those events have taken place and anticipated impact. The City's KSI levels will be provided for information.  <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> All planned operations and events are delivered <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 90% - 99% of operations and events are delivered <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> 89% or less operations and events are delivered
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	UPD/I&I/Crime Directorate
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

PRIORITY: Safer Roads	
Measure 4	The percentage of ANPR activations where vehicles are intercepted by the City of London Police
Owner	UPD
AIM/RATIONALE	ANPR is a very important tool in combating crime and making the roads safer places. This measure will provide assurance that the Force is acting on information received via ANPR effectively and efficiently.
DEFINITIONS	An “ANPR activation” is one where the system reads a number plate and flags to the Force that there is an issue with the vehicle or driver
MEASUREMENT	Of the total number of ANPR activations, the number and percentage that are intercepted by the Force. <b>GUIDE:</b> (to be included) <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> (to be included) <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> (to be included) <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> (to be included)
DATA SOURCE	UPD/I&I
CURRENT PERFORMANCE	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Public Order</b>	
<b>Measure 5</b>	<b>The percentage of those surveyed who are satisfied with the information provided to them about large scale, pre-planned events and how those events were ultimately policed.</b>
<b>Owner</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force with information relating to how satisfied the community is with information received about pre-planned public order events and satisfaction with how those events were actually policed.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	A “pre-planned event” is one where advance notice is given which requires a police plan and subsequent deployment of officers.
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>Reporting will provide details of engagement/information provided before and during the event, together with the results of iModus VOCAL surveys of those that received the information.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> Over the past year the Force achieved an average satisfaction level of 88% (ranging from 82% - 93%). It is valid to use a numerical guide here as what is being measured is peoples’ perception, i.e. no perverse incentives or action can be used to influence performance against this measure</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> 85% - 90% (or greater) <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 80% - 84% <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> 80% or less</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	UPD
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Tackling Crime</b>	
<b>Measure 6</b>	<b>Levels of victim-based violent crime.</b>
<b>Owner</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force with sufficiently detailed information (intelligence and statistics) to allow it to manage its response to violent crime efficiently and effectively. Victim based violent crime is one of two categories of crime (the other being acquisitive crime) that constitutes the greatest volume of crime.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	“Victim-based violent crime” comprises homicide, violence with injury, violence without injury, sexual offences and robbery “Systemic increase” is one that is 6 consecutive increases above the mean or 4 consecutive increases above a control level
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	PMG will receive data around current levels of victim-based violent crime, trend information and analysis. <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> Reducing trend of victim-based violent crime or within statistical tolerance levels (as indicated monthly on performance charts) <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> No stable trends indicated or 2 or more points above the mean <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Systemic increase in levels of violent crime
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	PIU (I&I)
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

PRIORITY: Tackling Crime	
Measure 7	Levels of victim-based acquisitive crime.
Owner	Crime Investigation
AIM/RATIONALE	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force with sufficiently detailed information (intelligence and statistics) to allow it to manage its response to acquisitive crime efficiently and effectively. Victim based acquisitive crime represents the Force's largest volume crime area.
DEFINITIONS	"Victim-based acquisitive crime" comprises robbery, vehicle crime and theft "Systemic increase" is one that is 6 consecutive increases above the mean or 4 consecutive increases above a control level
MEASUREMENT	Assessment is based on current levels of victim-based acquisitive crime, trend information and analysis. Trend criteria: <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> Reducing trend in victim-based acquisitive crime or within statistical tolerance levels (as indicated monthly on performance charts) <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> No stable trends indicated or 2 or more points above the mean <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Systemic increase in levels of acquisitive crime
DATA SOURCE	PIU (I&I)
CURRENT PERFORMANCE	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Tackling Antisocial Behaviour</b>	
<b>Measure 8</b>	<b>Levels of antisocial behaviour incidents in the City of London.</b>
<b>Owner</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force with sufficiently detailed information (intelligence and statistics) to allow it to manage its response to antisocial behaviour efficiently and effectively. It is a direct outcome measure that indicates the Force's success in addressing and preventing ASB.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	An "ASB incident" is an incident that has been closed on the Daris system using Codes 1, 2 or 3, Incident and Attendance "Systemic increase" is one that is 6 consecutive increases above the mean or 4 consecutive increases above a control level
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	Assessment of performance will be based on data around current levels of ASB, trend information and analysis. <b>SATISFACTORY:</b> Reducing trend in levels of antisocial behaviour incidents (as indicated monthly on performance charts) <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> No stable trends indicated or 2 or more points above the mean <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Systemic increase in levels of antisocial behaviour incidents
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	PIU (I&I)
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Protect the City of London and UK from Fraud</b>	
<b>MEASURE 9</b>	<b>The percentage of victims of fraud investigated by the Economic Crime Directorate who are satisfied with the service provided</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	This measure focuses on frauds investigated by the Force's ECD. It is not sufficient to be effective in terms of fighting fraud; we are also required to deliver a first class service to victims providing them with the support and help they need at different points in the investigative process.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p><b>"Investigation"</b>: - This is all Unifi crime records classified as "Fraud Investigations – Substantive offences recorded in Action Fraud" allocated to ECD Operational Teams</p> <p><b>"Victim"</b> – Victims include those whose referrals have been adopted for investigation by ECD. Given the nature and duration of economic crime investigations it is highly probable that these victims will have been captured by the Victim Code even if the ultimate outcome is NFA.</p>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>Measurement will be by survey. ECD will have the overall satisfaction figure by the beginning of the second week in the new quarter to report to the Force Performance Monitoring Group. The full report to follow in slower time.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> Over 2014-15 the Force averaged a satisfaction rate of 65%. It is accepted that whilst performance against this measure improved over the course of the year, the level is low when compared to satisfaction in other areas.</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> Parity with satisfaction levels for other measures (80% - 85%) or greater</p> <p><b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 65% - 79%</p> <p><b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Reducing satisfaction levels or less than the 2014-15 average of 65%</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	ECD Strategic Delivery Unit
<b>CURRENT</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Protect the City of London and UK from Fraud</b>	
<b>MEASURE 10</b>	<b>To ensure City Fraud Crime, investigated by ECD results in a positive action whether through offender disposal, prevention or disruption</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	Ensuring that wherever possible the Force takes positive action with every City Fraud Crime investigated by ECD demonstrating the diverse and high quality service victims can expect from CoLP ECD. This positive action is likely to enhance overall victim satisfaction and the City's standing as a safe and desirable place to live and work.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p><b>"City Fraud Crime"</b> includes all ECD Fraud investigations into fraud or fraud related offences occurring within the City of London. <b>"Point of outcome"</b> is defined as when there is an offender disposal or when the crime is closed and categorised in accordance with the HO crime outcomes.</p> <p><b>"Positive action"</b> is defined as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. When there is an offender disposal.</li><li>2. When there is a confirmed disruption of a technological or financial fraud enabler.</li><li>3. When the crime contributes to an ECD Fraud awareness/ prevention product.</li></ol>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>Measurement will be based upon the number of City Fraud Crimes reaching the Point of outcome benefitting from positive action.</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> All City fraud crimes reaching point of outcome result in positive action <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 95 -99% City fraud crimes reaching point of outcome result in positive action <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> 94% or fewer City fraud crimes reaching point of outcome result in positive action</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	ECD Strategic Delivery Unit
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: National Lead Force</b>	
<b>MEASURE 11</b>	The attrition rate of crimes reported to Action Fraud
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	CoLP as the national lead force has a responsibility to improve the police service response to fraud nationally, and the service provided to victims in particular. A key way of measuring this is to ensure that as many victims as possible receive a positive outcome from having reported a crime to Action Fraud. This measure allows an assessment of the overall performance of the end to end process from reports received by Action Fraud, through NFIB data collation and crime packaging to action by police forces.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p><b>“Attrition rate”</b>: - This describes the ratio of outcomes to the number of reports received by Action Fraud.</p> <p><b>“Disseminated reports”</b>:- A crime report received by Action Fraud that has undergone assessment, had intelligence added or deemed viable for investigation and disseminated to a police force or other partner agencies.</p> <p><b>“Outcome”</b>:- An outcome is determined by the Home Office counting rules and is achieved when a disseminated crime results in outcomes 1-18 (This only applies to police services and only includes those outcomes reported to the NFIB registrar).</p>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>The ECD Strategic Delivery Unit (SDU) will report monthly on the number of Action Fraud reports received and disseminated together with the outcomes to produce the attrition rate.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> To be confirmed</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	Know Fraud, SharePoint and individual Police forces via Strategic Delivery Unit, ECD
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: National Lead Force</b>	
<b>MEASURE 12</b>	The number of complaints against Action Fraud
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	As the national fraud reporting centre Action Fraud has the responsibility to provide a first class service to fraud victims. Addressing dissatisfaction and complaints is a key priority to maintaining both reporting and confidence levels in the service. Monitoring the level of complaints will indicate the extent to which Action Fraud is listening to victims' needs and improving service levels.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p><b>“Overall percentage of Customer Complaints”</b>: - This refers to the percentage of fraud reporting victims, who have submitted a complaint in relation to an aspect of the service received by Action fraud.</p> <p><b>Types of complaints received:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of update</b> – When the victim hasn't been updated on the status of their report,</li> <li>• <b>Dissatisfaction with a letter received</b> – No satisfied with the content/tone of status update letters</li> <li>• <b>Quality of communication with the contact centre</b> – Poor standards of service</li> <li>• <b>Dissatisfaction with a specific aspect of the action fraud process</b>- such as the criteria used to determine whether a report qualifies as a report of fraud.</li> </ul>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>PMG will receive monthly reports of the percentage of fraud reporting victims that have submitted a complaint.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> To be confirmed</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	Action Fraud Systems, via Strategic Delivery Unit, ECD
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: National Lead Force</b>	
<b>MEASURE 13</b>	<b>Level of the National Lead Force's return on investment</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	It is not sufficient to be effective in terms of fighting fraud; the NLF is also required to be efficient, representing a good return on investment. This measure allows for an assessment of the cost of the resources invested against the monetary value of the fraud prevented.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p><b>"Return "</b>: - The value of money saved by ECD activities</p> <p><b>"Investment "</b>:- The total amount of money spent on ECD activities</p> <p><b>"Return on investment"</b>:- The amount of money saved by ECD for every pound of money spent</p>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>The ECD ROI figure is calculated using the same methodology employed by most organisations who want to illustrate a "potential" value of services provided to Stakeholders in monetary terms. The total amount of money saved as a result of ECD activities is divided by the total amount of money spent in order to provide the total estimated pound saved figure. The assumption is that for every pound spent ECD save stakeholders and the public (an estimated) 'x' amount of money.</p> <p>The elements that constitute savings include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projected monetary value of future fraud loss saved by disrupting technological enablers of crime</li> <li>• The pound value of criminal asset denial through to recovery</li> <li>• Projected pound value of future fraud loss saved by ECD Enforcement Cases</li> </ul> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> To be confirmed  <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> To be confirmed  <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> To be confirmed</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	UNIFI, NFIB, Asset Recovery, finance dept via Strategic Delivery Unit, ECD
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Providing the national lead against Fraud</b>	
<b>MEASURE 14</b>	<b>The value of fraud prevented through interventions</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	To demonstrate the outcome in financial terms the results across a broad range of operational activity aimed at tackling fraud.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	<p>An intervention is a disruption of a financial, technological or professional enabler of fraud. Each enabler has a defined, agreed value attached to it so there is consistency to ascribing values to the disruption of a particular enabler (e.g. taking down a website, telephone line or sham business or bank account).</p> <p>Systemic reducing trend is one that is 4 consecutive decreases</p>
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>PMG will receive data monthly detailing the total value of confirmed fraud enabler disruptions. The amounts reported will be the £ value calculated from agreed definitions produced by NFIB that can be attributed to the disruption of a web site or bank account multiplied by the number of confirmed interventions in the period. Comparative and trend information will be provided with previous month and longer term.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> The monthly average value over 2014-15 was £30,688,000 in a range from c.£20m to £43m, therefore a significant tolerance should be allowed to accommodate monthly fluctuations</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> Within 15% of the monthly average or an increase on the monthly average <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> Reducing trend <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Systemic reducing trend or greater than 15% reduction to the monthly average</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	ECD Strategic Delivery Unit
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>PRIORITY: Providing the national lead against Fraud</b>	
<b>MEASURE 15</b>	<b>The percentage of victims of fraud who are satisfied with the Action Fraud reporting service</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	Economic Crime Directorate
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	Action Fraud is a bespoke service for victims of fraud; it is essential to maintain levels of service to ensure Action Fraud is utilised fully to the benefit of victims. The Force took full responsibility for Action Fraud in April 2014 and with that came the opportunity to develop the same high satisfaction standards that are achieved elsewhere for victims of crime. Accessible crime recording facilities are essential to maintain the level of information required to identify and mitigate the fraud threat during initiation and growth.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	The measure relates to ease of reporting a crime and how efficiently it is allocated. As a large number of crimes are allocated to other forces for investigation, the Force cannot be held responsible for end-to-end victim satisfaction at the current time.
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>Quarterly by survey. PMG will receive data detailing the number of reports to Action Fraud in the reporting period, the percentage satisfaction of victims using the online survey and the percentage satisfaction of victims using the telephone survey. The victim survey is conducted at the conclusion of the initial reporting the crime and can be completed online or over the phone.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> Over the course of 2014-15 the Force achieved an average satisfaction level of 92% with little monthly variation.</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> 90% – 95% (or greater)</p> <p><b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 85% - 89%</p> <p><b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Less than 85% or reducing trend</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	Action Fraud via Strategic Delivery Unit, ECD
<b>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

PRIORITY: STRATEGIC POLICING REQUIREMENT	
<b>MEASURE 16</b>	<b>The level of Force compliance with requirements under the Strategic Policing Requirement</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	ACPO (Strategic Development)
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	Along with its obligations to provide an efficient and effective policing service to the City of London, the Force has regional and national obligations to respond to the most serious threats that extend beyond force boundaries, which is articulated by the Strategic Policing Requirement. It is a Force priority to support the SPR and the purpose of this measure is to provide reassurance that the Force has the required levels of capacity and capability to meet its obligations under the SPR.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	NA
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>A quarterly assessment will be made by Strategic Development regarding the level of compliance with College of Policing toolkits for Counter Terrorism; Civil Emergencies; Public Order; Serious Organised Crime; and Cyber Crime and progress against any outstanding HMIC recommendations</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> All toolkits fully up to date and all recommendations on track to be delivered within due date  <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> Toolkits completed but review overdue  <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> : Toolkits not complete and/or recommendations not implemented by due date</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	Strategic Development
<b>CURRENT</b>	

<b>Toolkits</b>	
Counter Terrorism	Current (review due XXXXX)
Serious Organised Crime	Current (review due XXXXX)
Large Scale Cyber Incident	Current (review due XXXXX)
Civil Emergencies	Current (review due XXXXX)
Public Order	Current (review due XXXXX)

<b>HMIC Reports</b>	
SPR (National)	
SPR (City of London)	
Public Order	
Cyber Crime	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>SATISFACTION</b>	
<b>MEASURE 17</b>	<b>Levels of satisfaction of victims of crime with the service provided by the city of London police.</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	The aim of this measure is to provide the Force will sufficiently detailed information to manage the quality of its service provision to the victims of crime. Although victim satisfaction surveys are a statutory requirement, they provide an essential indicator of the level of professionalism the Force portrays and provides. The Force includes victims of acquisitive crime, which is not required by the Home Office, as without those victims, the sample size for the City of London would not be statistically valid.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	“Victim of crime” are victims of violent crime (except sexual offences), vehicle crime, acquisitive crime and criminal damage
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>PMG will receive quarterly reports of the results of survey results with comparative and trend information. Quarterly results will be broken down to report satisfaction with regard to ease of contact; actions taken; follow up; treatment; and whole experience. Whilst PMG can direct action in relation to any of those categories, the principal measure will be the results for whole experience.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> Over 2014-15 the average for whole experience was 83.4%. This is lower than previous years, which averaged closer to 85%. It is valid to use a numerical guide here as what is being measured is peoples’ perception, i.e. no perverse incentives or action can be used to influence performance against this measure</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> 85% - 90% (or greater)  <b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> 80% - 84%  <b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> Less than 80% or reducing trend</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	PIU (I&I)
<b>CURRENT</b>	

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

<b>SATISFACTON</b>	
<b>MEASURE 18</b>	<b>The percentage of people surveyed who believe the police in the City of London are doing a good or excellent job</b>
<b>OWNER</b>	UPD
<b>AIM/RATIONALE</b>	This measure assesses the public's perception of the Force, based on people who probably have not been a victim of crime but are part of the City of London community, be it in the capacity of resident, worker, or business. It will use a different survey from the Street Survey.
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	NA
<b>MEASUREMENT</b>	<p>The measure will be assessed by twice yearly 'customer' surveys conducted for the customer workstream of City Futures which assesses a range of service outcomes, from feeling of safety during the day and after dark to how well the public feel the Force is performing.</p> <p><b>GUIDE:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>SATISFACTORY:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>CLOSE MONITORING:</b> To be confirmed</p> <p><b>REQUIRES ACTION:</b> To be confirmed</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	Customer Satisfaction Survey

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**