

## PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SUB (POLICE) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 26 April 2018

### Minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Resource Management Sub (Police) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

#### Present

#### Members:

Deputy James Thomson (Chairman)	Kenneth Ludlam (External Member)
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Caroline Mawhood (External Member)
Tijs Broeke	Lucy Sandford (External Member)
Andrew Lentin (External Member)	

#### Officers:

George Fraser	- Town Clerk's Department
Alex Orme	- Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
Pat Stothard	- Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management
Alistair Sutherland	- Assistant Commissioner, City of London Police
Stuart Phoenix	- City of London Police
Hayley Williams	- City of London Police

#### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Doug Barrow.

The Chairman noted that this would be Lucy Sandford's final meeting of the Performance and Resource Management Sub-Committee and thanked her for her valuable contribution.

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

There were no declarations.

#### 3. MINUTES

The Sub-Committee considered the minutes of the last meeting, held on 1 February 2018.

The Chairman noted that, under *Item 12 – Deep Dive: CR23 Police Funding Risk*, the “Business Rate Premium” should be referred to rather than the “Premium Rates”.

The Chairman noted that, under *Item 7 – Projects and Programmes Presentation*, the Assistant Commissioner had explained that Police telephony had suffered from significant issues. He asked for an update on their status

and the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that this had been actioned and the issues were expected to be resolved by September of this year. (1)

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes be approved.

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk that summarised the actions from the last meeting, held on 1 February 2018.

**Reporting Schedule**

The Chairman noted that the proposed meeting schedule had been circulated some time ago but was awaiting confirmation from the Chamberlain's department before meeting dates could be confirmed. The Chamberlain explained that they would confirm these in the next few days. (2)

**Public Order Open Day**

The Chairman asked what the Member uptake on the event on 20 June was. The Town Clerk agreed to confirm and feed back on this. (3)

**Programme Management Capability**

The Chamberlain explained that the Project Management Office within the Town Clerk's Department were undertaking work to improve the project management across the whole organisation. She explained that they would employ tools to ensure that project processes could be monitored and understood by those who were not finance experts.

A Member noted that meetings of the Police Accommodation Programme did not appear to have financial oversight and asked if this was now going to happen. It was noted that the Chamberlain was now personally sitting on the project board, providing oversight especially for any major projects such as this.

A Member asked if this would apply to the IT Transformation Programme. The Chamberlain explained that the priority would be to focus on the most major projects, with the engagement of a project/programme accountant on relevant projects though if it was felt that there was a shortfall in financial expertise on a project then they would be obliged to act. The Member noted that the Police IT Transformation would be a significant programme and asked if this would be allocated a specific resource. The Chairman agreed, referencing a previous report to this sub-committee that quoted a projected cost of £10-20m. The Chamberlain confirmed that a project of this size would certainly be subject to additional financial oversight. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that a road map would be set out for this programme.

A Member noted that there needed to be a careful balance when financially overseeing a project to allow the project manager to retain control of the process. The Chamberlain agreed.

**Stop and Search**

The Chairman explained that there were still some areas of real concern marked as “RED”, and therefore this action should not yet be marked as complete. (4)

### **IT Transformation Report**

It was confirmed that this was planned to be submitted to the May meeting of the Police Committee.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

## **5. INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chamberlain that provided Members with an update on the work of Internal Audit undertaken for the City of London Police since the last report in February 2018.

The Chamberlain explained that they were currently finalising the audit, with the Audit Plan being reviewed by the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner. He confirmed that he would feed back on progress in due course.

The Chairman noted that it was disappointing that a number of recommendations had still not been implemented and their target completion dates had been revised from March to September. He asked that increased efforts be made to action these as soon as possible. The Assistant Commissioner explained that a number of the outstanding recommendations were minimal, could be completed relatively easily and offered to provide further details of these if required outside the meeting. A Member stated that they were glad of this.

A Member asked for an explanation of the Leavers’ Salary Overpayments recommendation highlighted within the report appendix 2. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been a clerical error in which an email was missed, leading to accidental overpayments. The Member noted that there were two instances of this and noted that this was very concerning. The Chamberlain explained that they were now confident that the issue leading to the error in both cases had now been resolved.

A Member noted the number of recommendations relating to Police-seized goods. The Chairman requested that the CoLP provide a brief update note on this to Members prior to the next meeting. (5)

The Chairman noted that Programme Management benefits realisation tracking was marked as a RED risk and asked for confirmation of when this would commence. The Assistant Commissioner explained that work with consultants had been undertaken, with the system now ready to be briefed to the relevant staff. He explained that it was just a case of implementing the procedures that were now in place. He asked if a separate report on benefits realisation and tracking from the Force Change Portfolio board should be submitted to this sub-committee and the Chairman suggested that it simply be included as part of existing reports around the Demand and Value for Money/Transform Programme.

A Member asked the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management what their perception of the current status of the CoLP's audits were. The Chairman noted that this would feed into discussion under *Item 12 – Demand and Value for Money Review/Transform Programme Update*. The Chamberlain explained that there were a number of areas that remained RED risks, but the majority of work was around AMBER risks for which they were working closely with CoLP to resolve. A second Member asked for a comparison with the status this time last year and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management explained that there had been a slight shift towards RED risks. The Member asked if this would influence audit focus for next year and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management confirmed that it would.

The Chairman asked for an explanation of the fieldwork for the corporate wide audit as referenced in paragraph 5 of the covering report. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management explained that this fieldwork was complete, and a draft audit report would be submitted to the next meeting. (6)

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

6. **Q4 PERFORMANCE VS MEASURES**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that summarised Police performance against the measures set out in the Policing Plan 2017-20 for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018.

**Measure 1 – Number of Crimes**

The Assistant Commissioner explained that CoLP were ranked in the top 3 forces at suppressing the national trend towards increasing crime rates.

**Measure 6 – Violent Crime**

The Assistant Commissioner noted that there was a slight increase in violent crime.

**Measure 8 – Public Order**

The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been a challenge in recruiting public order officers, but that this was now resolved.

**Measure 9 – Acquisitive Crime**

The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been a rise across London in acquisitive crime, but that good collaborative work was ongoing with the MPS and BTP, such as Operation Gondola, and had produced good results. He explained that a new crime prevention strategy and the current patrol strategy would hopefully reverse the current trend. The Chairman noted that there had been good joint working with the London Ambulance Service (LAS).

The Chairman illustrated concerns around data presentation, referencing some gaps in the data for Measure 10 which may be attributable to challenges relating to NICHE or resourcing. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been good collaboration with other police forces in order to resolve some teething problems with the NICHE system. He explained that, although

extracting the data manually had proved time-consuming and difficult, the data yielded was accurate. The Chairman asked if this method was a temporary fix or a longer-term solution. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there were adjustments to be made with reports that had already been used by the East Midlands team. A Member asked when the issues would be resolved to the point that the system is effective. The Assistant Commissioner explained that it was hoped they would be resolved very quickly, as any critical IT issue would be. The Chairman asked for a note to be circulated to Members summarising the outcomes of the CoLP meeting to address the current issues. (7). The T/Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime emphasised that, regardless of the current issues faced, the implementation of NICHE provided a significant improvement over the previous system.

The Chairman noted that, within the main report under Measure 1, the commentary provided did not match the timeframe set out within the data table.

The Chairman asked for an update on knife crime. The Assistant Commissioner explained that, although the City of London was not immune to the national rising trend, their figures were good by comparison with other areas. He explained that there had been beneficial joint operations with the MPS, such as Operation Sceptre, and significant arrests had been made.

The Assistant Commissioner noted that CoLP had agreed a pan-London review on homicide, meeting with the MPS and BTP to formulate a service strategy. He explained that CoLP had provided a major incident team to investigate a homicide occurring on the borders of the City of London which was technically on MPS ground. He explained that CoLP hoped to become a major contributor in the pan-London response effort.

A Member asked what thefts fell within the category of “all other thefts”. The Chairman noted that this had also been asked at Police Committee, and the Assistant Commissioner agreed that a breakdown would be circulated to Members of both committees. (8)

A Member noted that the night-time economy was a major contributing factor in violent crimes and asked what the CoLP’s strategy was in addressing this. The Assistant Commissioner explained that joint-collaboration with the Licensing Committee and licensees had meant a great deal of work had been achieved in this area. There had been a number of enforcement operations to address these issues, such as that in Bishopsgate in which a “mobile police station” had been deployed.

The Chairman noted that Counter-Terrorism hostile reconnaissance reports had reduced significantly and requested that the number and outcomes of Project Servator operations be tracked within this report going forward. (9)

The Chairman noted that the numbers in the table representing Measure 3 – Cyber Attack did not add up.

The Chairman noted that there had been a reduction in the number of City-based reports of Measure 4 – Fraud. The T/Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that this reduction was due to the significant number of boiler room operations that had taken place the previous year.

A Member asked if Fraud policing outcomes were scrutinised. The T/Detective Chief Superintendent of Economic Crime explained that this was the role of the Economic Crime Board that would meet next on 27 April 2018.

The Chairman noted that there had been a large jump in sexual offences in March and asked for an explanation of this. The Assistant Commissioner agreed to feed back to Members but suggested it may be related to recent efforts to report historic offences. (10)

The Chairman noted that the report described harassment offences as having “low impact on the victim” and requested that report authors be more careful in their use of wording in future.

The Chairman asked for clarity on the final sentence under the activity section relating to Measure 6 – Victim Based Violent Crime, relating to an audit of all personnel connected with firearms and explosives licences. The Assistant Commissioner agreed to feed back to the Chairman. (11)

A Member noted that there were a lot of complaints relating to cyclists, especially around Bank Junction. He explained that there was a lack of useful data here to provide an accurate portrayal of the issues. He thanked those CoLP staff and officers involved in the recent pedal bike enforcement which had provided a high-profile, visible and well-received response to the complaints. The Assistant Commissioner explained that CoLP’s response to issues was based on a prioritisation of resources based on the level of information reported. He emphasised that if people do have grievances, then they are encouraged to report them to CoLP so they can be prioritised accordingly through the Tactical Tasking meeting. A second Member noted that there had been a significant increase in the number of cyclists across London and so providing the appropriate Police response to the related issues would always be challenging. A third Member asked if Cycle Superhighways were given a separate consideration to standard road highways. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that this was not the case.

The Chairman asked why there was data missing from Measure 8 – Public Order and Protective Security. The Head of Strategic Development explained that this data had not been available at the time of report submission deadline but was now available and could be tabled. The Chairman emphasised the importance of having the data included within the published report.

The Chairman asked for an update on the progress of actions to address CoLP’s lack of level 2 trained officers. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been a challenge in maintaining resource in this area for any period of time, resulting from a cycle where staff numbers would be under

pressure. He confirmed that they were confident that this had now been resolved.

The Chairman asked for confirmation of the number of respondents surveyed for Measure 10 – Victim Satisfaction. The Assistant Commissioner agreed to feed back this information. (12)

A Member asked when the recommendations in relation to Victim Satisfaction would be implemented, and whether they had been effective. The Member asked if the second recommendation, calling for an analysis of dissatisfied victims, was deliverable. The Assistant Commissioner explained that a slightly more assertive approach to measuring victim satisfaction had been employed, though could not confirm the exact dates this had been implemented.

The Assistant Commissioner agreed to bring CoLP's Action Plan to improve victim satisfaction back to this sub-committee. A Member requested that it also be submitted to the Professional Standards and Integrity Sub-Committee. (13)

A Member noted that visible policing has an effect on satisfaction levels, as in the case of road safety. He also noted that dissatisfaction was not always necessarily reported. The Assistant Commissioner explained that Road Safety was a top 7 priority and was always looked at as part of the action plan and tasking strategy in collaboration with CoLC. A second Member asked how the City compared with other areas in London. The Head of Strategic Development explained that the MPS does not carry out a comparable survey for wider London. The first Member commended CoLP for their approach and noted that other Police forces could learn from their example in this regard.

A Member asked if addressing road safety issues meant deploying more officers on the street. The Assistant Commissioner explained that a more rigid patrol strategy was now in place, featuring daily meetings, and a visible difference in terms of uniform policing.

A Member noted that 542 respondents to the survey appeared to be a low number and suggested that the validity of the results may be questionable as a result. He asked if it would be possible to action a media campaign to promote this. The Assistant Commissioner explained that the Director of Communications had a strategy in place for this and agreed to feed back further details. (14)

The Chairman noted that Antisocial Behaviour statistics were now included within the report and thanked CoLP for doing so.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

## 7. **HMICFRS INSPECTION UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that provided Members with an overview of activity undertaken in response to reports published by HMICFRS.

The Chairman noted that the recent inspection report had rated all items as good, as well as CoLP's response to the London Bridge terror attacks.

The Assistant Commissioner emphasised that it was very important to recognise the challenge that CoLP had faced over the last year so they were very pleased with the outcome of this inspection. He noted that only two Police Forces in the country were rated as "outstanding", and only Durham Police Force in all areas.

The Head of Strategic Development explained that the new form of Integrated PEEL Assessments will commence in September, with a focus on organised crime.

The Chairman illustrated his approval of the positive results and the ambition to strive for "outstanding".

The Chairman requested to be given sight of a current draft of the workforce plan as referenced within the report, due for publication in September 2018. (15).

A Member asked if we were working towards a 5-year workforce plan and the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that they were working with a rolling plan as a live document, subject to significant changes over the next 6 months. He confirmed that the plan would be submitted to this sub-committee. The Chairman reiterated that he wanted to be given sight of a draft before it is submitted to the November meeting.

The Chairman noted that the recommendation around disclosure issues was rated as a RED risk, not GREEN as had been promised at the previous meeting. The Head of Strategic Development explained that it should be marked as GREEN. The Chairman asked for the action taken to implement this recommendation to be confirmed. (16)

The Chairman queried the RED risks around Stop and Search. The Assistant Commissioner explained that there had been an issue with Q4 data extraction which has now been resolved. He also noted that there had been an issue raised around stop and search training provision, since addressed by a schedule of training. He explained that this area should now be ready to move to GREEN. The Chairman requested that stop and search statistics and the training plan be submitted to the next meeting. (17)

A Member noted that some areas marked for improvement were concerning, such as public protection and community engagement. The Head of Strategic Development noted that the HMICFRS's commentary on their causes for concern referenced the national perspective. It was also noted that these were 'AMBER' which meant they are in progress and still within the timescale to be delivered set by the Force or HMICFRS as per the AMBER definition.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

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

There were no questions

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

There was no further business.

10. **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.

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the non-public minutes of the last meeting, held on 1 February 2018.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes be approved.

12. **DEMAND AND VALUE FOR MONEY REVIEW/TRANSFORM PROGRAMME - PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police that updated Members on the progress relating to the Demand and Value for Money Review.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received.

13. **NON-PUBLIC 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 SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was one urgent non-public item of business.

**The meeting closed at 12.55 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: George Fraser**  
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174  
[george.fraser@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:george.fraser@cityoflondon.gov.uk)