1. **ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES**
The names of those attending and apologising will be noted in the Minutes

2. **MINUTES**
To consider the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 24-25 January 2018

3. **MATTERS ARISING**
To review and update the Council Action Log

4. **STANDING ITEMS**
4.1 Chair’s Update
   - Delivery Plan Q4 Update
   - Delivery Plan 18/19
   - NPCC Basic Requirements Document
4.2 College of Policing Update -

4.4 **NPCC International Criminality Portfolio and Brexit**
Submission from Richard Martin

5. **Workforce and Pay Reform**
Presentation from Francis Habgood, Mike Cunningham and Giles York
6. **NPCC National Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Strategy and Workforce Toolkit**  
   Submission from Gareth Wilson and Ian Hopkins

7. **Worboys – Supreme Court Judgement Implications**  
   Submission from Gareth Wilson

8. **Pre-Charge Bail Update**  
   **Disclosure Update**  
   Submissions from Nick Ephgrave

   **LUNCH**  
   13:00 – 13:45

   Submission from Bishop James Jones KBE, Richard Cooper

10. **NABIS 2021 Blueprint Project**  
    Submission from Andy Cooke and Ch Supt Jo Chilton

11. **Impact of National Rural and Wildlife Crime Strategies Implementation**  
    Presentation from David Jones and NFU President Minette Batters

12. **Counter Terrorism Policing Vision and Priorities**  
    Presentation and Submissions from Neil Basu, Keir Pritchard, Francis Habgood  
    - Vision and Priorities for Counter Terrorism Policing  
    - Update on the Investigation in Salisbury  
    - Police Support from SWIRIC/NPoCC/CTP Command and Control Recovery Plan  
    - Update on CBRN – Response, Capability and need to Mobile  
    - Recruitment in CT Policing

13. **Use of Police Technology – NPCC Crime Operations Interactive Session**  
    - Demonstrations on – (SISII, Holmes and PND)

   **CLOSE**  
   18:00

   **PRE-DINNER DRINKS**  
   19:00

   **DINNER**  
   19:30
19 April 2018 at 09:00 in the Principal Hotel, York

14. Police Reform
   Presentation from Paddy Tipping

15. Growing the Police ICT Company
   Submission from Ian Bell, CEO of the Police ICT Company

16. Technology Aspirations for the Service
   Presentation from Ian Dyson

17. Digital Policing Portfolio – Charging Model
   Submission Steven Kavanagh
   Digital Policing Portfolio – Digital Intelligence & Investigation Target Operating Model
   Submission from DCS Paul Keasey, Programme Lead

18. The Law Enforcement Response to Online CSAE and Proposals for Future Activity
   Submission from Simon Bailey and Will Kerr

19. Serious Violence Strategy
   Presentation from Scott Mcpherson, Director General of the Crime Police and Fire Group

20. Key Forensic Services
   Submission from James Vaughan

21. Police Aviation Update
   Submission from Dee Collins and Alan Baldwin

22. National Commercial Board – NPCC Finance
   Submission from David Thompson and Lynda McMullen

23. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
   To consider any items of business not included in the substantive agenda

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
   The next meeting will be held on 11-12 July 2018 S31(1)(a)(b).

FUTURE MEETING DATES 2018
   3-4 October 2018 – Cardiff

LUNCH 13:00
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OPEN SESSION

1. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed those present and the following tendered their apologies for 24 and/or 25 January 2018 session of Council:

- Peter Goodman – Derbyshire Constabulary
- Stephen Kavanagh – Essex Police
- Rob Beckley – Metropolitan Police
- Simon Bailey – Norfolk Constabulary
- George Hamilton – Police Service for Northern Ireland
- Gp Capt Steven Horne – Royal Airforce Police Force

The Chair welcomed all new visitors and speakers to Council:

- Sir Philip Rutnam, Permanent Secretary (Home Office)
- Hugh Ind, Director General of Immigration Enforcement (Home Office)
- Alison Saunders, Director of Public Prosecutions (CPS)
- DAC Richard Martin, Met Police (Item 4.4)
- DCC Louisa Rolfe, West Midlands Police (Item 7)
- Andy Ward (UCPI – Item 11)
- DCC Gavin Stephens, Surrey Police (Item 14)
- DCC David Hardcastle, Hampshire Police (Item 14)
- Ian Bell CEO, Police ICT Company (Item 8)

A copy of the Queen’s Birthday Honours list was circulated and the Chair expressed congratulations to all who received the Queen’s Police Medal (QPM) or Knighthood for distinguished service:

- Deputy Commissioner Craig Mackey – Metropolitan Police awarded Knighthood.
- Chief Constable Jeremy Graham – Cumbria Constabulary awarded QPM.
- Chief Constable Charlie Hall – Hertfordshire Constabulary awarded QPM.
- Chief Constable Andy Marsh – Avon and Somerset Constabulary awarded QPM.
- Chief Constable Matt Jukes – South Wales Police awarded QPM.
The Chair congratulated the following on their new positions:

- Mike Cunningham – CEO College of Policing.
- Rod Hansen – Chief Constable, Gloucestershire Constabulary.
- Matt Jukes – Chief Constable, South Wales Police

The Chair expressed thanks to Mark Rowley on behalf of Chiefs’ Council as he will be retiring from policing in March. She said he has played a pivotal role as the national lead for CT policing in what has been an incredibly challenging period. All Chiefs were immensely grateful for all his hard work and she thanked him for his leadership and professionalism he has given policing throughout his career.

Mr Stewart Leach was awarded a commendation for his dedication in promoting, and being responsible for, the effective and successful conduct of the Civilian Services Contingent since 2004.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18-19 October 2017 were agreed as accurate.

3. MATTERS ARISING

**Action item** number 4.3.7 (18 October 17): Simon Bailey prior to the January 2018 Council meeting confirmed that the regional concerns have been addressed outside of this meeting. He will now seek to contact Chiefs via ChiefsNet to follow up on this separately and to collect force SPOC details for national coordination of the revised child multiagency safeguarding requirements.

**Action item** number 4.3.8 (18 October 17): The Chair confirmed a paper would be brought back to the April Council meeting on the proposal to change the guidance on appropriate or necessary in relation to crime recording. The paper would consider the broader issues of crime recording resulting from CDI inspections and its benefits as a substantive agenda item.

**Action item** number 11 (19 October 17): The NPCC basic requirements document for coordination committees is in the process of being reviewed. All staff officers for the committees have been consulted and advised at the last joint coordination committee meeting on 9 January. Going forward the financial and resource impact must form part of the basic requirements document and this will be discussed further at a workshop being planned with the staff officers to discuss the requirements and risk management.
4. **STANDING ITEMS**

4.1 **Chair's Update**

The Annual Report from the NPCC Audit and Assurance Board (AAB) 2016/17 was noted by Chiefs and will be published on the NPCC website. The Chair also asked Chiefs to note the quarter 3 delivery plan and asked for feedback in particular from the coordination committee Chairs. This was noted by Chiefs.

The Chair highlighted work on the standards of behaviour led by Martin Jelly. Martin Jelly explained following on from work highlighting the abuse of position for a sexual purpose Julian Williams will be working jointly with the College of Policing (CoP) on providing an overview on professional conduct between colleagues in forces.

A short draft guidance document on standards of behaviour for internal relationships will be circulated on ChiefsNet and Martin Jelly asked Chiefs to feedback on this document. The final version will be presented to Chiefs at the next Chiefs’ Council meeting.

**Action**: Draft guidance on standards of behaviour for internal relationships to be circulated on ChiefsNet for Chiefs to respond.

**Action**: A paper with the final version of the guidance standards of behaviour for internal relationships to be submitted to the April Council meeting.

The Chair explained that there are plans to enable MPs to spend a day with their police force over the summer recess.

Once the final date and plans have been confirmed it will be announced on ChiefsNet.

**Action**: NPCC Comms Team to develop and coordinate with forces.

The Chair highlighted to Chiefs that there are two NPCC IMORCC vacancies and emphasised the importance of these positions. She asked Chiefs to promote these roles to chief officers who may be suited to these positions. These roles are being advertised on ChiefsNet.

The IMORCC portfolios vacancies are:

- Data Protection, Freedom of Information and Disclosure
- Records Management and Data Quality
The Chair confirmed work has progressed with the Learning Leaders programme. This will be brought back to Chiefs’ Council in April to provide a further update on developing a learning culture within forces (this work is being developed in conjunction with CoP).

The Chair explained that the NPCC had done analysis of the reasons behind Chiefs departing in recent years and work is ongoing to share the findings with HMICFRS and PCCs and include their perspective.

**Action:** To publish the data analysis on Chiefs departing in recent years ChiefsNet to all Chiefs.

An update will also be provided on the joint work between the NPCC and College on the Bishop James Jones’ recommendations from his review of the experiences of Hillsborough families.

### 4.2 Delivery Plan Q3 Update

The Chair introduced the paper containing a comprehensive update on progress towards the 2017/18 NPCC Delivery Plan. Chief constables noted the update.

### 4.3 Regional papers

The Chair guided colleagues through the feedback from the review of regional papers.

#### 4.3.1 Investigative Resilience Programme

The paper was supported and regional feedback was received on recommendation 6.3. This will be discussed as part of item 16 on the agenda.

#### 4.3.2 High Speed (HS2) National Police Coordination

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

#### 4.3.3 National Intelligence Strategy 2017-2025

The paper was agreed for the strategy to be implemented.

**Action:** The NPCC lead for the Intelligence Portfolio will respond to the North West and London regions to clarify cost and accreditation prior to committing to ongoing funding.

#### 4.3.4 Volunteer Police Cadets
Chiefs were supportive of the programme and what it had achieved. The programme will engage with forces individually to take this forward.

Chiefs approved the level of funding contribution outlined in section 2.4 of the paper.

4.3.5 NABIS 2021 Blueprint Project

Council acknowledged the need for some form of investment in expanding the use of NABIS (excluding London and Police Scotland who have their own arrangements) to allow an increase in ballistic intelligence gathering. It is anticipated that the service model options would deliver efficiencies to forces by removing duplication of services.

Chiefs recognised the need for a more joined-up approach, especially in helping forces achieve firearms classification accreditation and supported the direction of travel. However more debate is required on possible funding models and on compliance issues.

Chiefs requested a further paper be submitted to the April Council meeting outlining the size of investment required for the next financial year.

**Action:** Andy Cooke to work with NABIS on producing a substantive paper for an agenda item at the April Council meeting.

4.3.6 FCC 2018/19 Annual Charging Amendments

The paper was agreed and supported by the regions for implementation.

4.3.7 Mutual Aid for Police Communicators

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

4.3.8 Pre-Charge Bail Update

The paper was noted however Chiefs discussed the challenges of pre-charge bail specifically recommendation 4 (timeliness of Investigations). Nick Ephgrave confirmed he and Darren Martland have commissioned work to look at the impact of pre-charge bail on vulnerable victims.

A further update would be brought back to the April Council meeting on the work regarding vulnerable victims.
**Action:** A paper will be submitted to the April Council meeting.

### 4.3.9 Implementing the 2016 Investigatory Powers Act Update

The paper was agreed and supported by the regions.

### 4.3.10 Protocol to Reduce the Unnecessary Criminalisation of Children in Care

The paper was agreed and supported by the regions.

### 4.3.11 Engagement Project between Young People and the Police

The paper was agreed and supported by the regions.

### 4.3.12 National Pilot Programme Update

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

### 4.3.13 The Future of Lost Property Recording

The paper was agreed and supported by the regions.

### 4.3.14 999 Delays over 2 Minutes

The paper was supported and noted. Simon Cole has written to the South East region on their concerns regarding outdated practices and cost implications in relation of point 3 and confirmed these have been resolved out of the meeting. He will continue to address any concerns Chiefs have on this work through the working group.

### 4.3.15 Social Media and Digital Engagement

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

### 4.3.16 Aviation – Proposal for Delivery on HMI Recommendations

The update was noted and recommendations on approach supported by all regions.

Further updates would be brought back to future Council meetings.

### 4.3.17 National Coordination of Fraud Investigations
The paper was agreed and supported by the regions.

4.3.18 CED Training and Operational Carriage for Probationary Constables

The majority of the regions supported this paper but requested a further review of special constable using enhanced CED capability.

This application was supported by all Chief Constables providing a comprehensive application and monitoring process is adhered to.

**Action:** DAC Lucy D’Orsi to review the position regarding special constables and develop the application and monitoring process with the College of Policing.

4.3.19 Armed Policing CTSFO Enhanced Capability

The paper was supported by the regions.

**Action:** Simon Chesterman would liaise with the North East and Eastern regions on their feedback.

4.3.20 Management of Police Information Project Update

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

Ian Dyson confirmed IMORCC were currently reviewing current Authorised Professional Practice (APP) and are developing a new strategy for MoPI for the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) coming into force. MOPI remains a live issue that needs active consideration and oversight.

4.3.21 Reviewing Police National Computer (PNC) Retention Policy

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

4.3.22 ESMCP Update (closed)

As the Permanent Secretary was attending Council this issue was discussed further under item 5 on the agenda.

Francis Habgood reported that communication with forces has improved and that the Home Office recognised that ESMCP timescales require review. Simon Ricketts, former CIO at Rolls
Royce has been appointed by the Permanent Secretary to independently assess the programme with a view to HM Government being able to establish realistic fresh timelines for ESN transition.

Both the Permanent Secretary and Mr Ricketts have been keen to engage with Chief Constables in the course of the review. Chiefs discussed how the service might wish to transition onto ESN, recognising that some aspects of the network will be ready much earlier than others and that the service will need to be paid for from the official commencement date.

Chiefs emphasised the importance of engaging with Mr Ricketts during his review. It was noted that ensuring continued resilience and effectiveness of the current Airwave service remains a key issue for policing. Francis Habgood emphasised that whilst the Ricketts review will clarify the actual extent of delay, it is clear that the existing network will need to be extended beyond the currently projected national shut-down date of December 2019. The cost to the service of such extension could be considerable. Chiefs discussed the possibilities presented in the update paper for incremental transition onto ESN conducted nationwide rather than in a region by region approach. It was proposed this could shorten the overall transition period, with considerable savings to police budgets overall. However, it would not be without risks. It is suggested that in order to progress these ideas further, there would need to be a shift in programme governance to recognise the key role of chief constables, PCCs and the police service. Currently, despite being the majority funder through reallocated police grant, the police are only a small element of the Home Office-led Programme, with all funding departments having equal representation on Programme Board, whatever the size of financial contribution.

There was further discussion around the financial risks both nationally and locally should Airwave be extended for use. The critical importance of voice communication for policing, perhaps more so than other services, was emphasised by chief constables.

It was suggested the proposals in the paper could be presented to the Permanent Secretary and the paper was noted.

4.3.23 Identification and Access Management Progress Update

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

4.3.24 Update on Key Changes to Complaints and Misconduct Procedure

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

4.4.25 Police/Fire Collaboration Update

The update was noted by all regions.
4.4.26 Developing Requirements for Secret Level Networking

The update was noted and supported by all regions.

Mike Barton confirmed this work would be incorporated into the overall NPCC Crime Operations Coordination Committee (NCOCC) business plan going forward.

Action: Mike Barton to write to the North West providing more clarity around cost prior to committing to ongoing funding.

4.3.27 Transforming Forensics Programme – Business Case Update

The Police Reform and Transformation Board (PRTB) will meet on the 29 January and it is hoped the board will recommend continued funding for the programme in a phased and conditional approach.

Debbie Simpson thanked Chiefs for their feedback and said that the discussions would help shape the business case.

The draft version of the business case will be made available to Chiefs via ChiefsNet on the 2 February and there will be further consultation with force forensic leads to discuss the business case before the end of March. Alongside the business case, the outline cases for the four enabling projects will be released.

She welcomes the views of Chiefs and will report back at a future Council meeting.

4.4 Brexit Update

Richard Martin gave an update on progress and made the following points.

Chiefs were informed that a monthly meeting had been established with key stakeholders such as CPS and representatives from the civil service. Funding has also been secured from ACRO for the project team and an additional bid has been submitted for Home Office funding to support the development of infrastructure to assist UK police forces in the Brexit delivery and planning costs.

The Department for Exiting the European Union is keen to have more policing engagement. He has recently written to Chiefs to request feedback and establish a single point of contact from forces so they can capture all interdependencies that could affect policing.
The Chair emphasised the importance of carrying out this work jointly with the [523(1)] the MPS and the Home Office. Also the Chair informed Chiefs that Rob Price has been appointed as the Chief Executive Officer of ACRO and he will work in this position for 3 days a week and the remaining time he will work with Richard Martin on Brexit preparation for policing.

5 SIR PHILIP RUTNAM, PERMANENT SECRETARY, HOME OFFICE

The Chair welcomed the new Permanent Secretary for the Home Office, Sir Philip Rutnam. The Permanent Secretary thanked the Chair for providing him with the opportunity to speak to Chiefs.

Sir Philip explained that the Home Office has a critical role to play in the effective work of policing and the criminal justice system. He emphasised the need to work collaboratively and outlined the main issues as follows:

- The changing nature of demand including increased complexity and globalisation. This necessitates forward-planning, looking ten years ahead.
- The fiscal context is likely to remain challenging.
- Technology is altering the types of harm that we will be dealing with but it also presents opportunities.
- Expectation and scrutiny of policing is increasing and are likely to continue to increase.
- Policing must attract a diverse and talented workforce and must continue to focus on this.

It is these issues that will shape our working environment and we should be active, engaged and collaborative in addressing them. The service prepare carefully and proactively for future spending reviews. Critical factors in the preparation should be consideration of efficiency and productivity; the nature and effect of demand; long-term planning for the investment in change; and the attraction of a workforce with the requisite skills.

The Permanent Secretary noted questions on the ESMCP project and is confident that it is the right strategic direction. He suggested that consideration needs to be given to the criteria that should be in place prior to being able to safely switch off the existing technology.

6 MAKING DISCLOSURE WORK

Nick Ephgrave explained that last summer there were two published reports identifying the police service was not performing well in terms of disclosure. Of particular note, the HMIC
report identified current police training does not adequately equip officers to properly understand the disclosure process.

As a result of these findings a working group was formed in July 2017 and the combined 26 recommendations were reviewed by the group. In November, however, a series of high profile RASSO cases were discontinued or dropped due to failures in the disclosure process. These failings raised the issue to a critical level and both the NPCC and the CPS concluded that a national action plan was required and that this should be jointly owned by the police, the CPS and the College of Policing. In addition, there has been a request from the Attorney General’s office for a written response outlining the national plan to reassure the public.

The Director of Public Prosecutions reiterated disclosure considerations are a vital part of the investigation and investigating officers have a duty to look at all reasonable lines of enquiry. Officers need to consider the offence type and identify all relevant evidence. Additionally, senior managers should provide strong leadership and focus around this. She explained that she had hosted a seminar with a range of practitioners who agreed the need to have disclosure management guidance and strategy document.

The outline for the improvement plan will drive changes focusing on

- Capacity
- Capability
- Leadership
- Governance
- Partnership

Chiefs supported the core tenent of the improvement plan and committed to delivering it at pace. Nick Ephgrave asked Chiefs to nominate both a ‘Disclosure Champion at NPCC rank and a tactical lead and to start to build a cadre of specialist advisers and training experts for each force. Additionally, there will be training and cost implications which will be worked through with the College of Policing.

Chiefs discussed the following:

- Capacity including technological and artificial intelligence solutions.
- Expanding crime types
- Understanding the capacity/complexity implications for digital evidence.

7 REDUCING NUMBERS OF DOMESTIC ABUSE CASE REFERRALS
Alison Saunders explained there is a better understanding of the reasons behind low reporting of domestic abuse (DA) incidents across the UK. As a result there have been a number of changes and this has led to improvements in forces investigating and prosecutions of DA. However over the last two years there has been a reduction in the cases coming to consideration for prosecutions.

Alison Saunders explained she has been working with Louisa Rolfe, the NPCC lead for DA, to understand why referrals are lowering despite recording incidents increasing. They have jointly been reviewing cases with local domestic abuse leads to gain a better understanding of the reasons behind this.

Louisa Rolfe added over the last ten years there has been a significant increase in both convictions and recording of DA cases. Approximately a third of those arrested translate to prosecution. However, the recent fall in referrals is not consistent across forces. It should be noted that different structured datasets from forces and the different demands placed on forces may be influencing these variations. Therefore work is being undertaken with the College of Policing and the Home Office to understand these complexities.

Training has been rolled out on how to manage reluctant or hostile victims and this has been uploaded on ChiefsNet. Louisa Rolfe asked Chiefs to look at their local referral figures and to provide feedback.

8 NATIONAL ENABLING PROGRAMMES

Ian Dyson presented on the National Enabling Programmes (NEP) and gave an overview of the key areas required to implement a secure platform across UK police forces. This will enable new ways of working, whilst maintaining the autonomy for local decision-making and control of digital assets.

He provided key highlights from the ICT summit which took place on the 17 and 18 January. Key speakers included Jason Corbishley, Hacer Evans and Giles York and they spoke to a wide stakeholder audience explaining the transformational benefits that the NEP will bring to policing.

Following from Home Office approval of the outline business case in August 2017 a benefits management work stream was established. The team has developed a national framework and approach to benefits management including support to forces in helping to baseline, track and realise the benefits from the NEP technologies. At the beginning of January 2018, the team has refreshed the Identity Access Management (IAM/PS) and business cases to take account of key changes in approach, deployment and funding availability. These have been submitted to LETU for consideration at their next board meeting and final business cases will be submitted later this year.
The programme team continues to work with Microsoft to improve the offering to forces. Ian Dyson explained since the inception of NEP, the programme team has been working with policing IT and Information Assurance (IA) to generate policy preparedness and new technology solutions to hopefully understand and mitigate risk impact.

Ian Dyson stressed the importance of empowering officers and staff to take advantage of cloud-connected mobility and productivity tools which will allow for collaboration at a national level and enable wider business change for forces. It was confirmed that Microsoft will no longer release new products for local (non-Cloud) deployment after 2021.

Chiefs discussed the direct immediate benefits being delivered by NEP including the projected savings over the next three years, reduction in individual force expenditure and improved information security.

Looking forward Ian Dyson mentioned the NEP is planning their own events, with roadshows for forces with opportunities to attend seminars and themed webinars. All Chiefs congratulated Ian Bell on his appointment as CEO of the Police ICT Company.

9 POLICING AND MEDIA RELATIONS

The Chair welcomed members of the Crime Reporters’ Association for a session on media relation. She said that the public benefits from open and transparent professional relationships between officers and staff and the media at all levels. Additionally, the Chair said it is important that Chiefs ensure their officers and staff understand the College of Policing’s Media Relations Authorised Professional Practice which supports them in that engagement.

The Chair introduced Gareth Morgan, the NPCC lead for communications and media issues. He said the relationship between police and media is positive with regular, professional engagement but changing media and communications landscape and resource constraints for both police and media presented challenges for both. He explained joint work with media to address shared issues as set out in the supporting paper.

There was a discussion on the following points:
- Different perspectives on use of social media to engage with the public and highlight issues, and how that activity is reported by different outlets.
- Media representatives were lobbying for social media platforms to be formally considered as publishers meaning they would have to conform to national publishing standards.
- How the media and communications departments respond to requests request from press.
• If there is an increasing reliance of the media on FOI requests.
• Social media trolling towards police and the ethical position on media reporting on this.

Day 1 End

Day 2: 09:00-17:00 25 January 2018

10 USE OF POLICE TECHNOLOGY – INTERACTIVE SESSION

An awareness session on national projects was held for all Chiefs covering:
• Digital Public Contact (DPP)
• Child Abuse Images Database (CAID)
• Home Office Biometrics (HOB)
• National ANPR Service (NAS)

The session focused on some of the service key relationships and the technology and infrastructure that support policing.

11 UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY (UCPI) UPDATE

Andy Cooke updated Chiefs on the progress of the UCPI and made the following points:

• NPCC Undercover Public Inquiry Gold Coordination Group Chaired by Sara Thornton continues to meet on a regular basis.

• The new UCPI Chairman, Sir John Mitting, Chaired his first public hearings in November which primarily concerned submissions regarding the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act.
• The Chairman recognised that the on-going restriction order process, either for anonymity or in relation to huge volume of documents, was a large and time-consuming task.
• The latest update from the UCPI in October indicated that a revised timetable would be available on completion of their strategic review.
• The most significant issue the coordination team is managing at present continues to be the anonymity applications and associated risk assessments.
• Following a number of meetings with the UCPI, their priorities have been set out with new deadlines in relation to supporting risk assessments.

Chiefs supported the work and noted the paper.
Additional item – Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) Police Transformation Fund proposal

Andy Cooke introduced the overview of SOC PTF proposal and said that he wanted to ensure that Home Office, §23(1), and NPCC are in full agreement regarding what the priorities should be around SOC. He explained that three NPCC proposals (Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, Cyber and Economic Crime) are all substantial bids.

Andy Cooke summarised the National Securities Council priorities and introduced Lynne Owens, the Director General of the §23(1).

Lynne Owens outlined how the priorities were aligned to the SOC strategy review set out next steps. She asked Chiefs to note the proposed capabilities with the respective investments and to continue their support for SOC funding.

12 OPERATION ELTER RESOURCING (closed)

Andy Cooke continues to lead the investigative scoping exercise to understand the material held, to assess the operational and personal risk and to better inform forces. He advised that in completing this work forces will be in a position to comply with the agreed terms of reference in relation to the NPOIU and be in a position where they are able to link into the national operations. In doing this forces will be better able to comply with the current rule 9 requirements from the public inquiry team.

Andy Cooke continued to explain that Operation Elter is now also assisting forces with the provision of former NPOIU documents required to defend both civil claims and the requirements of the Investigatory Claims Tribunal. These requirements are particularly resource intensive with the latest claim requiring the analysis of over 10,000 documents. Due to the volume of NPOIU material now held by Operation Elter Andy Cooke informed Chiefs that it has been necessary to extend the timescale for completing the investigation exercise.

Andy Cooke reminded Chiefs that the NPOIU initial investigation work undertaken by Operation Elter is unbudgeted within the MPS. This matter was brought to Chiefs’ Council in June 2016 and revisited again in May 2017 where on each occasion £1.6m of funding was agreed. The projected cost for next 6 months is £1.76m and he asked Chiefs to agree this work including the continuation of the oversight process.

Andy Cooke made the following further points:

- HMIC was instructed by the Home Office to undertake a review of Op Elter’s resourcing requirements. HMIC concluded that the requested resourcing of Operation Elter (62 staff)
was reasonable and proportionate taking into account that the investigation had clearly grown.

- It is anticipated that current staffing levels will need to be maintained for 6 -12 months in order to complete the scoping exercise.
- The MPS is currently in receipt of a UCPI Rule 9 request to make available all the centrally held NPOIU material. This will be completed within the initial investigative strategy.

Chiefs endorsed the report and agreed the following decision at point 5.1

- Operation Elter (via CC Cooke) to be tasked by Chief Constables to undertake the ongoing investigative strategy in relation to the NPOIU based on the centrally held material
- Chief Constables agree (through their designated Chief Officer SPOC) to support this work with any associated local investigation
- Resources and costs for this work to be shared by the 43 Forces of England and Wales and the Ministry of Defence police, the Civil Nuclear constabulary and British Transport police in line with the standard formula.
- Oversight of this work and resourcing requirements to be undertaken by the NPCC Gold Group with regular reporting to Chiefs Constables’ Council

**IMMIGRATION CRIME**

The Chair welcomed Hugh Ind, Director General, Immigration Enforcement to Council. He introduced his presentation by emphasising the need for close working between the police and Immigration Enforcement across the whole spectrum of police work from anti-social behavior to serious and organised crime.

The presentation gave an overview of Immigration Enforcement’s work and the scale and range of their operations and partnerships. The relevance of Immigration Enforcement to policing was highlighted. Their vision is to reduce the size of the illegal population and the threat and harm it causes. The work on safeguarding vulnerable migrants and modern slavery was highlighted, as well as successes in the key mission of deporting illegal immigrants and offenders in a way that is respectful of human rights.

The Chair thanked Hugh Ind for his interesting and informative presentation and for highlighting the relevance, links and crossovers with UK policing.
POTENTIAL FUTURE STRUCTURE FOR LOCAL POLICING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Simon Cole introduced the item, which would contain four updates. He asked Chiefs to note the considerable work that had been done in these areas.

Reviewing the Local Policing Coordination Committee

Simon Cole presented the current structure of the Local Policing Coordination Committee and highlighted two areas, the Response Policing portfolio led by David Hardcastle, and the Children and Young Persons portfolio led by Olivia Pinkney.

Simon Nickless, lead for the Troubled Families portfolio, described the current landscape in the area of prevention, including areas such as crime prevention, children and young people, citizens in policing etc. The area of prevention is well articulated in the Policing Vision 2025 and there is a need for coherence around this within the service. The paper proposed three options including pulling a number of portfolios together under a single ‘prevention portfolio’, a ‘strategic prevention approach’ across portfolios or to maintain the current approach.

Chiefs acknowledged the importance of going beyond situational problem-solving to include early intervention. The College would also have a role to play. The readiness of the service to look at prevention across portfolios was discussed and examples from the crime, finance and workforce coordination committees were cited as areas where this was working well. There was already support from the leads to work together and recognition that there should be input from the Vulnerable People portfolio (VPP).

Chiefs were asked to consider the three options and agreed the preferred approach would be option 2 – a strategic approach applied across portfolios – and that this would be developed further for consideration at a future meeting. It was also agreed that Simon Bailey should be consulted in his role as lead of VPP.

Action: Simon Cole to work with Simon Bailey to include vulnerability in the approach to prevention.

Modernising Local Policing – Guidelines (HMIC Update)

Gavin Stephens introduced the Modernising Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines, he reminded Chiefs that the consultation would be open for a further week and encouraged further response from forces. He also asked for volunteer forces to test the guidelines and fill in some of the evidence gaps that still exist. A new definition of neighbourhood policing has also been proposed.
Chiefs were reminded that the guidelines were initially a recommendation from the PEEL 2016 effectiveness inspection report but that they also have to support delivery of the Policing Vision 2025 and offer real benefits to communities. The work is the product of a College Guidelines Committee Chaired by Gavin Stephens. The College’s rapid evidence assessment and the 207 responses to the call for practice from forces have contributed to the guidelines. The guidelines outline practice that can improve outcomes and that can offer high return on investment. What they do not yet address is how neighbourhood policing contributes to other areas such as CT, SOC, online crime etc. In addition the financial benefits of the guidance have yet to be addressed.

College testing found forces broadly supported the definition and guidelines but felt more work was required on the practice advice to accompany it. The next phase is to evaluate the practice advice and produce meaningful cost/benefit analysis for forces. A PTF bid will be considered for this work.

Chiefs were supportive of the work and the approach to implementation via multi-force pilots. They were keen that the work had to be made relevant to frontline policing. Mike Cunningham suggested that further engagement be undertaken with HMICFRS at the HMI level to align expectations around a more structured approach to local policing.

**Action:** Mike Cunningham to facilitate further HMICFRS engagement on Neighbourhood Policing Guidance.

Neighbourhood Policing and Counter Terrorism – this item will be dealt with in Item 15 - Counter Terrorism.

**Response Policing Update**

David Hardcastle offered an update on the work of the Response Policing portfolio. This is the largest single group of officers in policing and the role has changed considerably in recent years. The portfolio was set up to provide representation for this group and take response policing forward. A practitioner group has been established to ensure response officers have a voice. They will work with the portfolio on the four work streams:

- **Operational Influence** - to work with other leads on policy and practice for response since it cuts across so many areas.
- **Professional Development** - there is currently no role profile for a response officer. Officers need to know what is required of them and have standards applied to the role.
- **Recognition** - there is evidence that response officers feel less valued and that new recruits do not aspire to the role. Work is required to make the role a valued one and to provide formal recognition of the work they do.
• Wellbeing - the impact of shift work and the longer term impact of the role on resilience are being considered.

Chiefs were broadly supportive of the work as outlined. There was some thought given to the term ‘Response Officer’ and whether that in itself underplays the vital role performed. There is a need to develop a common language for this across policing and to ensure professional development for these officers was not behind that of other specialisms.

Chiefs discussed the recommendation 4.2 that response officers should, as a minimum, be response qualified in order that they can fulfil their core role of responding to emergencies.

This was not supported at this time as Chiefs required further detail on the gap between officers qualified to drive at the basic level (i.e not to exceed the speed limited) and at the response qualified level.

14 COUNTER TERRORISM UPDATE (closed)

Mark Rowley reflected on his time in the police service and expressed his personal thanks to colleagues for their support over the course of his career.

He acknowledged the additional money that had been made available for counter-terrorism policing in 2018/19 but raised concerns about sustainability beyond the end of the next financial year. He also provided information regarding the representation of staff within Counter Terrorism Units, comparing the proportion from the lead force to the other constituent forces. He encouraged all Chiefs to check their representation within their CTU. The request was made by Chiefs that other pipelines for resource other than solely forces, such as direct entry detectives, were considered for CT roles.

An overview of the David Anderson review of last year’s terrorist attacks was provided. This revealed some procedural issues within the CT system but also highlighted the much greater number of subjects who need to remain on the radar, rather than the binary position of being an open subject under investigation or closed. Neighbourhood policing will have a significant role to play in this approach but the step-change cannot be achieved with existing levels of resource. A clear articulation of what is needed, and at what cost, is required in advance of the next comprehensive spending review. This may require consideration of activities that we invest less in, as well as clarity regarding the tactical request that we are making of officers and staff.

The terrorism threat remains both high and problematic, with far right and Islamist agitators making their voices heard more forcefully to present a narrative of victimisation. The significant risk exists that this further entrenches polarised and confrontational positions. Draft guidance on police engagement with extremists has been compiled based on key principles that policing
acknowledges extremism comes in many forms; supports freedom of speech; remains independent of politics; upholds the law; and engages with communities as widely as possible. Careful judgment is required in engaging with those who are equivocal in condemning extremism.

**NATIONAL RE-MOBILISATION OF INVESTIGATORS**

Matt Jukes gave an indication of the scale of the shortfall in detective capability. HMICFRS estimate that 22% of posts are either vacant or occupied by individuals without requisite qualifications, and 1,400 staff are working on non-recent inquiries.

There are a number of good initiatives in place across forces and these have been pulled together, with the College, into a toolkit of options around attraction, recruitment, retention and wellbeing of investigators. This will be showcased at a national conference in February. There is no single easy solution and that Matt Jukes is working across the service to address issues of:

- Pay and conditions
- Wellbeing – addressing issues of scrutiny and blame
- College of Policing on qualifications/PIP
- Evaluation of alternative entry routes (what works) including direct entry Detective Constable, early streaming to DC and police staff investigators and working with the S23(1), and CT networks.

The work to date will not deliver ‘surge capability’ in response to major incidents. Feedback was requested from Chiefs on the proposal to remobilise recently retired detectives. Current methods through agencies at force level are costly and inconsistent. Work is ongoing with HMRC in considering the tax implications of remobilising those retired.

Chiefs supported the work to date.

**COLLEGE OF POLICING OVERVIEW AND PRIORITIES**

The Chair welcomed Mike Cunningham to Council in his role as CEO of the College of Policing. He presented his early thoughts two weeks in post. He had observed a coherence across policing that
was absent three years ago and this was a positive change. He thanked Rachel Tuffin for her work in the interim CEO position and for the good work of the College to date which he hopes to build on.

He offered Council his perspective on reform from his experience as HMI. He could see the prism of police reform had shifted from the early large constructs and interventions (such as the introduction of PCCs, NPCC, College of Policing and the introduction of and the Code of Ethics etc.) and noted that the scale and pace of change has been driven by austerity and the changing nature of demand. He has observed a varying appetite for change across forces and commented that the service cannot move at the pace of the slowest, nor can it afford to wait for complete consensus. The challenge now is how to move forward together and to take the natural opportunities as they arise.

The emerging challenge is around capability - workforce reform has focused on capacity and needs to address what we are expecting of the workforce now and what we capability we need to build for the next 5/10 years. He identified his early thoughts on areas of priority:

- Leadership and skilling of staff.
- Understanding productivity – work on wellbeing is already underway and will gain momentum.
- Performance Management – not a slavish approach to PDR, but staff should understand what is expected of them and whether they are doing a good job, and the College will look at how to optimise performance.
- Digital – how technology can assist the service in terms of productivity.

Coherence and clarity across the service are key and as the priorities of the College are developed, they need to be aligned to priorities of the NPCC and the Home Office.

A key challenge of the College is how it engages with the service. Chiefs were asked to support the College and be advocates of it. A parallel challenge for the College is to be more confident in its own identity and its clarity of purpose. The College is a multi-faceted organisation and without clarity of purpose there is a risk that it will become a repository for too many things. The College should be responsive to the pace and scale of change and work with the service to support it. Chiefs provided comment and raised the following points. Chiefs were grateful for the early thoughts and were supportive of the general priorities:

- The perception of a lack of independence while funded by the Home Office.
- The focus so far has been on leadership in senior ranks and professionalising the service. The focus should also be at the existing junior officer level and getting the right products to the front line. The College needs to be seen as more relevant to everyday policing.
• College staff, given to the nebulous nature of the network of the College, do not always seem to have a cohesive sense of belonging. Mike Cunningham acknowledged that staff do want more clarity.

The Chair thanked Mike Cunningham for his overview and thoughts.

17 COLLEGE OF POLICING UPDATE

Rachel Tuffin provided an update on College business and highlighted four areas:
Response to the PEQF discussion. The College would prepare a formal response to the letter from the Chair following discussions at the October 2017 Council.
• The College is developing a consultation for senior qualifications. It will include building on existing experience, the proposal to incentivise rather than mandate the qualification and accrediting parts of the SLC and SCC. Consultation is set for April 2018. Chiefs were asked to volunteer to be involved in the development of the consultation paper.
• The initial banding was £27k per apprentice in terms of funding, this has subsequently been lowered to £21k and the College is in discussions to have this reverted to £27k. The issue of funding in Wales is also being progressed.
• The impact of apprenticeships on attracting a diverse candidate mix will be closely monitored through the forces that are adopting the scheme early.
• To support the implementation of the apprenticeship entry route, the College has put together an implementation team and are producing guidance and a toolkit. In addition the College will offer bespoke visits to forces that are facing particular local issues.

Licence to Practise. Work is continuing on the operating model which will now reflect changes to secondary legislation rather than the primary legislation as initially proposed. There are tight timeframes from the Home Office and Chiefs were asked to volunteer to contribute to the process. The College is proposing to take a more central role in the accreditation and registration process than originally planned.

Disclosure. Training is available on the College MLE in the form of a video briefing on disclosure (which would be useful if forces when planning refresher training). In addition the training on ‘Investigation for a Fair Trial’ has been refreshed to include emerging issues on relevance.

Diversity. Work with consultants on recruitment portals and attraction is near completion. A virtual meeting room platform is in development where members of the public can go to ask questions and seek information about careers in policing. Funding is being sought to support this.

Chiefs expressed concern about the banding for apprenticeships in terms of affordability.
Action: Workforce coordination committee to prepare a combined response on the banding for apprentices.

18 NATIONAL POLICING DIVERSITY STRATEGY & WORKFORCE PLAN

Gareth Wilson the NPCC lead for EDHR explained that after a competitive tendering process the National Centre for Social Research would develop the NPCC Diversity Strategy. They have commenced this task and this will be presented to Chiefs’ Council in April. He explained that as part of this action a consultation process will take place and it is important that Chiefs ensure their forces are engaged with the process.

Gareth Wilson said he attended an informative follow-up meeting on the Race Disparity Audit led by the Ministry of Justice on the 18th of January. He can now confirm that there will be the Joint NPCC/APCC Diversity and Inclusion Conference on the 22nd of November and asked that Chiefs send representation from their forces. He also explained there have been challenging discussions around race being considered a priority at the conference over other protected characteristics. He confirmed that he is working with all relevant groups and, although there will be a heavier emphasis on race, the broader diversity issues will covered through the event.

Ian Hopkins said that the paper submitted was a first a draft of the workforce plan and asked for feedback from Chiefs. He explained that the workforce plan is currently out for consultation and this will include staff networks and the Federation. There was positive interest from the Home Office and the feedback they gave was around how the strategy and workforce plan could consistently drive performance across all police forces.

The main issue identified is how police forces can use their data to support the required improvements.

19 PAY AND CONDITIONS (closed)

Francis Habgood updated Council on the NPCC’s submission to the Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB). he has been doing on pay and reward during 2017 and in relation to the settlement announcement in December 2017.

He explained that research involving surveying forces and extensive market evaluation across industries and employers supported setting starting salary at £18,000. This would give local forces flexibility to set apprentice pay, based on local market factors, between Pay Point 0 and Pay Point 1 with constables remaining on their starting salary for 12 months before progressing to the next pay point.
Chief Constables were supportive of the proposal subject to it meeting the Living Wage/London Living Wage requirement.

**Action:** Francis Habgood to confirm that £18,000 Pay Point Zero for PC Apprentices meets the living wage requirement.

The 2017 PRRB supported the recommendation to allow local flexibility for chief officers to make additional bonus payments for ‘hard to fill’ and superintending roles. The work is ongoing and will focus on the ability to recruit and retain staff in these roles.

Chiefs were asked to consider whether there was a requirement to review the pay structure for DCCs in collaborated posts. The issue relates to the relationship between CC and DCC spot salary resulting, in some cases the collaborated DCCs are paid less than other DCCs in the region. Working with CPOSA and having conducted a survey, the proposal is that the issue is not sufficiently urgent that action is required in this financial year.

Chief Constables agreed with the proposal that the issue of collaborated DCC pay need not be considered in this financial year. They considered a short term option of seconding collaborated DCCs to the highest paid force in the region, but recognised that there were limitations to this option since DCCs would have to be employed by the force and PCC would need to be consulted.

Francis Habgood explained the process for how the NPCC determined their recommendation to the PRRB for police officer pay in 2018/19, which involved considering forces financial positions, the economic outlook including living costs and rates of inflation, comparisons with other sectors, the views and evidence of stakeholders such as the Home Office, staff association, other workforce reform such as introductions of apprenticeships and advanced practitioners and views from officers gathered through focus groups and surveys. Francis Habgood summarised the key issues in making a recommendation:

- Affordability to forces and how increases at different levels would impact on budgets recognising that the funding settlement for 2018/19 meant that funding increases were dependent on Police and Crime Commissioners increasing their precept by £12 a year for household and that difference in funding between forces mean their individual increases would vary between 1.6 per cent and 3.5 per cent. Also recognising that most forces have made an assumption of 2 per cent.
- Impact on officers of different levels of increase and their position following many years of no increase.
- Feedback from officers and staff associations about concerns with 2017 award not being in line with the PRRB’s recommendation and being below inflation and only partly consolidated.
- Market rates are drifting upwards and are expected to be 2 – 2.5% in 2018.
• Benchmarking of officer pay with other sectors showing that top level PC pay is in line with market comparisons, however, other ranks are lower. There is a further requirement for full benefit analysis against the market – including pensions.

It was confirmed that the pay settlement for police staff from last year had not yet been resolved and this needs to be resolved before addressing the 2018 position.

Police Officer Pay. The letter from the Treasury has allowed greater flexibility, however this is not open-ended and suggests it should be targeted and address issues of recruitment and retention.

Chiefs were asked to consider how the non-consolidated award of 1% for police officers in 2017 should be dealt with and the annual uplift recommendation for 2018 and whether this should be consistent across all ranks (including Chief Officers).

The options raised included:
- Consolidate the 1% and a 2% uplift for 2018
- Consolidate the 1% and a 1% uplift for 2018
- Uplift of 2% for 2018, leaving the 1% unconsolidated.

Following debate, it was agreed the recommendation should be 2% uplift for 2018 and that the 1% non-consolidated from 2017 was a one-off award. This would be in line with the market rates and ensure the recommendation would be affordable to all forces. It was agreed that disparities in levels of funding in forces and increased operational and inflationary demands meant that the majority of forces would not be able to afford a pay increase of more than two per cent.

Francis Habgood suggested that the staff associations may put forward 3% and that neither the Home Office nor the APCC had indicated what they would be recommending at this stage.

Following a discussion on chief officer pay recommendations, Chiefs agreed that the recommendation should be the same as for police officers on the basis that it is consistent. In addition the gap between chief superintendent and ACC pay was closing and, with pension issues, this could prove a disincentive to future applicants.

Chiefs made the following decisions:

• The recommendation to set Pay Point 0 at £18,000 to enable chief officers to set apprentice pay based on local factors was endorsed subject to it meeting the Living Wage requirements.
• The recommendation that apprentices should remain on their initial Pay Point for 12 months was endorsed.
• The recommendation for the work to continue on bonus payments for specific roles was endorsed.
• Chiefs agreed with the recommendation to defer submissions on the collaborated DCC pay issue.
• Chiefs recommended that the pay uplift for 2018 should be 2%.

20 NPCC FINANCE UPDATE (closed)

Dave Thompson provided Council with an update on the outcome of the submissions to the 2018/19 settlement, what the learning points were and what was required for future work. The joint approach with PCCs on the settlement submission had been positive and, whilst political differences are emerging between PCCs subsequently, there is still a desire to work together. The challenge for next year is how to improve the process and build capability within the service to take this forward. The NPCC and APCC are considering a longer term sustainable, shared capability. He noted that understanding demand and activity based costing is a priority.

The 2018/19 settlement was a better position than expected which will ease the current situation; however it was not the level that was requested. There was a difference in the benefit to forces which would become clear once the precepts are finalised and taking into account tax base growth. In general, forces would receive between 1.6% and 3.6%, so the grant is not falling. Additionally the Transformation Fund has been maintained.

Reallocations - the amount of funding allocated outside of funding the 43 forces has increased from 9% to 11%. There is an intention to continue to challenge the amount of money not going directly to policing. It was also noted that the pay awards must be funded from the rise.

A presentation was provided on the settlement and level of increase forces would receive and how this would reflect in term of £ per head of population. It was noted that the increase took into account £12 increase on precept but did not account for variances in tax base growth. Further analysis looked at the impact of population growth (especially in relation to under 25s), socio-economic factors, and deprivation.

The next steps are to clarify if the grant has been frozen for two years and to continue to encourage the Home Office for a review of the funding formula next year.

Chiefs were supportive of the work and the need to work closely with PCCs. They recognised the need to build capability and that work on the 2019/20 settlement or CSR needs to be a priority. Chiefs were supportive of a bid to the transformation fund to resource the capability. The discussion highlighted the following:

• The need for reliable national data was recognised.
• Whist the funding formula is important and must be addressed; there was a view that a united position on the overall grant was essential.
• Further work is required on productivity.
• The service needs a compelling narrative on reserves.

Chief Constables noted the details of the settlement and the debrief report. The proposal to support the Financial Excellence Centre through the PTF was supported for the first year in principle, subject to a more detailed paper.

21 BUDGETS

The Chair presented the budgets for 2018/19 for the agreement of Council:
• NPCC Budget and Funding – Chief constables noted the continued level of funding contributions from the Parties and approved the central Budget Plans for 2018/19.
• ACRO Budget – Chief Constables agreed the contribution of £1,825,000 to pay for the services of ACRO in 2018/19. It was noted that contributions for 2019/20 were still budgeted at £2,825,000 since the implications of Brexit were not yet fully understood.
• National Police FOI/DP Central Referral Unit continued funding – Chief constables endorse the recommendation of £372,000 in 2018/19 and 2019/20.
• NPoCC Budget and Funding - Chief constables noted the level of funding contributions from the Parties and approved the Budget Plan for 2018/19.
• National Wildlife Crime Unit – Chief constables endorsed the continued funding contribution to the National Wildlife Crime Unit of £145,000 for 2018/19 as agreed in January 2017.

22 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A Police Memorial Paper funding paper was presented to Chiefs. Whilst it was acknowledged that discussions should continue on a future, more sustainable model, interim support is needed to allow the National Police Memorial Day (NPMD) charity to continue to meet its current responsibilities and its engagement with the service. Accordingly the paper proposed the transition period is supported through equal contributions by each force for a three-year period.

Chiefs agreed the interim contribution for one years and it was confirmed that a business case for the longer term future of and arrangements for police memorial will be developed within the timeframe and brought forward for approval.

The Chair encouraged all Chiefs to seek volunteers from their forces to apply for the national NPCC lead portfolio positions that are vacant within the coordination committees and referred to the current list published on ChiefsNet.
The next Chief Officer Day would take place on the 14 March at the Emmanuel Centre in London and encouraged Chiefs to put forward any suggestions for session topics they would like to see on the agenda to Richard Hampson for collating.

The Chair informed Council that this would be Debbie Simpson’s last meeting at Council and thanked her for support and contribution to policing and the work nationally on Forensics within the Crime Operations Coordination Committee. All Chiefs wished her well for her future role.

The Chair confirmed the October meeting of Council would take place in Wales and would send more information to Chiefs once arrangements had been made.

**Action:** NPCC Central Office team to liaise with South Wales Police on arrangements for the October Council meeting.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on 18-19 April 2018.
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<tr>
<td>18-Oct-17</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.7</td>
<td>Impact of the New Children and Social Work Act 2017 - Revised Child Multi Agency Safeguarding Requirements - Simon Bailey to bring the paper back to the January 2018 Council meeting for formal agreement once the concerns of the South East, South West, North West and Eastern regions were addressed.</td>
<td>04-Jan-18</td>
<td>Simon Bailey</td>
<td>Simon Bailey</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Oct-17</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.8</td>
<td>Proposal to Change the Guidance on Appropriate or Necessary in relation to Crime Recording - Bill Skelly to work with Simon Edens as head of the NPCC Performance Management Coordination Committee to consider the broader issues of crime recording resulting from CJD inspections and its benefits as a substantive agenda item at the January 2018 Council meeting.</td>
<td>04-Jan-18</td>
<td>Bill Skelly</td>
<td>Bill Skelly &amp; Simon Edens</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>The paper will not be returning to Chief's Council as the advice disseminated in the Crime Recording Matters newsletter was the final update. CC Skelly does not intend to bring the paper back but does have a meeting arranged with HMI Matt Parr, and further information may be circulated following that.</td>
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<td>Police Resourcing and Efficiency Update</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chiefs noted a lack of assessment on financial impact in proposals that are put forward for transformation, implementation of new systems, workforce reform etc. Costings should be a requirement in all proposals along with the risk and impact assessment of not doing it. Coordination Committees have guidance from NPCC on basic requirements and the Chair suggested that the issue of costings be included in a review of these requirements.</td>
<td>25-Dec-17</td>
<td>David Thompson</td>
<td>Nicole Higgins</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Chair's Update</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>A short draft guidance document on standards of behaviour for internal relationships will be circulated on ChiefsNet and Martin Jelley asked Chiefs to feedback on this document. The final version will be presented to Chiefs at the next Chiefs' Council meeting.</td>
<td>01-Mar-18</td>
<td>Martin Jelley</td>
<td>Martin Jelley</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Following Ian Spittal's retirement, Julian Williams has continued the work around creating appropriate internal relationship guidance, working jointly with the College of Policing. A draft has been written and initial informal advice sought from stakeholders across the service, as part of an early consultation. This guidance has now been sent for review by external Counsel to ensure compliance with the Human Rights Act and employment law. The paper is due for return to the College early April 2018 and will be circulated on ChiefsNet for Chiefs to provide comment by the end of April 2018. Paper to be submitted now to the July Council Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Chair's Update</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The Chair explained that there are plans to enable MPs to spend a day with their police force over the summer recess. Once the final date and plans have been confirmed it will be announced on ChiefsNet.</td>
<td>01-Mar-18</td>
<td>NPCC Comms</td>
<td>NPCC Comms</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Details are continuing to be worked on and a further update will be circulated to all chiefs in early June.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Chair's Update</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The Chair explained that the NPCC had done analysis of the reasons behind Chiefs departing in recent years and work is ongoing to share the findings with HMICFRS and PCCs and include their perspective. The NPCC office will publish the data analysis on Chiefs departing in recent years. ChiefsNet to all Chiefs.</td>
<td>01-Mar-18</td>
<td>NPCC Central Office</td>
<td>NPCC Central Office</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>The findings were circulated on the 31 January via ChiefsNet to all chiefs.</td>
<td>31/01/2018</td>
</tr>
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<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>National Intelligence Strategy 2017-2025: The NPCC lead for the Intelligence Portfolio will respond to the North West and London regions to clarify cost and accreditation prior to committing to ongoing funding.</td>
<td>03-Mar-18</td>
<td>ACC Phil Kay</td>
<td>ACC Phil Kay</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>The Intelligence lead did make contact with the specific regions on the matters raised around cost and accreditation. This was further discussed at the last Local Policing Coordination Committee to resolve going forward.</td>
<td>02/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.5</td>
<td>NABIS 2021 Blueprint Project: Andy Cooke to work with NABIS on producing a substantive paper for an agenda item at the April Council meeting.</td>
<td>03-Mar-18</td>
<td>Andy Cooke</td>
<td>Andy Cooke</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>A paper has been submitted to the April Council meeting.</td>
<td>03/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.8</td>
<td>Pre-Charge Bail Update: A further update would be brought back to the April Council meeting on the work regarding vulnerable victims</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>DCC Darren Martland</td>
<td>DCC Darren Martland</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>A paper has been submitted to the April Council meeting.</td>
<td>03/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.18</td>
<td>CED Training and Operational Carriage for Probationary Constables: DAC Lucy D’Orsi to review the position regarding special constables and develop the application and monitoring process with the College of Policing.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>DAC Lucy D’Orsi</td>
<td>DAC Lucy D’Orsi</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Work is progressing well with the college of policing and a workshop with a cross section of constables to test the application procedure will take place by the end of June subject to availability to test the new process. The Home Office have had an official letter from DAC D’Orsi outlining Chief Constables desire to train probationers in Taser as and where necessary. This letter will be reviewed by the Home Secretary following an assessment by SACRILL. Specials have raised their concerns at not being considered for Taser training. DAC D’Orsi has responded stating the review of probationers was raised by Chief constables and specials would be looked at from the summer onwards. In the meantime DAC D’Orsi has invited special constable representation on the National less lethal working group to put forward national special constabulary views.</td>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.19</td>
<td>Armed Policing CTSPO Enhanced Capability: Simon Chesterman would liaise with the North East and Eastern regions on their feedback.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>DCC Simon Chesterman</td>
<td>DCC Simon Chesterman</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>All regions were updated on the CTSPO decision at the National Armed Policing Working Group. This included addressing the feedback raised by two regions. We are developing an implementation plan for the new capability, working with regional armed policing leads.</td>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-18</td>
<td>Regional Papers</td>
<td>4.3.26</td>
<td>Developing Requirements for Secret Level Networking: Mike Barton to write to the North West providing more clarity around cost prior to committing to ongoing funding.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Mike Barton</td>
<td>Mike Barton</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>ACC Richard Berry has liaised with the North West and provided more clarity around costs.</td>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>Potential Future Structure for Local Policing Coordination Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reviewing the Local Policing Coordination Committee: Simon Cole to work with Simon Bailey to include vulnerability in the approach to prevention.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Simon Cole &amp; Simon Bailey</td>
<td>Simon Cole &amp; Simon Bailey</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>An update will be provided by DCC Simon Nickless in the April Council meeting as his leading this work on behalf of CC Cole.</td>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Council</td>
<td>Paper Title</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
<td>Action by Date</td>
<td>Action Owner</td>
<td>Allocated To</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>Potential Future Structure for Local Policing Coordination Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Modernising Local Policing - Guidelines (HMC Update) - Mike Cunningham to facilitate further HMICFRS engagement on Neighbourhood Policing Guidance.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Mike Cunningham</td>
<td>Mike Cunningham</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>An update will be provided in the April Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism Update</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Neil Basu</td>
<td>Neil Basu</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>An update will be provided in the April Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>College of Policing Update</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Workforce coordination committee to prepare a combined response on the banding for apprentices.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Giles York &amp; Mike Cunningham</td>
<td>Giles York &amp; Mike Cunningham</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>An update will be provided in the April Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>Pay and Conditions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Francis Halgood to confirm that £18,000 Pay Point Zero for PC Apprentices meets the living wage requirement.</td>
<td>03-Apr-18</td>
<td>Francis Halgood</td>
<td>Francis Halgood</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>£18,000 is approx. £1700pa above the highest rate (for 25 yrs+) of the national living wage, therefore this is significantly higher for apprenticeships. Met officers will received the London weighting allowance to make up for the fact that £18k is less than the London living wage.</td>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to present chief constables with a final update on progress against the NPCC 2017/18 Delivery Plan (the Plan). It will also consider risk to delivery of those objectives that are being carried forward to 2018/19.

1.2 Chief constables are asked to note this update and assessment of risk. A full report containing further detail on each objective is available through ChiefsNet.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Plan was agreed at Chief Constables’ Council in April 2017. It is intended to complement national work undertaken by the College of Policing, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, Home Office and other law enforcement agencies to ensure a coordinated national response to the challenges faced by policing and wider law enforcement.

2.2 The NPCC Delivery Plan is structured around five ‘reform strands’ and developed to support the delivery of the eight outcomes of the Policing Vision 2025 (the Vision). Detailed in Appendix 1.

2.3 All updates have been provided by operational portfolio leads and been submitted to the NPCC via the coordination committee chairs. These have been collated and analysed by the NPCC central office.

3 REVIEW OF DELIVERY STATUS AND RISK

3.1 Coordination Committees have reviewed their objectives and provided a status update. The NPCC has reviewed these with the committees. Objectives have been assessed as:

Closed as complete (15), either
• Transferred to business as usual, or
• Where the outcome was achieved and the programme continues, an objective with a new outcome has been included in the 2018/19 Plan

National, multi-year programmes which will continue in 2018/19 (12)

Objectives that have not achieved the outcome by the target date and will be carried forward (7).

3.2 Risk has been assessed for the programmes that have been carried forward.

In addition, there is concern over the consistent ability and willingness of forces to adopt national solutions. There are clear programme actions in place to mitigate these risks which the NPCC is actively monitoring.
3.3 14 objectives were completed in 2017/18, with the outcomes were achieved within the timeframe.

3.3.1 Six objectives are closed and will be transferred to business as usual.

2.3 The Undercover Online (UCOL) model has been rolled out to all ROCUs with only one yet to fully complete. Recruitment is underway and it is transferring to business as usual.
2.8 The HMICFRS recommendation to transfer Organised Crime Group Mapping to the ROCUs was delayed initially by funding but will be complete by the revised target date of March 2018.
2.9 The programme to develop a CT border policing model has delivered against the objective and the financial targets met. A small transition team will continue to manage any change required due to dependencies on other programmes. The outcome has been achieved.
2.4b The Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) reporting model is in place with returns being received from Q3. Further refinements are being made in line with the review of the SOC Strategic Action Plan.
3.6 The Oscar Kilo website for wellbeing self-assessment has gone live and all forces have signed up to it. There is a landscape review team in place to ensure all forces are completing the self-assessments.
5.5 The guidance on entering suspect data on PND has been issued.

3.3.2 A further nine objectives have achieved their outcomes but will move into a new phase in 2018/19 and have therefore been included in the 2018/19 Plan as new objectives:

1.1 The HMICFRS recommendation for Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines is complete; the draft guidelines were presented to CCC in January and will be published in April 2018. 15 forces are engaged in the pilot, which will form part of the 2018/19 Plan.
3.7 The HMICFRS recommendation to review the shortfall in investigative capacity was completed and work to address the issues and develop opportunities will continue in 2018/19.
3.3 A Diversity Strategy and Workforce Toolkit have been developed and (subject to the approval of CCC in April 2018) will be implemented as part of the 2018/19 Plan.
3.5 Work on workforce futures will continue in 2018/19 with specific focus on understanding force readiness for transformation.
2.6 The Transforming Forensics programme has established two pilot sites and developed a business case. In 2018/19 they will support forces gain accreditation in line with the regulator’s requirements.
1.2 The Vulnerability Action Plan was developed and agreed during 2017/18. A new objective in 2018/19 will deliver a coordinated approach and support the implementation of the plan.
1.5 The objective to develop a response to Modern Slavery across policing has been achieved. The delayed report from HMICFRS meant that the action plan and benchmarking of forces was delayed, however this will be completed and a follow on objective is included in the 2018/19 Plan.

2.2

*S31(1)(a)(b) & S24(1)*

2.4a

*S31(1)(a)(b) & S24(1)*
3.4 Seven objectives have not delivered their outcomes within the timeframe and will be carried forward with revised target dates in 2018/19. These are showing either Amber or Green/Amber delivery RAG risk and will be reassessed during the development of the 2018/19 Plan.

1.3 The National Protocol to reduce the criminalisation of children in care has been produced but is delayed with the Department for Education. This is expected to be launched by July 2018.
1.4 The police/fire collaboration work continues and the work streams have been revised and updated. There is a new target date of April 2019 proposed.
1.6 Work to transform police volunteering has not been completed as planned due to delays in funding. The revised date of March 2019 is contained in the Plan for 2018/19.
2.7 Development of standard practice and an effective response to Foreign National Offenders continues with a new deadline of October 2018. The College has agreed to develop Authorised Professional Practice, scheduled to be complete by August 2018. Training and implementation phase should be complete by October 2018.
3.1 An interim submission to the Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB) was made in February 2018. A programme of work has been established to make a final submission by April 2019 and is contained in the 2018/19 Plan.
3.2 The national strategy for abuse of authority for sexual purpose was launched on time, however a self-assessment exercise identified that not all forces have fully adopted it. A new objective to fully implement this by March 2019 has been devised.
3.4 The reform of misconduct regulations will be carried forward to 2018/19. Phase 1 and 2 are complete and phase 3, which will involve an overhaul of the disciplinary system, has been delayed and it is anticipated the regulations will be laid in January 2019.

3.5 12 objectives relate to multiyear, national programmes. They are all included in the 2018/19 Plan with more specific outcomes for the period. These are discreet programmes which are largely contingent on continued national funding and include: the Specialist Capabilities Programme; the Digital Policing Portfolio; CT programmes; the National Commercial Board; and Business Enabling Programmes.

3.5.1 The current risk to delivery of these programmes varies:

![Delivery Risk RAG Rating](image)

3.5.2 The Specialist Capabilities Programme has secured funding for a further year. The approach to capability leadership has been developed and TSU is the first capability to go live with the data dashboard pilot. A development framework has been developed and the role of capability lead is being piloted. Payment mechanisms are being explored and tested. Risk is Amber/Green.

3.5.3 The DPP programmes continue, with funding for 2018/19 still awaiting ministerial sign off. The programme has been working on developing charging mechanisms and they have had initial discussions with the Finance Coordination Committee. Common risks relate to recruitment and funding.
4.1 The DPP Single Online Home will go live initially in October 2018 and deliverables for 2017/18 have been largely met. The programme is in the process of securing Statements of Intent from forces to join the SOH. Amber risk.

4.2 The Dil Programme’s outcome for 2017/18 was to provide a national target operating model and this is on schedule to be published on 31 March 2018. Green RAG to deliver.

4.3 The DETs Programme pilot sites are on schedule to go live in September 2018 with roll out commencing in June 2019. Amber risk due to funding and procurement risks.

4.4 The Mercury programme submitted and gained approval from the Home office for the Strategic Business Case and the Outline Business Case. The Full Business Case (FBC) was due for submission in February 2018 but will be delayed to May/June 2018. The risk is amber due to funding and spend issues. These are being mitigated through adjustments in the FBC.

2.5 The rollout of NCIA is on schedule with the exception of London (due to resource challenges and challenging timescales). The risk is amber due to benefits realisation risk; this is being addressed through a refresh of the FBC and resourcing.

2.10 The high level design for the regional network for the CT/OC Prison Intelligence network has been approved and milestones are being met. Green, very low risk to delivery.

3.5.5 The work of the National Commercial Board remains on track to deliver savings and efficiencies by 2020. The programme will have delivered £273m savings against the ministerial target of £350m with a further £100m proposed over the next 3 years. The milestones for 2017/18 will be delivered. There is an Amber Green risk rating due to dependency on force engagement and risks of data reliability.

3.5.6 The four national technology programmes within the Business Enablers strand are reporting high levels of risk of delay (with cost and dependency impact) as well as resourcing and funding issues.

5.1 The Operational Communications in Policing team continue to lead on interaction with national, Home Office programmes including ESMCP, NLEDP and HOB and engage with Chief Constables’ Reference Groups. The risk rating has moved from Amber to Amber/Red due to the uncertainty of ESMCP implementation, and associated costs of delay. Focussed work is underway to ensure that the Service’s advocacy with programmes and senior officials is as compelling and effective as possible.

5.2 The programme to deliver standards across policing has progressed but been delayed by funding and technical resourcing issues. The Amber/Red RAG rating reflects this and the risk that forces will not adopt them. The three Technology Standards for Policing have been identified and agreed;

- Commercial Standards - owned and managed by Police ICT Company
- Technical Standards - owned by the NPTC
- Data Standards - constructed to deliver a common description of policing.

5.4 The National Enabling Programmes are reporting Red risk to delivery. They have made progress: the Windows 10 Design (endpoint) and the Security Risk Management teams have made significant progress, and the Outline Business Case has been approved by LETU. Specific risks include:

- Uncertainty over funding of the programmes which is being addressed with the PRTB
- Dependency on other programmes, being mitigated through programme workshops
- Office 365 benefits could be impacted by forces finding their own solutions. Attempts to mitigate this have had limited impact. Further work by the design team is ongoing
- Funding requirements for force readiness is not yet clear and this is being addressed.

5.6 The Technology Portfolio Regional Roadshows have successfully spread awareness of the national programmes. The national programme ‘dashboard’ reporting is now available through the NPCC Operational Leadership Group and IMORCC, providing further transparency between national programmes and the service. The risk is Amber/Green due to delays in the force level milestones.

4 ACTION REQUIRED

4.1 Chief constables are asked to note this update and assessment of risk.

Sara Thornton
Chief Constable, NPCC Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Outcome</th>
<th>Local Policing</th>
<th>Specialist Capabilities</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Digital Policing</th>
<th>Business Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Crime</td>
<td>1.1 N’hood Policing Practice Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Police Volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Delivery</td>
<td>1.4 Police/Fire collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Modern Slavery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Children in Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering Threats</td>
<td>2.1 SC programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Armed uplift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Undercover online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4a SOC Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Foreign National Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 Border policing model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10 Prison Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Experience</td>
<td>3.7 Detective Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Analytics</td>
<td>4.1 Digital Public Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Digital</td>
<td>2.4b SOC performance model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 OCG Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Services</td>
<td>2.5 NCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Transforming Forensics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce and Culture</td>
<td>3.1 Reward Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Abuse of Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Workforce Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Misconduct Regs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Workforce Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Digital first – digital evidence transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 CT Mercury Prog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 CLEP/Shared Services/ Enablement and Commercial Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 National Technology Portfolio standard reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Programme Outcomes and RAG

Withheld S31(1)(a)(b) & S24(1)
# Programme Rag Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Overall (confidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, budget and quality with adequate resource appears <strong>highly likely</strong> (&gt;80% probability of success) with no major outstanding issue that, at this stage, appear to threaten deliver significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber/Green</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, budget and quality with adequate resource appears <strong>probable</strong> (60 - 80% probability of success); however, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, budget and quality with adequate resource appears <strong>feasible</strong> (40 – 60% probability of success) but significant issues already exist, requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly should not present a cost/plan overrun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber/Red</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, budget and quality with adequate resource appears <strong>in doubt</strong> (20-40% probability of success), with major risks/issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, budget and quality with adequate resource appears <strong>unachievable</strong> (&lt;20% probability of success). There are major issues, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme may need rescoping and/or its viability reassessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Programmes are either yet to be initiated or in the very early stages, and a RAG rating at this stage would not be relevant or accurate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to present chief constables with the 2018/19 National Police Chiefs’ Council (NPCC) Delivery Plan objectives. These are attached at appendix 1.

1.2 Chief constables are asked consider the proposed objectives and approve their inclusion in the Plan.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The 2018/19 Delivery Plan (the Plan) is designed to support the Policing Vision 2025 and reflects decisions made by Chief Constables’ Council and the six functions of the NPCC. In doing so, the Delivery Plan sets out the priorities for the NPCC for 2018/19.

2.2 Delivery Plan objectives have been developed by the coordination committee and portfolio leads in consultation with the NPCC. Each objective has been agreed with the committee and endorsed by the chair.

2.3 Each objective has been developed with clear outcomes with defined measures and milestones. This will form the basis for the reporting of progress and risk against the Plan. Details of each objective are available on ChiefsNet.

3 STRUCTURE OF THE PLAN

3.1 The NPCC annual delivery plan is structured around five ‘reform strands’ and has been developed to support the delivery of the eight outcomes of the Policing Vision 2025 (the Vision). This is detailed in appendix 2. It is intended to complement national work undertaken by the College of Policing, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, Home Office, and other law enforcement agencies to ensure a coordinated national response to the challenges faced by policing, intelligence agencies and the wider law enforcement community.

3.2 The Plan is made up of 39 objectives, over half of which (20) are new for 2018/19 and reflect:

- Changing demand on the service e.g. economic crime and fraud, cyber-crime and County Lines
- Current challenges facing the service e.g. Brexit, GDPR and youth engagement
- HMICFRS concerns and recommendations e.g. implementing neighbourhood guidelines, improving 999 call performance, further work to address investigator shortfall and the development of digitally enabled services
Further development and embedding of work completed in 2017/18 e.g. forensic accreditation, firearms (CTFSO) uplift, vulnerability action plan and work on workforce transformation and pay reform.

3.3 Seven objectives remain in the Plan from 2017 with extended deadlines. These were largely affected by delays to funding and will be closed in the early part of the year.

3.4 The remaining 12 objectives are large, multi-year programmes which are largely funded through the transformation fund, which carry forward into 2018/19 with new objective outcomes for the period. These include the Digital Policing and Specialist Capabilities programmes, national programmes under the business enablers strand, and CT change programmes.

4 ACTION REQUIRED

4.1 Chief constables are asked consider the proposed objectives and approve their inclusion in the NPCC 2018/19 Delivery Plan.

Sara Thornton
Chief Constable
NPCC Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Outcome</th>
<th>Local Policing</th>
<th>Specialist Capabilities</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Digital Policing</th>
<th>Business Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communities and Crime | 1.2 Vulnerability Action Plan  
1.8 Police Volunteering  
1.4 National Youth Engagement  
1.5 N’hood Guidelines | 2.9 Brexit preparation  
3.5 Detective Capability                                                                 | 4.1 Digital Public Contact  
4.2 DII                                                                 | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |
| Integrated Delivery   | 1.9 Police/Fire collaboration  
1.1 Modern Slavery  
1.7 Children in Care  
1.3 Prevention, problem solving | 2.1 SC programme  
2.4 SOC Reform  
2.12 Foreign National Offenders  
2.8 Prison Intelligence  
2.2 Cyber Specialist Capability  
2.6 County Lines  
2.7 Economic Crime/Fraud  
2.10 Delivering Armed Uplift                                                  | 3.5 Detective Capability                                                   | 2.3 Use of PND, HOLMES, SISII and NSN                                          |                                                                                |
| Countering Threats    | 1.6 CMD / 999 answering times                                                                                                  | 4.1 Digital Public Contact  
4.2 DII                                                                 | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |
|                       | 2.5 NCIA  
2.11 Transforming Forensics                                                                                                 | 4.3 Digital first – DET  
4.4 CT Mercury Prog.  
4.5 Digitally enablement                                                   | 5.1 HO ICT programmes  
5.7 Technology and data standards                                            |                                                                                |
| Citizen Experience    | 4.1 Digital Public Contact  
4.2 DII                                                                 | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |                                                                                |
| Data and Analytics    | 5.6 Disclosure                                                                                                                  | 4.2 DII                                                                 | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |
| Technology and Digital|                                                                                | 4.3 Digital first – DET  
4.4 CT Mercury Prog.  
4.5 Digitally enablement                                                   | 5.1 HO ICT programmes  
5.7 Technology and data standards                                            |                                                                                |
| Enabling Services     |                                                                                | 5.2 NCB – SS, CLEP, Comm model  
5.5 National Technology Portfolio standard reporting                        | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |
| Workforce and Culture | 3.6 Abuse of Authority  
3.3 Misconduct Regs  
3.2 Diversity Strategy  
3.4 W/F reform  
3.1 Pay reform                                                                 | 5.2 NCB – SS, CLEP, Comm model  
5.5 National Technology Portfolio standard reporting                        | 5.3 National Enabling Programmes  
5.4 GDPR and LED implementation                                              |                                                                                |
NPCC Delivery Plan 2018/19

Proposed Objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CC/Reform Allocation</th>
<th>Responsable CC</th>
<th>2017/18 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>By March 2019, implement and embed a structured and coordinated response to Modern Slavery and Organised Immigration Crime across policing, to mainstream within the co-ordinated approach to vulnerability/exploitation.</td>
<td>Crime Ops</td>
<td>Shawn Sawyer</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>By March 2019, embed the agreed National Vulnerability Action Plan to deliver a co-ordinated approach to vulnerability across the public protection strands: Using the National Vulnerability Action Plan, College of Policing Vulnerability training and review of the Serious &amp; Organised Crime strategy to influence a coordinated police approach to the exploitation of vulnerable people.</td>
<td>Crime Ops</td>
<td>Simon Bailey</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>By January 2019, develop a national youth engagement project to keep young people safe from harm: Within the Digital Public Contact Portfolio, plan, develop and deliver engagement content for young people with the police using social media In partnership with the Personal Social Health Education Association (PSHE) develop accredited expertise for face to face engagement between young people, schools and the police</td>
<td>Local Policing/Digital Policing</td>
<td>Olivia Pinkney</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>By August 2018, test and develop the new neighbourhood policing guidelines within a series of police force environments: Launch, disseminate and embed the guidelines Work with 15 police forces nationally to measure implementation and effectiveness of the guidelines Identify &amp; develop gaps in the evidence base surrounding Neighbourhood Policing’s contribution towards vulnerability, serious &amp; organised crime, counter terrorism, online engagement and prevention. Identify funding opportunities to support this development in Neighbourhood Policing</td>
<td>Local Policing</td>
<td>Gavin Stephens</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>By March 2019, improve performance on answering 999 calls to police: design and oversee a range of control measures to ensure timely handling of 999 calls to police, improving accessibility into the service, reducing the threat, risk and harm for victims.</td>
<td>Local Policing</td>
<td>Alan Todd</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>By June 2018, develop a national protocol to prevent the unnecessary criminalisation of children in care.</td>
<td>Local Policing</td>
<td>Olivia Pinkney</td>
<td>CF new deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>By March 2019, develop a strategy to scale up and transform Police Volunteering by: Assessing national representation of Special Constabulary Developing strategies and delivery plans for Special Constabulary and Police Support Volunteers Refreshing the Employer Supported Policing scheme Developing Citizens in Policing innovation and good practice</td>
<td>Local Policing</td>
<td>Shawn Sawyer</td>
<td>CF new deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>By April 2019, in line with the duty to collaborate detailed within the Policing and Crime Bill, develop a national framework and approach to enable closer collaboration between police and fire services.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Simon Edens</td>
<td>CF new deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC Specialist Capabilities Objectives 2018/19</td>
<td>CC/Reform Allocation</td>
<td>Resp. CC</td>
<td>2017/18 Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 By March 2019, ensure the agreed specialist capability recommendations are delivered in alignment with the</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>CC Barton</td>
<td>C/F with new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialist capability delivery board, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Investigations (review, CCTV, HOLMES):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence (analysis, review and retention, internet intelligence &amp; investigation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 By March 2019, create a force wide cyber capability and implement the objectives contained within the capacity</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Pete Goodman</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and capability strategy and annual plan (2018) for cyber-crime as a national, specialist capability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 By January 2019, ensure CT and Crime networking and IT opportunities are fully understood and exploited across</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>DCC Davies</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the service, including the use of PND, HOLMES, SISII and NSN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 To drive &amp; co-ordinate the NPCC response to tackling the threat from serious &amp; organised crime by connecting</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Andy Cooke</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the capacity and capability across the NPCC portfolio’s and working in partnership with key delivery agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as the National Crime Agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Complete the rollout of the National Common Intelligence Application (NCIA) across the CTP Network by March</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>Dave Thompson</td>
<td>C/F with new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During FY18/19, the APOLLO Programme is expected to complete the rollout and the associated business change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to CT/DE users in the network including MPS SO15 and MPS hosted National CT Units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 By December 2019, through the national county lines coordination centre, develop and implement an</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Duncan Ball</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate policing response to County Lines in conjunction with key stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure national join up over county lines and associated vulnerability operational tactics, strategy and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information sharing across police forces and key partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 By October 2019, implement reforms to national coordination of fraud investigation across local, regional</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Ian Dyson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and national policing and integration with the National Economic Crime Centre tasking and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 By April 2019, deliver an integrated counter terrorism and organised crime intelligence network across the</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism/</td>
<td>Terri Nicholson/</td>
<td>C/F with new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial estate.</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Jason Hogg</td>
<td>outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a picture of threat, risk and vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and manage offenders in custody who represent the highest risk of harm to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the effective collection, use and management of intelligence to prevent disrupt and prosecute, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highest priority groups and individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide oversight and direction of covert assets, to support the collection of intelligence within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial estate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>By March 2019, ensure that policing understands and is prepared for the various possible outcomes of Brexit (crime): Ensure that UK law enforcement has planned for all possible operational scenarios associated with Brexit and taken steps to mitigate any loss of capability caused by this process.</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Richard Martin</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>By March 2019, deliver the armed policing uplift in conjunction with the Specialist Capabilities Programme. To embed the uplift of 41 ARVs in England and Wales into Business as Usual: Develop the National CTSFO Capability and Capacity to meet National Security Council requirements and deliver the Armed Policing Objectives of the Specialist Capabilities Programme</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Simon Chesterman</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>By December 2018, support forces to achieve accreditation of forensic disciplines in line with the requirements of the Forensic Regulator to ensure business continuity and confidence in the CJS: Support forces in achieving ISO accreditation requirements for a range of forensic disciplines, in line with the requirements and timelines of the FSR.</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>CC Debbie Simpson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>By September 2018, improve the effectiveness of response to Foreign National Offenders by developing standard practice across all forces: Deliver Authorised Professional Practice (APP) that will act as a reference point for UK policing on all aspects of International Criminality. The work will be published in association the College of Policing following collaboration with relevant NCPCC portfolios and external agencies.</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>DAC Richard Martin</td>
<td>C/F new deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC Workforce Objectives 2018/19</td>
<td>CC/Reform Allocation</td>
<td>Resp. CC</td>
<td>2017/18 Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Design and develop a new reward framework for policing by April 2019.</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Francis Habgood</td>
<td>C/F new deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 By March 2019, implement the Diversity Strategy and Workforce Toolkit</td>
<td>EDHR</td>
<td>Gareth Wilson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Work with the College of Policing and Home Office to develop Phase 3 of the complaint and misconduct regulations for the police service by March 2019. Implement the legislative changes by April 2019</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Martin Jelley</td>
<td>C/F new deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 By March 2019, improve the quality of investigations &amp; well-being of investigations workforce across policing, including the delivery of the agreed recommendations from the Investigator Resilience Review in liaison with national colleagues, the College of Policing, HMICFRS and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Crime Operations</td>
<td>Gareth Wilson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 By March 2019, develop and implement a prevention strategy and research around inappropriate relationships with victims and abuse of authority for sexual purpose. Advise and direct all forces on best practice to eliminate the risk posed from officers and staff abusing their position for sexual purpose or to pursue an improper emotional relationship</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Martin Jelley</td>
<td>C/F new deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC Digital Objectives 2018/19</td>
<td>CC/Reform Allocation</td>
<td>Resp. CC</td>
<td>2017/18 Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> By March 2020, develop capabilities, services, content and national standards that allow the public to be informed, reassured and empowered in transacting, interacting and engaging with policing digitally.</td>
<td>Digital Policing / Local Policing</td>
<td>Simon Cole</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2</strong> By March 2020, provide the necessary operating model, enhanced capabilities and people, skills, knowledge, policy and standards to deliver the vision and enable continuous improvement through the provision of mechanisms for police and partners to constantly assess DII capability and gaps</td>
<td>Digital Policing / Crime Operations</td>
<td>Michelle Dunn</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3</strong> By March 2020, have all case file information and unstructured evidential multimedia relevant to a criminal prosecution, digitally captured, stored once where possible, and accessible on demand to all CJ partners, facilitating the effective use of video enabled / virtual justice capabilities/</td>
<td>Digital Policing / Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Giles York</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4</strong> By July 2019, deliver enhanced national digital connectivity across the CTP network, specifically the ability to ‘join the dots’ and the ‘ability to surge’ by: Connectivity to all 5 CTUs (Secure cabling, allowing direct access to each other’s data sets) Increased Storage &amp; Compute capability (central &amp; regional) Improved Ways of Working (New tools &amp; standardised processes to exploit Digital media &amp; Open Source data sets; Open Source Exploitation, Remote Viewing, Unified Case Management)</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>Neil Basu</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5</strong> By September 2018, support Chief Constables in framing ambitious plans to improve digitally enabled services within their forces, in line with the HMICFRS PEEL Police Efficiency 2017 Recommendation: An archetypal, best practice ambitious plan for digitally-enabled services. A joined up national framework of flexible choices for local adoption.</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Ian Dyson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC National Enablers Objectives 2018/19</td>
<td>CC/Reform Allocation</td>
<td>Resp. CC</td>
<td>2017/18 Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 During 2018/19, lead for the service on the implementation of ESN (Emergency Services Network), HOB (Home Office Biometrics) and LEDS (Law Enforcement Data Service):&lt;br&gt;Ensuring that the Service is best placed to represent policing within Home Office-led programmes, and to maximise the benefits from programmes once delivery begins.</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Richard Morris</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 During 2018/19 oversee and ensure the delivery of the five Commercial Work-streams; CLEP, Shared Services, Enablement, Commercial Models and Estates in support of delivering the following by March 2021:&lt;br&gt;Savings of £120m&lt;br&gt;Improved collaborative working across forces&lt;br&gt;Improved commercial capability.</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Lynda McMullen</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 By April 2019, plan, deliver and implement the National Enabling Programmes. Oversee the second year tranches of a suite of multi-year programmes that (contingent on resourcing from the Police Transformation Fund) will ultimately deliver:&lt;br&gt;Service-wide Identity and Access Management platform&lt;br&gt;Nationally available ‘Collaboration Workspace’ for Productivity Services&lt;br&gt;National Management Centre to counter cyber threats to, and on behalf of, all UK police forces.</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Ian Dyson</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 During 2018/19 prepare and support the implementation of GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) and LED (Law Enforcement Directive). Oversee and support preparations and readiness for GDPR and wider considerations through an ongoing compliance regime needed for the Data Protection Act 2018 in the police service through:&lt;br&gt;Assisting and supporting chief officers to deliver compliance through co-ordination of best practice advice and training resources&lt;br&gt;Represent the police service as single point of contact and liaise with key stakeholders</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Ian Dyson</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 By April 2019, further refine reporting mechanisms for programmes within the National Policing Technology Portfolio in order to deliver effective strategic oversight as well as enhancing interoperability and coordination through mechanisms including a service-wide Business Change Council and ‘Road Shows’ to forces.</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Richard Morris</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 By April 2019, deliver the National Disclosure Improvement Plan and embed a thinking approach to all investigations:&lt;br&gt;Ensure that all relevant material to either prove or disprove whether an individual is responsible for committing an offence will be properly considered and recorded.</td>
<td>CICC</td>
<td>Stuart Prior</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Progress the delivery of relevant technical and data standards for policing. By March 2019 (contingent on resourcing from the Police Transformation Fund):&lt;br&gt;Coordinate and assisting in the delivery of a range of relevant data and technical standards&lt;br&gt;Further develop the Standards Publishing beta site making it fit for purpose and production ready&lt;br&gt;Coordinate and develop a communication and engagement strategy for the dissemination of standards within the police community and amongst partners / industry.</td>
<td>IMORCC</td>
<td>Dr Steve Harvard</td>
<td>C/F with new outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NPCC - Coordination Committees
Basic Requirements – March 2018

The full governance arrangements for coordination committees are set out in the revised s22A agreement and make reference to basic requirements of each coordination committee. This document details the basic requirements, which will be reviewed annually. Any changes will be agreed with coordination committee chairs.

1. Terms of reference

Each coordination committee¹ will publish their Terms of Reference on ChiefsNet. Terms of Reference will be reviewed/updated on an annual basis.

2. Coordination Committee Meetings

A minimum of four meetings a year will be scheduled.
Future dates will be included in the NPCC diary which is published on ChiefsNet.
Minutes will be taken of the meeting and published on ChiefsNet.
The agenda will contain the following standing items:

- Minutes and Actions
- Delivery Plan Update/ Portfolio update
- Transformation Fund Programme update
- Review of papers proposed for submission to Chief Constables’ Council
- NPCC/Communications update (to be provided by an NPCC representative)
- Risks/Issues

3. Quarterly updates to NPCC

Coordination committee chairs will provide quarterly updates for the NPCC Delivery Plan for submission to Chief Constables’ Council and an update to the NPCC Audit and Assurance Board. A portfolio update will be provided for the joint NPCC/College quarterly staff officers meeting.

¹ The International Coordination Committee, due to the unique constitution and complexity of the multi-agency agenda, will be unable to fulfil these requirements. The NPCC has recognised they may not be achievable in full and alternative arrangements based on three meeting a year and a prescribed agenda have been agreed.

05/01/2017

National Police Chiefs’ Council (NPCC) 1st Floor, 10 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0NN - 020 7084 8950
4. **Papers for Chief Constables’ Council**

All papers for submission for Chief Constables’ Council must have the approval of the coordination committee chair and/or the committee. Papers will need to comply with the following requirements:

- Where possible papers should be no more than four pages
- Contain a statement of which committee is submitting it and when it was approved
- State a clear purpose and the decision required from the paper
- Contain a statement/details of cost or resource implications, including the impact of not doing what is proposed
- Where no cost or resource implication is identified this must be stated.

5. **NPCC Support**

The NPCC will provide a representative at meetings (either a Business or Communications Lead) to share information on matters relating to central coordination e.g. Chief Constables’ Council, Reform, Delivery Plan and Communications.

6. **Communications**

Working with the NPCC Communications team, coordination committees will communicate on behalf of the NPCC to explain operational police issues forming part of their remit.

Each committee will have an allocated Communications Officer overseen by the Communications Manager to provide support.
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1. College of Policing update

1.1 This paper provides a summary of discussion and decisions made at the last Professional Committee meeting held on 28th February 2018 and provides an overview of College leadership development activity.

2. Professional Committee update

Update on Disclosure (Stephen Kavanagh)

2.1 The Committee was briefed on the College’s contribution, alongside National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Crown Prosecution Service to the police service’s collective response to recent failures in the criminal justice system related to disclosure. There was agreement that an effective communications plan should be prepared, detailing how changes being implemented now will bring about improvements.

Henriques’ Recommendations Review (Rob Beckley)

2.3 Members discussed a paper put forward by AC Rob Beckley providing a stocktake of victim and complainant terminology on ‘believing’ victims in crime recording and investigations, brought about by the Henriques’ report. The key (disputed) recommendation from Henriques is that the police should not be instructed to ‘believe’ victim accounts. The paper put forward three options the last of which (option 3) included a recommendation to move away from the term ‘belief’ and focus on professional behaviours. Views on either side of the debate where expressed, but overall there was greater support for moving to option 3.
2.5 The Chair agreed that the paper would be shared for further debate with the Police Federation and Superintendents’ Association prior to circulation at the next Chief’s Council to allow for wider input. Following these discussions the College will then put forward its recommendations to the Home Office for consideration.

**Media APP Review (Oliver Cattermole)**

2.6 Members supported the clarifying amendment to the Media Relations APP on the identification of deceased people under investigation.

**Licence to Practise (David Tucker)**

2.7 The Committee was asked to consider a revised licence to practice model. The License to practice approach will apply to those working in high risk policing roles. It will support the professionalism and welfare of those working in these roles and drive consistency of service delivery.

2.8 Members supported the concept and model. Members also supported taking forward a licence for public protection leaders. However, there was considerable concern about the timescales for implementing the legislation and it was the view of the Committee that L2P should be progressed without regulations, drawing on voluntary support of forces. It was agreed that the work to develop the regulations should be developed as a separate strand of work.

**Police Education Qualification Framework (PEQF) (Sam Peach)**

2.9 The Committee was provided with an update on the PEQF, including an outline of the College’s approach to consultation on the introduction of senior qualifications. Key issues highlighted included an impending appeal decision on the police constable degree apprenticeship funding band, an update on the Welsh apprenticeship levy funding issue which remains unresolved; and a request by some forces to lower the age that people can apply to join the service. Members discussed entry in and out of the service, as well as requesting more work on costs and workforce modelling, as part of this work.

2.10 The College plans to formally consult on proposals for senior qualifications during April/May 2018 for a six week period. The College will continue to test and challenge the draft options with key stakeholders to help shape and inform the consultation paper outline, prior to formal launch.

**Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines Update (Richard Bennett)**

2.11 Members noted progress in the development of the Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines and supported the College’s proposed approach to releasing the guidelines in April 2018, with a phased release of supporting materials to ensure that they are tailored to meet the needs of different users (i.e. chief officers, force leads and practitioners).

**Health and Wellbeing Update (Mike Cunningham)**

2.12 The Committee was updated on the progress of the £7.5m Police Transformation Fund Wellbeing fund. Support was sought for the College’s approach to address health and wellbeing issues for the profession, including an open stakeholder event on 14 March. There was support for the approach and its three key strands of work. These include undertaking a landscape review of current gaps and capability needs; evaluating existing provision; and piloting new approaches to welfare services for potential national roll out. Members suggested the proposed timescales need to be clarified, along with considering the broader view of stakeholders.

**Foresight to Support Long-Term Planning in Policing (Gavin Thomas)**

2.13 Members were asked to consider the College and PSAEW proposal for the creation of a strategic forward planning capability exploring how key trends and drivers of change will shape policing’s future operating environment. Members supported the proposal for the College to take this work forward, indicating that it was also vital for the spending review. It was recommended that this should be linked into the NPCC Finance Coordination Committee.
Workforce Transformation Update (Sam Peach)

2.14 A final version of the strategic narrative and interactive timeline on workforce transformation and all the national programmes that sit within it was shared with members. Feedback was requested on how best to share the interactive document with the Service to ensure maximum impact. ‘Workforce Transformation in the Police Service’ has been developed to support planning, implementation and highlight interdependencies and benefits of all the initiatives to enable delivery of the Policing Vision 2025 and will continue to be updated, when necessary. Members agreed the document was helpful but the information on pay and grading required more detail. Sara Thornton emphasised the need to remain focused on the successful implementation of the initiatives it contained.

College Priorities 2018/19 (Mike Cunningham)

2.15 Members were updated on the status of the current draft business plan that the College Board has agreed will act as a holding plan, whilst the College undertakes work to crystallise its priorities. The Chair informed members that work has been initiated to refresh the College’s purpose and priorities. The College has also started work to develop a detailed stakeholder engagement plan to help communicate key messages. This work will help to clarify direction of travel and support more effective engagement on the workforce transformation agenda with the service.

College Business & CDG Update (Rachel Tuffin)

2.16 Members noted the update on current College business and decisions from its Coordination and Development Group. Rachel Tuffin drew members’ attention to the recently launched jobs and opportunities board within the College Membership website.

Chief Constables’ Council Update (Sara Thornton)

2.17 Members noted the update from the January Chief Constables Council meeting.

AOB

2.18 Members were updated on the advanced practitioner element of the Leadership Review, where a pilot will be running with 7 forces over the coming months. A further update will be provided to the Committee in due course. GT questioned how other initiatives, such as ‘lead constable’, for example, were being considered and how they interconnect and support each other.

2.19 DT raised the recent Worboys Supreme Court decision that was found to be a breach of Article 3 of the Human Rights Act; and also brings into question the quality of investigations. Given the potential significance of this decision, the issue will be further discussed at Chief Constables’ Council, looking at what it means for the professionalisation of investigations.

3. College Business Update: Leadership Development

3.1 This section provides an update of progress made since the last Chief Constables’ Council on key areas of work aimed at supporting leadership development including:

- Review of Senior PNAC & SCC phase two
- Publication of guidance for appointing chief officers
- Leadership development at all ranks and grades

Review of Senior PNAC & SCC Phase 2

3.3 The first phase of the review of Senior Police National Assessment Centre and Staff Assessment Process (Senior PNAC) and the Strategic Command Course (SCC) resulted in actions which led to significant improvements in the numbers and diversity of applications for Senior PNAC. The 2018 SCC cohort is the most diverse for at least a decade and came to a successful close on 23rd March 2018, with 40 students completing the course.

3.4 Phase two of the Review commenced in October 2017. A consultation was carried out in November-December on the following issues, which were then discussed with the SCC Professional Reference Group. o the name and purpose of the programme;
the structure and timing of the modules;
- direct entry at chief officer (ACC/DCC); and
- creation of a career development hub.

**Name and purpose**

3.4.1 There was consensus that the programme should be renamed the Chief Officer Leadership Programme and focused on ‘developing senior leaders in law enforcement to lead policing operations and organisations locally, regionally and nationally, at chief officer level.’ This name and purpose reflect repeated feedback that ‘command’ is only part of the leadership required at chief officer level and that chief officer leadership development is contained within a programme, not just a course.

**Structure and timing**

3.4.2 The changes to the SCC and SPNAC meant there was an opportunity to change the delivery of the SCC to be delivered in two modules, with a 5 month break. The consultation and SCC-PRG were split on this point, and the College will seek further evidence before a decision is taken, including asking the most recent SCC cohort for their views.

**Direct Entry at ACC / Commander and DCC/DAC**

3.4.3 Following a request from the Policing Minister and the Home Office, the College agreed to explore direct entry at ACC / Commander and DCC / DAC. The College proposed that initially this should be focused on those at the appropriate levels from other law enforcement agencies. Such a focus would help to minimise the additional training and experience requirements. There were strong views from the consultation on both sides, with some supportive of opening up wider than law enforcement, and others strongly opposed. Some felt that gaining greater diversity through police staff roles at ACO was a preferred option. Responses also recommended learning from other direct entry schemes, and noted that job design would need to be considered with regards to operational responsibilities. CPOSA pointed to a lack of evidence of benefits, and the need to retain and test operational command skills. The SCC-PRG endorsed opening the entry to operational staff from other law enforcement agencies, and work to progress these proposals will begin shortly.

**Creation of a leadership career development hub**

3.4.4 Following the Chief Officer appointments survey, the College of Policing was asked to develop a proposal for a hub that would allow the College, NPCC, PCCs and the Home Office to develop and support the selection of chief officers to help boost applicant numbers, including police staff, and superintendents, and improve representation of under-represented groups,

3.4.5 The proposals included in the consultation were as follows:

- **Overseeing continuous professional development**
  - Delivering the SCC and supporting the CPD of the most senior leaders
  - Providing ongoing career development advice and guidance
  - Oversight of NPCC portfolio, secondment and temporary promotion opportunities
  - Holding a database of those qualified through SCC including skills and experience

- **Supporting diversity and inclusion**
  - Working to increase the talent pool, diversity/numbers of applicants for senior positions
  - Providing positive action initiatives for under-represented groups
  - Progressing direct entry at ACC / Commander and DAC / DCC
  - Maintaining oversight of the progression of HPDS and fast-track alumni

- **Supporting appointments**
  - Overseeing the delivery of the SCC assessment processes
  - Supporting forces to establish criteria, job and candidate matching and full support to the process
  - Providing a central facility transparently to prioritise and consistently advertise vacancies
  - Providing an executive search facility for chief officer and ACO appointments
  - Offering expertise and guidance in the running of open and transparent selection processes
  - Overseeing a structured and consistent process for ACC/Commander and DAC/DCC direct entry
3.4.6 There was broad support for the development of the hub in the consultation, although there were different views on its exact functions, along with additional suggestions. Respondents were keen that it should have pace, quality, and capacity and should not create bureaucracy. There was a strong view that it should be funded centrally, with some discretionary services paid for at the point of use.

3.4.7 Since January, College has developed and agreed a high level proposal, followed by a commissioned business case for funding for the hub, with the Workforce Transformation Group and Police Reform and Transformation Board. The College submitted the case to the Home Office at the beginning of March and is awaiting completion of the validation process and confirmation of Police Transformation Fund allocation. Resourcing arrangements are being considered in anticipation of the decision.

Guidance for appointment of chief officers
3.5 The College has also recently published updated guidance which incorporates legislation and eligibility requirements, as well as good practice in selection and assessment of chief officers. The document aims to support PCCs, Police and Crime Panels and Chief Constables in recruitment, to ensure the best and most talented individuals apply for the most demanding roles, and that the most suitable candidates are appointed.

Leadership development at all ranks and grades
3.6 Alongside the leadership careers hub, the College has also submitted a commissioned bid to the Police Transformation Fund for a leadership and management development model for all levels, and is awaiting Home Office sign-off. A new Virtual Learning Environment for leadership launches at the beginning of April, with a number of forces taking part in a pilot. As part of this process, the Chartered Management Institute level 6 and 7 in Leadership and Management and Coaching Level 5 will be available to officers and staff.

3.7 As part of a partnership with the PSAEW, a series of 12 coaching workshops have been delivered regionally to superintending ranks and other interested colleagues, with the specific aim of them using these skills to develop and support the progression of those from under-represented groups.

4. DECISIONS REQUIRED

4.1 Council members are invited to note the outcomes and decisions arising from the College’s February 2018 Professional Committee meeting and the update on the College’s work on leadership development, set out in the paper.

   CC Mike Cunningham

   CEO College of Policing
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1. INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE

1.1. Ensuring an effective response to service needs arising from demands on the police is vital to improving performance and service delivery through better decision making on the allocation of resources and informed prioritisation. Work so far has included the initial assessment of demand by the College of Policing\(^1\), the considerable work undertaken by the PMCC Reference Group, the paper submitted by the Finance Co-ordinating Committee in January this year and work undertaken by HMICFRS to introduce Force Management Statements.

1.2. The service has made good progress in developing its understanding of demand but more work is needed. The challenge remains to translate the emerging knowledge into a shared understanding of how the service provided to meet demands can keep pace with the changing profile of demand complexity and to understand how this knowledge can be used to assess the effective use of resources. This requires a service-wide effort and willingness to share data and knowledge. There is some urgency to this work that suggests that work will need to start at the earliest opportunity and by June 2018 at latest.

1.3. There are four key imperatives that lend urgency to the work described and that have influenced the timeline contained in appendix 1:

1.3.1. This is basic business information that the service should have available to drive accountability across police forces;

1.3.2. The introduction and further development of Force Management Statements offers potential to support the development of improved understanding of demands on the police and of how services are provided;

1.3.3. It is anticipated that the next Comprehensive Spending Review will commence in 2019. The service needs to ensure that the lessons identified during the last process are addressed. There needs to be a clear description of service outcomes and a robust evidence base regarding demands on the police and effectiveness with which it is met. Ultimately this will support the ability to describe the impact of resourcing decisions on the services provided to the public.

1.3.4. Police forces are experiencing strain in meeting the challenges faced from more complexity of demands and in adapting services to meet the new landscape they face. This has serious potential implications for the wellbeing of the individual officers and staff carrying a significant demand burden and stress as a result.

2. BACKGROUND

\(^1\) [http://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Documents/Demand%20Report%202013_1_15_noBleed.pdf](http://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Documents/Demand%20Report%202013_1_15_noBleed.pdf)
2.1. The main findings and recommendations from ‘Better Understanding Demand – Policing the Future’ described the existing state of knowledge and best practice. There remains a need for increased clarity of definition of demands, the resulting service needs and the resource implications of providing services. It also identified a number of areas where knowledge and understanding could be improved with particular emphasis on building a better way to identify and quantify hidden demands on police and to understand the drivers of internal demands. Translating the available information into a meaningful narrative to support assessment of individual force productivity and efficiency remains a challenge for the police. The paper provided to the NPCC meeting in January by Mr Thompson has helped to steer the work outlined here.

2.2. The current proposal seeks to build further on the work already done, providing a single service-led response to concerns about the limitations to current understanding. At its core the proposal is to establish a service-led Centre for Excellence in Demand Management to drive a consistent understanding of demands and how this links to case loads, resources, productivity and outcomes, to share understanding of how societal, technological and political changes become a need for service, how services can be provided effectively, efficiently and legitimately and, finally to further promote best practice across the service.

2.3. This is also an opportunity to build an evidence base to support discussions between the Home Office and Treasury at the next Comprehensive Spending Review about an appropriate level of overall funding for policing. Key to this is improving the understanding of the interplay between demands, services and capacity on productivity and efficiency. Further opportunities exist to share best practice in resource management and demand reduction across policing and to capture opportunities for service-wide learning.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. The project will draw together knowledge and experience from the various strands of inter-related work being undertaken across the NPCC portfolios including work being done within the Finance and Workforce Co-ordination Committees.

3.2. This will provide opportunities to:

3.2.1. Develop a technical reference group of experts and practitioners to steer the definition and understanding of demands on the police;

3.2.2. Build the evidence base improving police understanding of demands and how it is changing, what services need to be provided and the resource and cost implications of delivering those services;

3.2.3. Identify indicators of demands, the services needed and service provision to support improved assessment of the standards of service provided;

3.2.4. Support the development of the information provided in Force Management Statements including assessments of capability and capacity;

3.2.5. Inform the assessment and continuous improvement of performance, how it is measured, monitored and managed;

3.2.6. Support the development of coalitions with other public services to maximise opportunities to deliver a catalogue of services through alternative channels;

3.2.7. Seek to fill gaps in knowledge and information, engaging resources from across the police and other stakeholders including engaged academics and partners;

3.2.8. Work with the College to develop effective service-wide demand modelling processes.

3.3. Experience from earlier work suggested that a small dedicated team is needed to deliver progress. It is proposed that the team be comprised of a small project support hub providing governance, leadership and support with a team drawn from a diverse mix of police forces and skills including analytical, demand management practitioners and policy leads working virtually. The investment requirement to support this is set out in paragraph 3.6.

3.4. Workstreams:

6 workstreams have been identified from the recommendations of the earlier work. Appendix 1 provides an outline of the expected timescale for delivery and appendix 2 provides additional detail describing how these workstreams will approach the tasks.
3.3.1 Understanding current demands:
Identify existing and emerging information that meets defined criteria to describe public, protective and internal and manageable/failure demands; Validation across the service, providing assurance about the consistency and reliability of the data; Identify additional datasets or information sources that can be used to better describe hidden demands and vulnerability/diversity;

3.3.2 Defining the services required to meet demands:
With the support of a technical reference group, develop and disseminate a shared understanding of the services required to meet the demands identified in 3.3.1. This should compliment the Policing Vision 2025; Consult with public and key stakeholders.

3.3.3 Productivity and resourcing:
Work together with the Finance and Workforce Co-ordination Committees to develop a service wide understanding of the relationship between demands, need for services, resources and costs; Describe the evidence about capacity and capability to meet demand; Use this understanding to evidence the impact of resourcing limitations on service to the public; Build a reliable mechanism for measuring and assessing internal demand.

3.3.4 Developing effective practice:
Reducing demand and optimising capacity; Working with the South Yorkshire Problem Solving Team to provide a consolidated approach evidencing the impact of prevention, early intervention and problem solving on demand reduction; Developing a consistent approach to risk based resource allocation; Share best practice.

3.3.5 Predicting demand:
Collaborating with existing big data models to predict demand change over time and inform optimal resource deployment decisions; Work with the College and HMIC to develop effective demand modelling processes; Horizon scanning to identify and understand the impacts of significant change.

3.3.6 A whole system approach to public sector demands:
Work together with the West Yorkshire Demand Partnership to support the development of ‘whole system’ thinking across the public sector; undertake an evidence review to identify best practice among partners and draw together an evidence base demonstrating effective collaboration and opportunities for innovation.

3.4 There is a potential role for the College of Policing to support the police service through a co-ordinating and commissioning role including but not restricted to:

3.4.2 Scoping and specifying specialist research requirements, being the key link between the police service and other academic and research bodies;

3.4.3 Commissioning the police service and specialist business areas to undertake work that contributes to or validates the evidence base;

3.4.4 Holding information and knowledge, providing a central point of reference through hosting a central on-line communications capacity via POLKA and planning and hosting workshops and events via the What Works Centre and Evaluation Toolkit;

3.4.5 The College may need some additional discretionary resource in order to be able to fulfil this requirement. The indicative investment requirement includes a provisional sum to support this.
3.5 There is a potential role for the APCC to work with the NPCC to support discussions with the government about the resources required to keep the public safe.

3.6 The initial resource needed from the police service to support the further development of the approach outlined here will include:

3.6.2 A project lead drawn from officers or staff with leadership aspirations and who may be current or potential SCC candidates;

3.6.3 Secondees or loans from forces (4 initially) – officers and professionals with a rich skill mix and relevant and current experience in demand analysis and management and policy delivery;

3.6.4 In addition police forces that are the leading practitioners in certain areas of policing or demand management may be asked to participate in research or to validate findings.

3.7 The cost of running the proposed hub is summarised below at around £645,000 in comparison to an overall policing budget of £11bn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police service</th>
<th>Cost £k pa</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project lead</td>
<td>£119,000</td>
<td>Assumed to be at C. Supt level or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner secondments x 4: demand mgmt practitioners; analytical professionals; policy professionals. Project support officer</td>
<td>£284,000</td>
<td>Assumed to be at Insp level or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary budget</td>
<td>£59,000 £57,000</td>
<td>Assumed at tier 5 For travel and other costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x support staff</td>
<td>£56,000 £70,000</td>
<td>Assumed at tier 4/5 For workshops and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£645,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative investment requirement** £15,000 per police force, per year for 2 years

4. **CONCLUSION**

4.1 In summary there are a number of risks to the service should the project not go ahead including:

4.1.1. The service will not be in a position to defend the existing protections to police funding at the next CSR;

4.1.2. The service will be at risk of reputational damage from external scrutiny with consequent impact on public confidence and police legitimacy;

4.1.3. The service is at risk of being overwhelmed by the changing nature of demand and individual officers at risk of ‘burn-out’;

4.1.4. The service provided to the public could be at risk and may eventually increase the risk of harm, analogies to the public health ‘postcode lottery’ may become a policing reality;

4.1.5. There is an ethical concern about the use of public funds and the commitment to ensure that funding delivers the optimum service.

5. **DECISIONS REQUIRED**

5.1. Members are invited to support the following recommendations:

5.1.1. Agree the approach set out here and agree to commit to support and participate in the work;

5.1.2. Agree to support the direct investment of the project from individual police forces in principle;

5.1.3. Agree to share completed Force Management Statements and associated data with the team for the purposes of supporting this proposal;

5.1.4. Commit to nominate key contacts within their forces who can be the key point of access for any requests for information;

5.1.5. Commit to identifying key stakeholders, experts and practitioners to join the technical reference group supporting the definition and understanding of demand on the service;

5.1.6. Agree in principle to recruit suitable candidates via quick time expressions of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Bill Skelly</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chief Constable</th>
<th>Lead Area</th>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix 1.  
**Professionalising Police Demand Management – outline timetable for proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated timescale</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Year 1 Q1**       | Recruit suitably experienced team  
An initial review of best practice from elsewhere – other public sector or private organisations or international examples of best practice |
| **Year 1 Q2 – Workstream 1** | A clear articulation of current demands on police  
Provide a catalogue of service needs arising from demands |
| **Year 1 Q3 – Workstream 2** | Feedback to support development of FMS  
Defined service level agreements |
| **Year 1 Q4 – Workstream 3** | Mechanism for measuring and assessing internal demands  
Framework to assess capability and capacity of individual police forces to provide the services needed to meet demands  
A clear articulation of national demands on police, the services needed and capacity and capability to support the evidence for resource requirement for policing. |
| **Year 2 Q1 – Workstream 4** | Framework to support demand reduction through problem/risk mitigation, and optimising capacity and capability  
Universal risk assessment framework  
Knowledge exchange platform/forums  
A clear articulation of risk to public service |
| **Year 2 Q2 – Workstream 5** | National environmental scanning product  
Predictive demand model |
| **Year 2 Q3 – Workstream 6** | Evidence-base for effective collaborative working across public sector  
Framework to support increased cross-agency demand management |
| **Year 2 Q4** | Progress review  
Next steps |
Appendix 2.
Professionalising Police Demand Management – outline proposal for workstreams

1. **Understanding current demands:**
   1.1. Identify existing and emerging datasets that meet defined criteria to describe public, protective and internal demands for service. Draw together existing data sets including Force Management Statements, Annual Data Return, Police Objective Analysis and data provided to support HMICFRS inspections. Analyse the available data to provide an articulation of the services that are needed to meet the demands. This will lead to the refinement of 2.1.
   1.2. Validation of the data across the service, providing assurance about the consistency and reliability of the data. Working with police forces and HMICFRS to understand the limitations in the data and to develop more accurate and meaningful reporting processes. Feed the learning from this analysis back into the development of the FMS and other data requirements.
   1.3. Identify additional datasets or information sources that can be used to better describe hidden demands and vulnerability/diversity. The College of Policing are currently working to identify metrics that might be used to describe vulnerability and diversity. Working together with this team to develop an understanding of how this data can be used to describe demands and the implications of this for the service needs that result.

2. **Defining the services required to meet demands**
   2.1. Support the reconsideration of the role and scope of the services that the Police Service provides;
   2.2. Bring together a co-ordinated group of technical policing stakeholders, experts and practitioners including police force representatives of Chief Constables and Police & Crime Commissioners, HMICFRS, the College of Policing, the Home Office and academia.
   2.3. Applying the results from the initial analysis of demands on the police to improve understanding of the relationship between demands and needs for services.
   2.4. Provide a clear articulation of the police services required to meet demands.
   2.5. Drawing from the high level Policing Vision 2025, develop a detailed articulation of the services provided by police, their purpose and function;
   2.6. In consultation with public and key stakeholders describe expectation through a set of defined service level agreements.
   2.7. Consult with public and key stakeholders.

3. **Productivity and resourcing:**
   3.1. Work together with the Finance and Workforce Co-ordination Committees to develop a service wide understanding of the relationship between demands, services needed and the implications for efficient resourcing and costs;
   3.2. Assess the understanding and application of techniques such as Systems Thinking, Value Streaming, Lean Manufacturing and Process Mapping to improve the efficiency of internal processes in order to reduce internal demand and improve productivity;
   3.3. Build a reliable mechanism for measuring and assessing internal demand;
   3.4. Consider building on existing work to develop a national assessment framework of police activity;
   3.5. Describe the evidence about capacity and capability to meet demand;
   3.6. Use this understanding to evidence the impact of resourcing limitations on service to the public.
   3.7. Drive forward the debate about how Police Service funding can be linked to the totality of demand on the service.
   3.8. In collaboration with the Finance Excellence in Policing Programme developing a service wide agreed set of metrics that can be used to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy of services provided to meet demands.
4. **Developing effective practice:**
   4.1. Working together with the South Yorkshire Problem Solving Team to increase the emphasis on prevention and early intervention rather than reaction. This would include increased focus on collaborative working to alleviate vulnerability;
   4.2. Defining a framework to identify opportunities to reduce demands through effective problem/risk mitigation, and optimising capacity and capability;
   4.3. Working with the South Yorkshire Problem Solving Team to provide a consolidated approach evidencing the impact of prevention and problem solving on demand reduction;
   4.4. Draw together evidence about effective decision making about deployment and resourcing;
   4.5. Support the development of innovative approaches to service provision that exploit digital opportunities;
   4.6. Provide a clear articulation of risk, risk assessment and impact and from this develop a diagnostic approach to risk assessment that will support better resourcing decisions;
   4.7. Consider how risk assessment tools and techniques such as THRIVE and MoRiLE could be adopted across the service;
   4.8. Support a clear focus for risk assessment on the risk presented to the victim, offender or community;
   4.9. Engage with the 2018 Excellence in Policing focus on risk to build a clearer understanding of what risks are being assessed, how and to what purpose. Support the development of a clear understanding of the services required to tolerate, mitigate or address risk. Ensure a clear distinction between risks, service needs and police response;
   4.10. Identify opportunities to quantify or evidence the risk to service provided to meet public demand;
   4.11. Working together with the College of Policing and other stakeholders to provide effective platforms and forums for knowledge exchange and sharing best practice.

5. **Predicting demands:**
   5.1. Consider how investment in systems and partnerships to gather demand management information and analytics might be applied to better predict future demand;
   5.2. Collaborating with existing big data models to predict demands change over time and the implications for service needs, informing optimal resource deployment decisions.
   5.3. Draw together the various systems and processes being developed across the police service to build predictive models of demands to deliver more accurate demand modelling processes;
   5.4. Support the development of innovative approaches to understanding digital demands and the implications of this for service needs;
   5.5. Environmental scanning to identify, understand and share the expected impacts of significant change;
   5.6. Work with the College to identify methods or models that can be used to understand the implications of predicted changes in demands on service needs and resources;
   5.7. Support the development of a model that integrates predicted demands with predicted capacity and capability of the police.
6. **A whole system approach to public sector demands:**

6.1. Working together with the West Yorkshire Demand Partnership, support the development across the service and the public sector of a greater focus on collaborative working and ‘Whole System’ thinking;

6.2. Establish a partnership reference group to include representatives from key areas of partnership working: health, social services, housing, mental health services, ambulance, fire for e.g.

6.3. Undertake an evidence review in order to draw best practice from other public sector agencies and others about how demands are identified and predicted and how this information is then applied to determine the service needs and to drive resourcing decisions;

6.4. Draw together evidence in specific areas where police and partners have worked effectively together to reduce demands across the public sector—children missing from home for example, place based approaches.

6.5. In collaboration with partner agencies identify opportunities for applying this learning to better address other demands through more effective partnership working and increased collaboration.
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1. INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE

1.1. The writing of the Operational Advice document was originally tasked to DCC Harrington by the previous Chair of NPPOPs, Justine Curran as an action within the working group. There is currently no definitive NPCC Event advice or College of Policing APP guidance available to forces.

1.2. The purpose of this Operational Advice is to ensure consistency in relation to the roles undertaken by police, how police engage with event organisers and other partners. This document is not definitive guidance, instead it sign-posts the reader to other Authorised Professional Practice, NPCC publications and other recognised guidance.

1.3. The document will provide advice to forces in relation to problem solving or high risk events and will sign-post guidance, legislation and policies which will assist in the policing of events thereby preventing or reducing crime, disorder and terrorism.

1.4. The target audience will be Chief Officers, Police Commanders and Planners of all events which require a police presence or some form of pre-agreed police response.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The advice document has been through the College of Policing Solutions Panel on 2 occasions in December 2017 and February 2018. It has been QA’d by College of Policing.

2.2. It has been legislatively checked by the Essex Police Force Solicitor.
2.3. The advice has gone out to Consultancy with DCC Harrington’s National Events Working Group and through the National Policing Tactical, Training & Equipment Working Group (TTEWG) currently chaired by DCC Paul Brandon.

2.4. The document has been circulated to NPPOPs chaired by ACC Chris Shead, and subsequently submitted through the Operations Coordination Committee and was well received by the group chaired by CC Alex Wood.

2.5. The document will inform the events module of the National Police Public Order Training Curriculum which is a mandatory College of Policing Course for Commanders. This commences on 1st April 2018.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. There is currently evidence of good and poor practice within forces nationally in relation to the planning of and policing of events. This document will ensure national consistency thus ensuring good practice in this area.

3.2. This advice will inform the events module of the mandatory National Police Public Order training course for Commanders from 1st April 2018.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1. There is currently no generic national advice available to forces in relation to events. This document is a one-stop signposting document to provide the very much needed advice which will ensure consistency in the way we plan and police events. Events is a huge area of business, incorporating sport and festivals in enclosed and open arenas and in private and public places. There is much confusion nationally as to where to find relevant information and this document will close that gap.

5. DECISIONS REQUIRED

5.1. That this advice document can be officially submitted to all forces via Chief Constables as NPCC Operational Advice for Events, stored within the Police Library, recorded on Chief’s Net and linked to relevant College of Policing APP Guidance. That is also utilised as recommended advice to inform the events module of the National Police training curriculum.

Name: Alec Wood
Title: Chief Constable
Lead Area: Operations
Event Policing – NPCC Operational Advice Document
v5.4 (Final Draft Version) (05.03.2018).

Introduction.

The UK is a world leader in the events sector. The UK’s event industry is estimated (in the HM Government BusinessVisitsandEventsStrategy2015) to contribute £39.1 billion to the UK’s economy, accounting for 35% of the UK’s visitor economy. The industry is estimated to employ over half a million people, primarily in small to medium sized enterprises with the top ten leading event agencies in the UK having a turn-over of more than £2 Billion.

This document has been issued by the NPCC National Events portfolio lead. This document is not definitive guidance, instead it sign-posts the reader to College of Policing Authorised Professional Practice (APP), NPCC Publications and Government Agency or third party directives & guides (such as the SGSAGreenGuide and events industry guidance such as the Events Industry Forum ‘PurpleGuide’ (subscription applies). This document has been produced following comprehensive consultation with Police Forces and provides a route map to the operationally accepted best practice and guidance. It has been endorsed by the NPCC.

This document refers to legislation applicable in England and Wales. In relation to Police Scotland and the Police Service of Northern Ireland, devolved legislation in place in those force areas should be substituted for the legislation shown in this document where applicable.

1. Events to which this advice applies.

This document is applicable to all events which require a police presence or some form of pre-agreed police response. This document should be considered and used for all events, even where specific advice is provided by other NPCC Leads, for example football; also refer to FootballAPP.

An ‘event’ (for the purposes of this operational advice) is a planned public or social occasion. This definition includes the policing of the following types of events (this list is not exhaustive):

- Sporting events including those sporting events which take place on the public highway (i.e. marathons, fun runs, etc.).

- Concerts and festivals.

- Charity events.
Parades (which do not meet the requirement to notify police under Section 11 Public Order Act 1986, namely, processions or parades commonly or customarily held in the policing area and funeral processions).

2. Aim

The aim of this operational advice is to:

- ensure consistency in relation to the roles undertaken by police, how police engage with event organisers and other partners and charging for police services
- provide advice to forces in relation to problem solving problematic or high risk events
- sign-post guidance, legislation and policies which may assist in the policing of events thereby preventing or reducing crime, disorder and / or terrorism

3. Role and responsibilities of the Police.

PublicOrderAPP(PlanningandDeploymentSection) states:

The requirement for police attendance and action at an event is based on the need for the police service to discharge its core responsibilities:

- preventing and detecting crime
- preventing or stopping a breach of the peace
- traffic regulation (only under statutory powers relating to events)
- activating contingency plans when there is an immediate threat to life
- Coordinating emergency response activities associated with a major incident taking place at the event.

Public Order APP also states that the following core principles should be applied to the policing of all events in conjunction with command and command considerations (Gold, Silver and Bronze):

- Policingstyleandtone
- Communication
- UseoftheNationalDecisionModel (NDM)
- Command
- Proportionateresponse
- Capacityandcapability

Operations APP also states: When planning a police response, it is imperative that commanders have a clear understanding of the role that police will perform during the
operation. Once committed to undertaking a role outside the core or otherwise statutory and common law duties and obligations, individual commanders may be held accountable for any police activity or inactivity regarding that commitment. Chief constables (or their equivalents) are also likely to be held responsible (e.g., when taken to court). Chief constables, as the employers of police staff, may be accountable in respect of police staff actions. This is very relevant in relation to the policing of events.

It is also widely accepted that the police have no general duty to preserve public safety (crowd control) at any public event, except where there are imminent or likely threats to life. Legal opinion suggests that the responsibility for public safety rests with the organisers of an event, the owners of the land on which it takes place and the local authority if the event takes place on a road. However, other persons or agencies who undertake actions regarding public safety at an event may assume a duty of care and, therefore, also become responsible. In the past the police service has taken the lead and undertaken actions to facilitate public events, acting for what they believed to be the public good. However, a more focused approach, confining police action to those issues which are part of our core responsibilities and where there is legal authority, must be adopted.

Further to the above, in the current financial situation, forces must also carefully consider every deployment of officers and staff and consider whether each deployment (whether paid for or not) represents best value and is the best use of the resource. This is particularly relevant in the field of event policing where, by the very nature of the event, there is an existing event organiser (many of whom will be organising the event for commercial purposes) with a moral and legal obligation to ensure the safety and security of people attending their event. For most events, this will mean organisers take their responsibilities seriously, comply with relevant legislation and put in place adequate control measures to manage crime, disorder and security meaning the presence of police is not required or is limited.

However, there will be occasions where the management of crime, disorder or security-related issues is beyond the capability of the organisers and the presence of police may be required. Examples of such events may include (not an exhaustive list):

- events with a national profile which attract significant public interest/attendance (possibly including live TV broadcast)
- events likely to result in significant crime and/or disorder (See Section 6 below re role of SAG and Section 7 below re problem solving high risk events)
events where the audience profile may (through no fault of the event organisers) lead to an increased risk of criminality, disorder, safeguarding issues or terrorism (such an event may include an event likely to be attractive to large numbers of young people attending on their own). See Section 9 below.

After considering the above, it is recommended that all forces:

- fully consider known and likely events within their force areas/regions and document their approach by way of the Public Order StrategicThreatandRiskAssessment (STRA) process, thereby ensuring a strategic approach to the policing of events
- have in place processes (in line with IntelligenceManagementAPP) to identify events which may require a police involvement and effectively assess the threat, harm and risk presented by such events
- make decisions regarding the policing of events, the management of risk related to events and the deployment of police resources in accordance with the NationalDecision Model (NDM)

The above STRA, intelligence, risk management and decision making processes could lead to the force deciding to adopt one of the following options in relation to any specific event coming to their attention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Likely contributing factors to decision making (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not policed (but ongoing assessment by way of force tasking and coordination processes)</td>
<td>No current intelligence to indicate any risk of crime &amp; disorder or terrorism (or a low risk which can adequately be managed by the organisers of the event). Low profile event with only limited attendance and only local/regional interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual attention by Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPT)</td>
<td>Low risk of crime &amp; disorder nearby to the event or terrorism, with crime &amp; disorder issues inside the event area being managed by the organisers of the event. Low to medium profile event with reasonable attendance and regional or national interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency policing operation with police liaison in Event Liaison Team (ELT) / Multi-Agency Control (MAC) (regardless of whether or not police are deployed within the event footprint)</td>
<td>Low to medium risk of crime &amp; disorder or terrorism which may require some form of police intervention due to unknown or untested capability of the event management or a police-led protective security plan. Unknown (or difficult to assess) participant profile/behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full policing operation with full command structure, etc.</td>
<td>Medium to high risk of crime &amp; disorder, all or part of which is beyond the capability of the event management (i.e. gang attendance, risk of child protection issues, etc.) or increased risk of terrorism. High profile event attracting national interest, live TV coverage, high numbers of young people attending on their own, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Intelligence systems and processes.

As stated above, effective Intelligence Systems and Processes (Intelligence Management APP) are essential to ensure risks related to events with force areas are effectively managed. The Intelligence APP gives detailed guidance on ensuring effective intelligence governance, structures, tasking & coordination, dissemination and intelligence products.

Where a decision is made to police an event and implement guidance in the Operations and Public Order APP (including the appointment of a command team), it is essential that a designated Bronze Intelligence is appointed and the intelligence requirement for the policing operation set. Public Order APP gives detailed guidance on what the role of Bronze Intelligence includes.

**Force-wide intelligence Sharing**

All forces should utilise the services of the National Intelligence and Operations Unit (commonly known as ‘Op Gothic’). The unit contributes to the planning of almost all festivals and large scale music events across the country through the provision of problem profiles and by acting as a clearing house for information and intelligence. This has directly led to significant reductions in crime and disorder at many large events and without this function
there is a high probability of increases. This goes beyond simple acquisitive crime at events, with greater risk to the general public, particularly more vulnerable members of the community being targeted. In the area of safeguarding, Op Gothic has been able to ensure event organisers and police operations are aware of threats to public safety posed by illegal drugs, psychoactive substances and weapons. Work also includes tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and modern slavery with persons of interest being circulated to other forces. Operation Gothic can be contacted at Operation.gothic@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

**National Police Coordination Centre (NPoCC) reporting:**

**Use of the National Reporting Form.**

The [NationalPoliceCoordinationCentre(NPoCC)](#) have introduced (with the agreement of the respective NPCC leads) the ‘National Reporting Form’. The National Reporting Form is intended to provide a central reference point of all events and protests in England and Wales. Submitted reports will act as a signpost for further information to support wider learning and identify good practice across forces. Using this information commanders and planning teams will be able to ascertain who had policed a similar event in order to conduct further research to inform and assist their planning. Completion and submission of the form should form part of the debriefing and review process for any operation. The intention is not to submit a form for every single event that is policed nationally. Instead, a pragmatic view should be taken when considering whether or not to submit a form. In deciding whether or not to submit a form, commanders and planners should remember that the underlying aim is to ensure learning and best practice is shared to assist colleagues planning and commanding other, similar, operations. As a result, a form should be submitted for events which meet the following criteria:

- All protests and demonstrations.
- Large scale public gatherings (where the attendance is predicted to be over 500 persons in attendance and there is a police operation with a formal GSB command structure in place).
- Unlawful occupation of land or premises.
- Organised marches and parades.
- Public Military Events.
- Festivals, carnivals or public celebrations.
- Sporting events (excluding football and any other sporting event which are reported by other means).
- Visits by protected VIP’s.
- Any event where the Gold commander consider there is wider learning or knowledge that
will benefit other forces.

Regular music events at fixed venues donotrequire reporting unless there is a specific high profile or notable event that required police intervention.

Further information is available on the Mercury system. Completed forms should be submitted to NPOCC@NPOCC.PNN.POLICE.UK

5. Multi-Agency Working

Safety Advisory Groups.


There is no statutory basis for SAGs and there has been, until recently, there was very little national guidance as to how they should function, their remit and their competency threshold. The ‘UK Good Practice Guide to Working in Safety Advisory Groups’ (available to purchase) published by the EmergencyPlanningCollege is endorsed by key partners and offers advice regarding membership and the considerations as to when an event should be put before a SAG. It remains only as guidance though and acknowledges that in parts of the UK, many areas of good practice already exist that do not adhere precisely to the guidance.

The key purpose of a SAG is to allow for matters of public safety to be considered by all relevant partners so that plans can be developed and, if possible, tested to ensure that reasonably foreseeable risks are then mitigated as effectively as possible. SAGs are not empowered to approve or stop events, or to issue licences. Instead, they are an advisory function that is discretionary when needed. In some cases, SAGs may issue ‘letters of no objection’, ‘letters of no support’ or ‘letters of concern’ to organisers. It is suggested that a draft of any such letters should be cleared by police legal departments if it is to purport (as it should) to come from all the SAG partner agencies. Any concerns that the police service has in respect of safety should be addressed through the Safety Advisory Group chair to the event organiser.

The decision whether or not to bring an event to a Safety Advisory Group should be based upon a consistent approach, considering such issues as the nature of the event, the levels of risk associated with that event and the numbers of people attending the event at any one time. For example, a village fete that has been taking place for many years without incident may be deemed a low risk, but if one year a local band with a national following is invited, that may increase the risk to the event. Attendance numbers and crowd profile, sale of alcohol, scale of the event, risk activities and complexity of the event are some of the factors
partners should use to assess if a SAG may assist regarding public safety (in its’ widest sense) at an event.

Key to an effective SAG will be terms of reference of the SAG which accurately reflect the key role of providing a quality assurance process for safety related measures at an event (or venue). The functions of a SAG should be distinct from any multi-agency planning group established for a specific event and should be different from any multi-agency arrangements in place for the management of an event (i.e. an ELT/Multi-agency control room – see below). Agreeing SAG terms of reference is a matter for members of the local SAG, however, the following may be considered (this list is not exhaustive):

To promote clarity of roles and responsibilities relevant to the event(s) within the SAGs remit.

To advise the local authority and/or event organiser in order to ensure high standards of health and safety.

To promote the principles of sensible risk management in safety and welfare planning.

To promote a consistent and co-ordinated, multi-agency, approach to event planning and management.

To advise the local authority and/or event organiser with regard to forming appropriate contingency and emergency arrangements.

To advise the local authority and/or event organiser in respect of relevant legislation and guidance.

To encourage arrangements to be made to minimise disruption to local communities.

To consider the implications of significant incidents and events relevant to their venue(s) and events.

To consider the implications of significant incidents and events relevant to the surrounding areas and facilities.

To receive reports relevant to debriefs, visits and/or inspections of the venue or event.

In some cases it will be relevant to consider specific terms of reference in addition to these generic examples. These may include:

To advise the local authority with regards to its functions in relation to safety certification.
To advise the local authority with regards to its powers under the licensing legislation.

As stated above, the local authority, building authority, police, fire & rescue service and ambulance service should be considered core members of a SAG. Invited members may include (this list is not exhaustive):

Other local authority representatives as deemed appropriate (this could include Event Team, Emergency Planning, Highways, Health and Safety).
Event organisers/promoters.
Venue owner/operator.
Health representatives.
Stewarding/security.
Traffic/transport providers.
British Transport Police.
Maritime and Coastguard Agency.
Harbour Authorities.
Medical/first aid providers.
Resident/community representatives.
Highways Agency.
Crowd safety managers.

The key issue for the police service representatives at a SAG should be based on the core roles and responsibilities of the police service at events (see Section 4. above). Any intelligence affecting the event should also be disclosed if appropriate to the group. This should be a two-way process with the event organiser being encouraged to provide details around any known or perceived risks.

It is recommended that the police service does not chair SAG meetings as the role of the police is to provide input at the meeting and therefore cannot be an independent chair. Consideration should be considered that by chairing the SAG, police may incur unnecessary liability for the event and lose the ability to focus on police matters.

Depending on the size, scale and nature of the event, consideration should be given as to who is the most appropriate person to attend the meetings on behalf of the police service. It may be that the levels of competence would sit with an operational planner or it may be deemed more appropriate for a Silver or Gold Commander to attend. It is vital therefore that this decision should be made based on competency, necessity and experience. It should be noted that Safety Advisory Groups have no decision-making powers and, as such, a SAG has no power to prevent an event from taking place, although some agencies represented
have powers to do just that if there are serious concerns regarding safety. As a result, police representatives at a SAG should be aware of the powers and responsibilities of other agencies to intervene as well as their own police powers relating to licensing, crime prevention & reduction and the role of police.

**It is strongly recommended that discussions around any police costs take place outside of the SAG.**

There is also a great deal of other guidance and information available relating to safety Advisory Groups available in addition to the EPC guidance and APP mentioned above. This includes:

- **Health and Safety Executive** – The role of local authority safety advisory groups.
- **Sports Ground Safety Authority guidance** (Section 4.3 of the SGSA Certification Guidance)

**JESIP**

Initially the [Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Programme (JESIP)](https://www.jesip.org.uk) was a two year programme which ran from 2012-2014. It was primarily about improving the way the police, fire & rescue and ambulance services worked together when responding to major incidents. What followed, was much needed practical guidance to help improve any multi-agency response to any type of incident or event. The [JESIP Joint Doctrine: interoperability framework](https://www.jesip.org.uk/JD/Interoperability_Framework) sets out a standard approach to any form of multi-agency working. Whilst the initial focus was on improving the response to major incidents, JESIP is scalable and applicable to all forms of event, whether pre-planned, rising tide or spontaneous. The [five jointworking principles](https://www.jesip.org.uk/JD/5Principles) of co-location, communication, coordination, joint understanding of risk and shared situational awareness uses the [Joint Decision Model (JDM)](https://www.jesip.org.uk/JD/JointDecisionModel) (which has its’ roots in the [NDM](https://www.jesip.org.uk/JD/NDM)) and can be applied to any type of multi-agency incident and any environment, incident or event where organisations need to work together more effectively. As a result, police commanders are encouraged to utilise the JESIP doctrine when managing and planning a multi-agency response to any event and when dealing with partners to an event.

**Protocols, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and/or Statement of Intent (Sol).**

In line with the [Operations APP](https://www.jesip.org.uk/APP), partner agencies should be involved in the planning and resolution of operations and incidents as appropriate. Protocols and/or Memorandum’s of Understanding (MoU) / Statement of Intent (Sol) should be clearly defined and agreed between the [Gold commander](https://www.jesip.org.uk/GoldCommander) and counterpart roles within all partner agencies.
This ensures that each agency understands its' role and responsibilities in the operation, and supports an effective line of communication between agencies. Such multi-agency protocols / MoU’s / Sol’s can be developed by way of the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) process (see above). Any multi-agency protocol / MoU / Sol should state:

Which agency is responsible for what, where and when.

What jurisdiction does each agency involved have in the planning of the event.

Responsibilities of each agency.

Establish command, control and coordination structures within each agency at strategic, tactical and operational levels – including the identity of key post-holders within each agency.

How the partnership will react to changes, including a joint understanding of risk and how risk will be managed i.e. increase in risk of violence, intelligence re firearms, inclement weather forecast, etc.

How there will be a hand-over of primacy between agencies, the threshold for such a hand over of primacy and the mechanism for the handover taking place.

How information/intelligence will be exchanged (if need be, implementing an information exchange protocol between all agencies involved in the event) and how shared situational awareness will be maintained.

How key decisions will be made.

The role of the SAG (see above).

To support this process, the gold strategy should specify the role of the police in the operation, and the responsibilities and requirements of other partners and stakeholders.

**Communication and co-ordination between agencies.**

The type and scale of an event will determine the best model for inter-agency working, including whether you need to co-locate communications / liaison functions with other partner agencies (i.e. stewarding/security, emergency services, local authority and first-aid providers in a single control room or Event Liaison Team (ELT)). Such co-location is considered best practice and enhances inter-agency communication, shared situational awareness, joint decision making and the coordinated response to incidents, regardless of whether there are police deployed on the footprint of the event.

**HSE and Events Industry Forum Purple Guide.**
The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) web site contains a host of information, resources, guidance and summaries of relevant legislation for event organisers and partner agencies in relation to running safe events. In addition, the Events Industry Forum have produced the Purple Guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Music and Other Events. This publication is designed to replace the original ‘Purple Guide’ (HSG195) which was originally published by the HSE. The guide aims to help those who organise music or similar events, so that the events can run safely. The guide goes beyond the compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and covers not only legislation and good practice for Health and Safety, but other legislation and good practice across the industry. There are sections of the guide which specifically deal with Crime & Disorder; Working in Safety Advisory Groups (which is an abridged version of the EPC guidance mentioned above); Safeguarding Children and Young People; Crowd Management; Contingencies and Emergency Planning. Knowledge of the content of the guide is essential for police commanders and planners engaging with event organisers and partners.

Testing and exercising plans.

The police Silver Commander should encourage all event organisers of large or complex events to undertake appropriate and proportionate multi-agency testing and exercising of their plans and contingency plans to ensure such plans are effective and fit-for-purpose. Where organisers are reluctant to undertake such testing, this should be raised at the Safety Advisory Group which should scrutinise the organiser’s crowd management plan/safety plan.

6. Problem solving high risk events

Pre-Event.

In certain circumstances, action by the police may be appropriate when a pre-planned event is considered to be unsafe or could potentially result in significant crime & disorder or terrorism. Such action could be (but is not limited to):

- a letter to the organisers advising of the potential danger and their liabilities
- use of Section 12 of the Public Order Act 1986 or Section 13 of the Public Order Act 1986 to restrict or prohibit public processions (this does not apply in Northern Ireland)
- application for injunction
- coordination with the Crown Prosecution Service to remind the land owner of their responsibilities under the Occupiers Liability Act 1984
- action under the Licensing Act 2003 to make objections about a licence or temporary event notice (see below)
Co-ordinate with the event organisers [public liability insurer](#).

Co-ordinate with the [Health and Safety Executive (HSE)](#) to seek improvement notices and/or prohibition notices.

Seek a review of the safety certificate or special safety certificate under the [Safety at Sports Grounds Act 1975](#) (see section 7. below).

Use of dispersal powers under [Section 34-42 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014](#).

Closure Order under [Section 76 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014](#).

(It is recommended that legal advice is taken prior to embarking on the options above).

**Safety Certificates and Special Safety Certificates.**

It should be noted that this section is only applicable to events held inside purpose built stadia.

The [Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975](#) governs the issue of safety certificates and special safety certificates in relation to events which take place in stadia. A great deal of guidance and information can be found on the [Sports Grounds Safety Authority](#) (SGSA) web site and in the SGSA publication [GuidetoSafetyatSportsGrounds(commonlyknownasthe‘Green Guide’)](#).

The Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, requires the county council, unitary authority, metropolitan or London borough (‘the local authority’) to be responsible for issuing and enforcing a safety certificate in respect of sports grounds designated by the Secretary of State. These are sports grounds that, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, have accommodation for more than 10,000 spectators (5,000 in the case of Premier League or Football League grounds in England and Wales). The 1975 Act defines a sports ground as a place where sports or other competitive activities take place in the open air, and where accommodation has been provided for spectators, consisting of artificial structures, or of natural structures artificially modified for the purpose. The Act did not foresee that a sports ground might be fitted with a roof that could be closed for certain events. However, provided that some sport is played with the roof open, such a venue should still be regarded as a sports ground. The legislation does not apply to indoor arenas or temporary arenas (i.e. pop festivals in parks or agricultural land). Instead, these are generally covered by the Licensing Act 2003.
Section2ofthe1975Act allows local authorities to impose such terms and conditions as the local authority consider necessary or expedient to secure reasonable safety at the sports grounds when it is in use for the specified activity or activities, and the terms and conditions may be such as to involve alterations or additions to the sports ground. Special Safety Certificates are issued when the stadium is being used to hold an event of a type not specified in the general safety certificate (e.g. a pop concert being held inside a football stadium).

In order to utilise this legislation to deal with a challenging event taking place (or to implement control measures to manage the impact of such an event), police would be required to show that “admission of spectators to a sports ground or any part of a sports ground involves or will involve a risk to them so serious that, until steps have been taken to reduce it to a reasonable level, admission of spectators to the ground or that part of the ground ought to be prohibited or restricted” (Section10,SafetyofSportsGroundsAct1975). To be able to make an application under this section, police would need to show that the physical condition of the stadium is insufficient to safely manage the event in question (referred to in the ‘GreenGuide’ as the (P) factor) and/or the quality of safety management in place at the stadium is insufficient to effectively manage the event in question (referred to as the (S) factor).

Whilst action under this section is worth considering for events (or potential events) which present a high risk of crime and/or disorder, police commanders and planners must realise that any application under this section must show “how the likely behaviour or conduct of those attending and the inadequacies of the stadium infrastructure or management impacts on the safety of those attending”. Any objection under this section can only relate to the stadium itself (including entry and exit) but not to activity (i.e. drunkenness, disorder or drug dealing) by people attending the concert which takes place in nearby residential areas. This cannot be managed by way of an application under this section (see Licensing Act 2003 below).

**Licensing Act 2003.**

The HM Government publication RevisedGuidanceissuedunderSection182LicensingAct2003 (issued April 2017) is a comprehensive and authoritative summary of applicable licensing legislation which is of great assistance to police commanders and planners in managing licensed events (or potential events) likely to have significant crime and disorder issues associated with the event.
Police must be aware of event organisers objectives under any licence issued under the Licensing Act 2003. The Act sets out four licensing objectives which must be taken into account when a local authority carries out its functions. They are:

1. The prevention of crime and disorder.
2. Public safety.
4. The protection of children from harm.

The LicensingAct2003 offers a great deal of guidance and options for police commanders and planners in managing problematic licensed events with potential powers much wider-ranging than those available under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975. Where a proposed event includes licensable activity such as the sale of alcohol or the playing of live music, police representatives involved during the event planning process should, at the earliest juncture, seek the advice of an experienced police licensing officer and ensure that officer is invited to any planning meeting or safety advisory group. Ideally this contact should be as soon as the police become aware of the proposed event due to time constraints imposed by the Licensing Act 2003.

7. Command, Planning and Tactics

Policing principles.

Where a decision is made to police an event, the principles contained in various College of Policing APP must be followed in relation to:

CommandandControl (Operations APP) and Command (Public Order APP)
OperationalPlanning (Operations APP)
CorePrinciplesofPublicOrderPolicing (Public Order APP)
PlanningandDeployment (Public Order APP)
TacticalOptions (Public Order App)
BriefingandDebriefing (Operations APP)
PostIncidentProcedures (Operations APP)

Crowd science and crowd safety.

As stated in Section 4. above, the police have no general duty to preserve public safety (crowd control) at any public event unless there are imminent or likely threats to life. In addition, the Public Order APP (Planning and Disorder Section) identifies the core responsibilities of police (which does not include crowd safety). However, it is
acknowledged that police commanders and planners do require some form of awareness of crowd science and an understanding of crowd safety in order that they can encourage event organisers, SAG’s and licensing/certifying authorities to, where necessary, take expert advice when required. To this end, the College of Policing now include crowd science in command and planning training and CPD to enable police commanders and planners to identify potential crowd safety issues and request other agencies to take the necessary certified expert advice and/or guidance to safeguard the public.

8. Safeguarding children and young people.

Safeguarding is a term which is broader than ‘child protection’ and relates to the action taken to promote the welfare of children and protect them from harm. Safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility. All organisations that come into contact with children should have specific safeguarding policies and procedures in place. This includes voluntary and community organisations, faith groups, private sector providers, as well as schools, hospitals, event organisers and sports clubs. Safeguarding is defined in the HM Government publication Workingtogethertosafeguardchildren2015 as:

- Protecting children from maltreatment.
- Preventing impairment of children’s health and development.
- Ensuring that children grow up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care.
- Taking action to enable all children to have the best outcomes.

Where an event is likely to attract large numbers of children, police must be proactive in working with event organisers to identify whether the event is being specifically targeted by offenders likely to prey on children at or near the event. Police must ensure that organisers of an event likely to attract large numbers of children, are aware that those attending the event could become a target for exploitation (sexual or otherwise), modern slavery/trafficking, drug supply, other serious & organised crime and CSE. Police commanders should ensure that safeguarding is a priority for event organisers and the Safety Advisory Group. Where safeguarding is not being prioritised, the police service must ensure everything that is legally possible is done to redress the situation.

Children have a right to be protected from harm. It is therefore important that any organisation that works with children or knows children will attend their event(s) have a clear set of guidelines about how they will keep children safe and respond to child protection concerns. The NSPCC web site, offers a great deal of guidance and advice for
organisations who may require advice or assistance in writing and implementing a safeguarding policy.

The following issues should be addressed in the organisers safeguarding arrangements (as a minimum requirement – See Section 7. above Licensing Objectives – point 4 of which covers Safeguarding):

Suitability of the area (or areas) designated for viewing by children (or likely to be occupied by children).

Policy on spectators bringing infants to the event.

Procedures for dealing with lost and found children.

Toilet facilities – provision and ratio.

Revised staffing levels, CRB/DBS checks and levels of training for those areas specifically used to accommodate children or where children are likely to assemble.

Searching policies and procedures.

Refusal of entry, ejections and other policies for dealing with children and young people who are drunk, breach ground regulations and/or commit offences.

Ticketing strategy and entry policy – to include checking of ID to ensure age appropriate when over 18 only events.

Provision of specialist safeguarding, medical and welfare staff – training of stewards in relation to sexual offences (understanding of forensic opportunities, scene preservation, etc.).

Sharing of intelligence – (from other festivals/organisers) awareness of opportunities of OCG’s to coerce victims at event, etc.

A bespoke assessment of the potential risks to children at the event – i.e. who may pose a risk and what situations may increase the risk.

Identification of the different ways someone might raise a concern at the event.

Transparency around the organisation’s annual Human Trafficking Statement (provided the organisation is of such a size to be required to produce such a statement).

The Major Investigation and Public Protection APP gives a great deal of guidance on modern slavery, gangs & youth violence, managing sex offenders, child abuse and child sexual exploitation.
Where such a risk exists, this should be a key element of the investigative strategy and intelligence requirement for the event, with, where necessary, specialist officers employed on the event working under the direction of BronzeCrime.

9. Protective security

The current terrorism threat level makes putting in place effective and proportionate counter terrorism protective security measures challenging (given the volume and size of events which take place within force areas). In relation to protective security, police commanders and planners should consider the following actions/factors at an early stage:

Consider early appointment of a CT Security Coordinator (CT SecCo). Guidance on the appointment of a CT SecCo is available via the secure APP website (pnn email address required). The appointment of a CT SecCo can include the following events or circumstances (not an exhaustive list):

- Public Military Events.
- Party political and other high security conferences, summit, etc.
- High profile ceremonial and civic events.
- Events involving protected persons.
- Crowded place events (including high profile sporting events).
- Other events where the police Gold Commander believes that the appointment of a CT SecCo will support the delivery of a safe and secure event.

The role of a CT SecCo includes:

- Developing a security plan with a view to minimising threat, managing vulnerability and therefore mitigating risk.
- In respect of a policed event or operation - supporting Gold’s strategy.
- Coordinating all aspects protective security by looking at an event holistically from a CT perspective.
- Using an in-depth knowledge and awareness of a range of security assets and their operational deployment to:
Target harden.
Reduce vulnerability.
Lessen risk.

Implement multi-agency protective security measures with the organisers and other partner agencies via the multi-agency planning process and/or SAG.

Explore opportunities for organisers to help and support protective security, for example, through promotion of the ActionCountersTerrorismcampaign.

Ensuring staff involved in policing the event are briefed on any threat and have relevant information available to them, for example,

- NPCC/College of Policing “Terrorism Response: Aide Memoir” (restricted access, available for secure APP web site).
- STA (See, Tell, Act) safe principles for officers should be applied.
  - See: what is happening and where
  - Tell: communicate, describe incident/type of weapon
  - Act: stay safe, update, observe/contain

Ensuring police commanders and planners are aware of relevant counter terrorism command and control functions/structures contained within ‘NPCC (2015) Command, Control and Coordination of Major CT Operations’ (restricted access via secure APP web site)

Work together with the organiser and other partners to implement National Counter TerrorismSecurityOffice (NacTSO) guidance in relation to CrowdedPlaces. This work should also include consideration regarding the development of protocols relevant to the environment and the role of the event organiser and that of the police.

- The implementation of NacTSO “Run,Hide,Tell” guidance is relevant to public places and large open spaces, however, careful consideration must be given regarding the implications of “run, hide, tell” within a stadium environment. Where events are taking place within such an enclosed stadium environment, police must work closely with the safety officer at the stadium to ensure police understand the existing plans for the stadium and how they will be applied to the event in question, should a firearms and/or weapon attack take place.

- Consultation with regional Protect/Prepare leads/teams and Counter Terrorism Security Advisors (CTSA’s) will support the development of these protocols.
Other invaluable guidance can be found through the NacTSO website (which is primarily aimed at the public, businesses and event organisers), NPCC–National Counter Terrorism Policing HQ and National CTPolicing website (only available from PNNenabledaccount) (which are aimed at the police service) and should be seen as the gateway to a range of tactics, advice and products available to businesses, event organisers and the police.

10. Costs and charging

Where a decision is made to police an event, police commanders must review the provision of which services can lawfully be charged to the organiser of the event under ‘Special Police Services’ (SPS) pursuant to Section 25(1) of the Police Act 1996 (as amended). Section 25(1) states:

“The chief officer of police of a police force may provide, at the request of any person, special police services at any premises or in any locality in the police area for which the force is maintained, subject to the payment to the local policing body of charges on such scales as may be determined by that body”.

Special Police Services are police services provided over and above core policing at the request of a person or organisation. This is a very important point when considering SPS and must be borne in mind by police commanders contemplating supplying and charging for police resources under SPS.

It is widely accepted that police can charge for policing inside stadia and on land ‘owned, leased or controlled’ (the ‘footprint’) by event organisers and the organiser’s land immediately outside (i.e. a clubs or event organiser’s private land). Police forces have generally accepted that they cannot charge for event day policing outside the footprint, even when the need for that policing has arisen only because of the event (e.g. officers at and along the route from a train station to the event or nearby town centres which are full of patrons making their way to and from the event).

There have been a number of important legal challenges over the last few years which dictate what police can charge for. These legal cases must be considered by Police & Crime Commissioners, Chief Constables and Police Commanders when considering supplying police resources under SPS.

LeedsUnitedvWestYorkshirePolice[2013]EWCACiv115
IpswichTownFootballClubvChiefConstableofSuffolk[2017]EWCACiv1484

The test laid down by the Court of Appeal in Leeds United was that the most important question in determining whether the policing could be charged for as SPS in the context of a football match (or any other event) was whether the policing was on public or private land.
Policing on public land would usually be in pursuit of the police’s general policing duty and could not therefore be SPS. Policing on private land would generally be SPS, unless it was provided in response to actual or imminent violence (e.g. additional officers being called in to deal with an outbreak of disorder). The Court of Appeal's ultimate conclusion was:

“The policing of the extended footprint on match days is provided in order to maintain law and order and protect life and property in a public place. None of the arguments advanced on behalf of WYP persuades me that the law and order services provided by them in the extended footprint are different in principle from the law and order services that they provide in any other public place. I would dismiss this appeal.”

The court added:

“For as long as it remains the law that police operations connected with football matches are in part SPS and in part normal police operations, so that a line has to be drawn somewhere, the drawing of that line along the boundary between the private land of the host club and the public highway outside it seems to me to be the best normal (although not invariable or automatic) means of identifying SPS”.

Forces should consider the language used by the Court of Appeal in Leeds United and now Ipswich Town. It is hard to think of a realistic example policing on public land that might permissibly be charged as SPS (a police escort for a wide load travelling on a public highway is the only example that has been offered by the Court of Appeal - in the Leeds United case).

Due to the fact the demarcation between what can be charged for in relation to stadium- based events, it becomes more challenging in interpreting the guidance in relation to other events and it is recommended that forces take legal advice in cases which are not clear cut. For example, it is clear that police could charge SPS for any police officers deployed inside a temporary concert arena in a park which the event organisers have leased from the local authority and erected large fencing around the event (thereby creating a temporary arena) where access is only granted by way of a purchased ticket. However, police would not be able to charge to police a fair in a local park where the park remains open to the public, even although the company operating the fair has paid the local authority to be able to do so (i.e. the fair remains a public place). Similarly, following the Ipswich Town ruling, police would not be able to charge for the policing in a public road which has been closed and operated by agents of the organisers to facilitate crowds in to and out of the event due to the fact the road remains a public place (even if closed to traffic).
In relation to the charging for SPS the NPCC Guidance on charging for police services provides a great deal of information for forces to ensure consistency and compliance with Section 25(1).

**Firearms.**

It is the view of the NPCC lead for Armed Policing and the NPCC Lead for the policing of Events, that any decision to deploy firearms at an event is no different from any other decision to authorise the issue and deployment of firearms for any other policing purpose. As a result, any decision regarding the issue and deployment of firearms at an event to which this advice applies should be taken in accordance with the Armed Policing APP. Furthermore, it is also the view of both NPCC leads that firearms officers should not be deployed to an event under SPS. The rationale for this view is that if the threat is so significant that the authorisation for the deployment of firearms officers is required, then it is considered that this is a core responsibility of police and, hence, should be provided without cost recovery under Section25(1)ofthePoliceAct1996.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The attached paper (main paper annex) was tabled and discussed at the College of Policing Professional Committee on 28th February 2018. The paper and recommendations, including the recommended third option at 8.10 (4.8 below), were supported by the Committee albeit some members expressed a preference for the first option. It was agreed that the paper would be circulated for wider consideration through the NPCC, Superintendent’s Association and Federation as there are some strong and varying opinions on this matter. The College of Policing will then take stock of the feedback and remit it back to Professional Committee if appropriate. A summary of the paper is provided below.

2. Summary and Background Information

2.1 In 2016 Sir Richard Henriques wrote a report into the Metropolitan Police Service’s handling of non-recent sex allegations against high profile offenders, Operation Midland. In his report he made a number of recommendations including two, the subject of the attached review. One was the use of terminology; that in investigations “complainant” should be used rather than “victim”; and the other was that “the instruction to believe a victim’s account should cease”.

3. Terminology

3.1 In recent decades the use of the term “victim” has become much more commonly used than “complainant”, possibly because of a growth in recognition of, support and services for people harmed by crime. The dictionary definitions of “victim” are not predicated on there being a conviction and the common usage of the word is much broader than the one Henriques advocates.
3.2 The term “victim” is used by public services and within some associated legislation as applying to people who are harmed by circumstances wider than offences with a related conviction. Both the Ministry of Justice and the Crown Prosecution Service accept it as applying to people prior to any conviction in order that they can access services and exercise certain rights, such as victims’ right to review, albeit there is the recognition that caution has to be used with the term “victim” in court proceedings.

3.3 Participants in focus groups of police officers and staff did not feel using the word “victim” affected their mind-set; they described it as a categorisation similar to the way they might call somebody a suspect. While accepting labelling in general can influence behaviour no evidence could be found that indicated the use of the term “victim” had that affect. The alternative term “complainant” was also seen as problematic.

3.4 This has been a live debate in the United States, settled in some states through legislation that enshrines in law the terminology and status of the victim. No one has so far suggested an acceptable alternative to either word albeit there are sensitivities about the use of words such as survivor.

Recommendation 1: That the College of Policing and wider policing continues the general use of the word “victim” but describes, in Authorised Professional Practice and associated training material, the differing interpretations and sensitivities, thus guiding investigators to be prepared to adapt their choice of wording according to the audience and context.

Recommendation 2: That the police service, through the College of Policing and the NPCC Lead for Victims and Witnesses, supports steps taken through the Victims’ Commissioner to put the status of victim on a clearer legal footing (perhaps through a Victims’ Law), thus ensuring an official legal definition that settles the debate and clarifies its use as a categorisation for support, services and specific rights.

4. Believing the Account of a Victim

4.1 The word “believe” in the context of crime recording arose from an HMIC inspection recommendation into crime recording in 2014 and incorporated into the crime recording rules in 2015. This led to debate inside and outside of policing and a letter from the College of Policing in 2016 seeking to clarify what was meant in respect of believing victims. The letter said that at “the point when somebody makes an allegation of crime that the police should believe the account and a crime report should be completed”. Following this point an investigation should continue that is open-minded and establishes the evidence.

4.2 Some people regard the use of the word “believe” as having helped ensure the police respond appropriately to victims, especially in respect of sexual offences and abuse. They have a concern that the police should not retreat from such a position for fear of sending the wrong message to victims. Others regard the word “believe” as instructing a mind-set, a wrong thing to do even at the earliest point of an impartial investigation.

4.3 The current Authorised Professional Practice and training modules do not assist in providing clarity in the way the word is used, nor in exactly what should be regarded as the “account” of a victim. In focus groups with police officers and staff there was significant misunderstanding about what was required or expected, with a number interpreting it as an instruction to believe the victim throughout the course of an investigation.

4.4 Victims of crime, especially sexual offences or abuse, frequently cite a fear of being disbelieved or blamed for an offence as being a barrier to reporting the crime. What is also clear is that this concern extends throughout the whole investigative and legal process and extends wider than just the police.
4.5 Research shows that by adopting certain approaches investigators can help make victims feel more believed and supported throughout the process of investigation. These approaches can be trained and developed in officers and staff, as can a wider understanding of the barriers to reporting and the impact of certain crimes on victims. These are currently not consistently addressed in police training.

4.6 In examining cases where there have been failures of investigation it is unclear if it is a result of a particular mind-set, a lack of knowledge, insufficient capacity to manage the workload, poor processes or incompetence. What is abundantly clear is the recent exponential increase in investigative requirements and workloads that must be factored into political and public discourse on these matters.

4.7 There is confusion among investigators and staff over exactly what is to be believed and how far belief should extend. This could potentially be addressed by better guidance and training but it still defines a mind-set, something that is problematic, if not unethical, to mandate, as opposed to expected behaviours. Legitimacy of policing requires our investigative approach to be seen to be fair and impartial and conducted in a professionally supportive and respectful way.

4.8 Changing the word “believe” in the crime recording standard carries, however, a significant risk of sending the wrong message to victims and staff. If changed, any misleading and negative perceptions would need to be challenged.

The College of Policing has three key options:-

I. that the word “believe” is retained but provide significantly more clarity in APP, internal police training and external communications, about how “believe” and “account” should be interpreted and what is expected;

II. propose a change to the counting rules removing “believe” but replacing it with a phrase that talks about any allegation being initially “treated as being truthful”, with associated explanation in APP and training materials that this is not about a mind-set but an accepting, informed and open-minded approach;

III. propose a change removing the word “believe” but reinforcing that fact that any crime will be treated seriously. In taking matters seriously it means that the investigation commences immediately, all accounts and investigation will not be conducted in a frame of mind of “belief” or “non-belief”, but in a supportive and open-minded way, with active listening and a full explanation to the person making the allegation about the independent role of police and the way they will be supported in providing the best evidence to support any possible legal proceedings.

The third option is recommended.

**Recommendation 3:** The College of Policing and NPCC should approach the Home Office to amend the crime recording counting rules to remove the words “The intention that victims are believed” to “The intention is that victims can be confident they will be listened to and their crime taken seriously”. If accepted the College of Policing APP and training materials should be reviewed to support this approach.

4.9 Certain aspects of investigative practice can create a more victim focused approach to an investigation without compromising the neutrality of the investigator. These include guidance on the development of professional empathy and an open-minded approach and reflective practice;
understanding of the impact of crime on victims and how accounts can vary and change;
guidance on how accounts can be clarified, tested and appropriately challenged in the most supportive way possible; an understanding for all investigators of the evidence base of false reporting and the factors that can subconsciously influence them in their work. In looking at the APP and training courses there is some excellent recent material but this could be more consistently embedded and delivered.

Recommendation 4: The College of Policing consider how the aspects described above could be embedded across all APP and training to ensure it is victim focused and procedurally fair for both victims and suspects. The College of Policing should consider with the NPCC and HMICFRS how greater consistency can be achieved in the delivery of investigative training and standards across forces.

4.10 There are steps the police service could take to enhance the service victims receive and without undermining the independent role of investigator. The police complaints system is an extremely poor mechanism for seeking resolution of victims’ concerns and the police service could play a part in shaping alternative mechanisms for responding to issues raised by victims.

Recommendation 5: The NPCC Lead for Victims and Witnesses engages with the Ministry of Justice and Victims’ Commissioner and considers how appropriate compliance with the Victims Code and proposals (such as Victim Advocates) could be progressed to ensure victims can ensure their crime is being taken seriously and dealt with in a reasonable and appropriate way.

5. DECISIONS REQUIRED

5.1 Chief Constables are requested to provide feedback on the College position.

Name Rob Beckley
Title Assistant Commissioner
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Review into Terrorist Role and Believing Victims at time of Reporting

Introduction

1.1 The paper below was tabled and discussed at the College of Policing Professional Committee on 28th February 2018. The paper and recommendations, including the recommended third option at 8.10 below, were supported by the Committee albeit some members expressed a preference for the first option in 8.9. It was agreed that the paper would be circulated for wider consideration through the NPCC, Superintendent’s Association and Federation as there are some strong and varying opinions on this matter. The College of Policing will then take stock of the feedback and remit it back to Professional Committee if appropriate.

1.2 In 2016 Sir Richard Henriques wrote a report into the Metropolitan Police Service’s handling of non-recent sex allegations against high profile offenders, Operation Midland. In his report he made a number of recommendations including two, the subject of this review. One was the use of terminology, that in investigations “complainant” should be used rather than “victim”; and the other was that “the instruction to believe a victim’s account should cease”.

1.3 Some months before Henriques reported, the College of Policing had convened a meeting and circulated a letter in order to provide guidance in respect of the Home Office crime recording rules. As there were continuing differences of opinion both inside and outside of policing, amplified by Henriques’ report and other high-profile failures in investigations, I was asked to review this matter by the College. The terms of reference are attached at Appendix A.

1.4 This is a subject that elicits a wide range of feelings and assertions and disagreement about the words used, but, underlying it, a broad consensus about the desired outcomes: That police should be accepting and welcome of allegations of crime; that people who might be vulnerable or uncertain should feel supported and confident in reporting crime; and that when a crime is brought to the police it should be responded to and investigated professionally and impartially.

1.5 I did not have a set view on these matters as I embarked on this review. I was open to the debates and evidence and listened carefully to many points of view. These are sensitive and multi-layered issues so I lay out in some detail in this review the principles and considerations that guided me in coming to a range of recommendations.

TERMINOLGY – VICTIM/COMPLAINANT

Background

2.1 In Sir Richard Henriques’ report his first recommendation is that throughout the investigative and the judicial process those who make complaints should be referred to as complainants and not as victims. He has “a clear and concluded view that all complainants are not victims”4. He says the judicial process is engaged in determining whether or not a complainant is indeed a victim. He believes the false terminology gives an impression of pre-judging a complainant and affects the neutrality of an investigator.
2.2 This is a definition of “victim” that is predicated on the outcome of judicial process and reflects an interpretation of the Black’s Law Dictionary that defines a victim as “a person harmed by a crime, tort or other wrong”\textsuperscript{ii}. Many of those closely involved in the judicial system, especially the judiciary, support this position. It is clear, however, that the term victim is widely used in society in a less legalistic way. Dictionary definitions are more encompassing. One example, of many similar ones, describes a victim as being:

- A person harmed, injured, or killed as a result of a crime, accident, or other event or action
- A person who has come to feel helpless and passive in the face of misfortune or ill-treatment.\textsuperscript{iii}

2.3 This is not a new debate. The use of the word “victim” has increased significantly in the past 40 years as the use of “complainant” has fallen\textsuperscript{iv}. The recognition that those harmed by crime need support after the commission of a crime and while navigating the legal processes has meant so-called “victims’” services have grown and the rights and needs of victims have been more formally recognised in policy and legislation.

2.4 Additionally, some who advocate on behalf of those harmed by violent crime or sexual abuse dislike the word “victim” because of the associated implication of powerlessness and a reliance on others to put things right. The term “survivor” is often used and the police sometimes encouraged to use that term, while some will argue that they do not wish any label to be used.

**Context**

3.1 The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) recognise a wider use of the term victim. The MoJ runs victims’ services and champions the Victims Code, directed at people who might otherwise be called complainants if a narrower legalistic definition is used. Likewise, the CPS runs a Victims Right to Review for those who have not had charges laid at court. Both describe the approach they take as pragmatic. The word victim is not a legal status based on a factual determination in a court of law but a categorisation that allows access to services and support. In the context of court hearings both the MoJ the CPS said they use the term complainant as they recognise it as appropriate in that process.

3.2 Most (but not all) victims groups regard the debate as irrelevant and strongly support the use of the word victim, albeit a recognition that some people do not like the word for a range of reasons. It is argued that the word is all encompassing and reflects a focus on the person and the support they may need, not the crime.

3.3 Those who represent the interests of defendants mostly support the position taken by Henriques although they recognise that the word is often used more widely and loosely. They expressed a wider concern that excessive focus on victims and the building of rapport and empathy could potentially blinker investigators to the innocence of related suspects.

3.4 In focus groups with police investigators all said they routinely used the word victim rather than complainant. A number understood the point being made by Henriques but all denied that such a categorisation and use of the word affected their mind-set. They felt too much was being read into the word, it was not a requirement to accept the guilt or innocence of anyone but a route for ensuring the person potentially harmed is dealt with respect and care. As one officer described it, “putting a person in the victim ‘box’ opened a pathway for a number of
support processes, but it all still needed to be underpinned by a proper investigation”. Many said they would seek to ensure the person categorised as a victim is called by their name rather than the label, and they discussed the importance of ensuring the process for everyone, including suspects, is as personal as possible.

3.5 In the College of Policing’s Authorised Professional Practice (APP) and associated training syllabuses there is no explanation of the use of vocabulary in respect of victims, survivors or complainants other than quoting the Black’s Law Dictionary definition.

Discussion and Recommendations

4.1 Unlike the word “believe” which is discussed below, the word victim is not one that defines an expected state of mind, it is a categorisation. It is a categorisation that, in the way the word is commonly used in society, is broad and not contingent upon a legal finding of guilt in a court of law. Given that so few cases investigated by police will ever be determined at court, it is too restrictive to limit the use of the word to the relatively small proportion of people who would be victims by merit of having had a conviction to uphold their status.

4.2 In policing and the law, as in society more widely, terms are often used that put people into a category ensuring certain services or approaches are applied but not that the guilt or innocence of a person is assumed. The terms ‘victim’ or ‘suspect’ may be used for the purpose of recording crime but the guidance and standards after a crime is reported require an investigation to be conducted in an impartial and open-minded way. There is, of course, research that shows how use of language and labelling can influence behaviours¹, and any suggestion that a complainant is pre-judged would run counter to principles of procedural justice (discussed in the section on “believing victims” below), but there is no research I have found that suggests the widespread use of the term victim has had that effect.

4.3 In many respects the use “complainant” is equally problematic. It is a depersonalised, somewhat ugly, legalistic word. Many who might be called a complainant vehemently deny any suggestion they are complaining about what has happened, they are looking for society to put matters right. Some have argued that the adversarial system itself forces matters to be pre-judged as being right or wrong whatever the label. As one interviewee for this review said “I respect the fact that it (the word complainant) is used in a court process but it is an equally pejorative word and to me reflects a less humanised system”.

4.4 One judicial interviewee suggested that the debate about the use of the word “victim” has become more emphatic in judicial circles recently because of a concern that some police investigations are not being conducted in an appropriately impartial and even-handed way. This is exemplified by failures in disclosure of evidence and in following up relevant lines of enquiry, matters some judges suspect could be linked to an instruction to believe a victim (discussed in the next section).

4.5 In the United States, where the use of the word victim is equally widespread and has been challenged in courts, legislation has been passed in some states to formally recognise and enshrine in law the terminology and status of victim thus drawing a line under the debate⁰.
4.6 All the people interviewed were asked if they had an alternative word to either victim or complainant. None of the words suggested, such as “injured party”, “aggrieved” or “target” (as in a person who has been the target of a crime) appear suitable as an alternative.

4.7 Recommendation 1: That the College of Policing and wider policing continues the general use of the word “victim” but describes, in Authorised Professional Practice and associated training material, the differing interpretations and sensitivities, thus guiding investigators to be prepared to adapt their choice of wording according to the audience and context.

4.8 Recommendation 2: That the police service, through the College of Policing and the NPCC Lead for Victims and Witnesses, supports steps taken through the Victims’ Commissioner to put the status of victim on a clearer legal footing (perhaps through a Victims’ Law), thus ensuring an official legal definition that settles the debate and clarifies its use as a categorisation for support, services and specific rights.

THE USE OF THE WORD “BELIEVE” IN STANDARD AIDS AND GUIDANCE

Background

5.1 Police have, in the past, used high levels of discretion in decisions to record a crime and commence an investigation. Additionally, for personal crime, especially sexual offences and crimes committed within a domestic setting, many barriers were put up to progressing any investigation, both by the police and the legal system of the time. This was exemplified in Roger Graef’s 1982 Channel 4 programme, Watching the Detectives. The consequences of that programme still echo and led to changes in the way accounts of crime are taken and responded to. But inconsistency in the discretion applied to crime recording, especially for rape and other sexual crime, continues to bedevil policing.

5.2 In respect of rape, in 2002 the Metropolitan Police issued a Police Notice that said “It is the policy of the Metropolitan Police to accept any allegation made by any victim in the first instance as being truthful.” This has been repeated and adopted by other forces.

5.3 The HMIC inspection into crime recording in 2014 found an alarming number of crimes that had not been recorded as such. They recommended, in respect of recording crime, “the presumption that the victim should always be believed should be institutionalised”. This referred to recording of all crime albeit they were particularly concerned about allegations of rape and other sexual offences.

5.4 In 2015 this recommendation was incorporated into the Home Office counting rules for recorded crime. In the preamble to the crime recording standard the following was added: “The Standard directs a victim focused approach to crime recording. The intention is that victims are believed and benefit from statutory entitlements under the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime.”

5.5 In April 2015 Dame Elish Angiolini reported on rape investigation and prosecution in London. She said it was questionable whether a policy of institutionalised belief is appropriate. She felt that rather than labelling the approach as belief it is more appropriate for investigators to demonstrate respect, impartiality, empathy and to maintain an open mind. She felt that in the first instance officers should proceed as per the original 2002 police notice, assuming
truthfulness on the initial allegation. She said believing the complainant may prejudice the impartiality of the officer’s role and lead to their failing to recognise or give weight to other evidence inconsistent with the complainant’s account.

5.6 Following the the HMIC report and Dame Elish’s report, the then Metropolitan Police commissioner Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe commented on Radio 4’s Today Programme that the term belief has confused matters. He emphasised the need to be empathetic, open minded and that the evidence must be tested. He described a danger that, with the advice going around, there is a tendency to think the police will always believe any complaint and that such a stance is not wise for any good investigator.

5.7 In response to this interview the Chief HMI, Sir Tom Winsor made clear that the 2014 inspection concerned the administrative act of recording a crime\textsuperscript{xi}. He described the need to dispel presumptions of disbelief and said police must proceed with an open mind. In response, Sir Bernard accepted that HMIC were referring to an institutionalised belief at the time of recording but said the presumption of belief is open to being misinterpreted. He said that that recording crime at the earliest possible moment “means the report has been ’accepted’. An analysis of belief does not add to the fact that the allegation is now to be investigated”.

5.8 As there was no explicit national police standard or guidance in respect of this matter Alex Marshall, the CEO of the College of Policing sought to clarify matters by convening a roundtable event in 2016. This led to a letter from the College to police forces saying that the current standards and guidance are clear: “At the point when someone makes an allegation of crime, the police should believe the account given and a crime report should be completed. If, at the time of reporting, there is credible evidence to the contrary that determines no crime was committed then the matter should be recorded as an incident”\textsuperscript{xii}. His letter described the expectation that such an approach is followed by a thorough, impartial, investigation of the facts and allegations made. It has been termed a “two-phase” approach. Alex Marshall provided context by extracting guidance from four separate sources, albeit none of these provide definitions, explanation of the terminology or detail of what is expected from officers.

5.9 In April 2017 Sir Richard Henriques was asked to review the work of Operation Midland, the enquiry into historic child abuse conducted by the Metropolitan Police into high profile suspects. His review looked at the policy of belief and recommended that the “instruction to believe a “victim’s” account should cease.

Context

6.1 There is little disagreement that police cultures of disbelief as well as an avoidance of pursuing what some officers’ saw as unsolvable crimes, undermined confidence in bringing matters to the police and criminal justice system for investigation and resolution. Excessive discretion in crime recording led to what used to be described as “cuffing” crimes, finding ways to prevent crimes being recorded or diverting them so an investigation was not necessary.

6.2 Despite advances in recording practices, it was clear (from the HMIC 2014 Inspection and other reviews) that crimes were still being written off before recording and investigation. This led to the emphasis on the frame of mind required in the initial acceptance of the report, that it would be “believed”, the allegation would be unconditionally and positively recorded as a crime unless there is evidence to the contrary immediately available.
6.3 There is a growing public awareness and increasing press references to a policing policy of believing the victim, often following high profile cases where defendants have been acquitted of serious offences. The suggestion made is that the police approached such investigations with a mind-set of belief rather than one of objectivity and impartiality.

6.4 In interviewing people for this review, it is clear there are significantly differing perspectives on these matters. There is a strong view that the police service has made enormous strides in building the confidence of victims and any indication that the police might be retreating from a policy that involves the word “believe” will send the wrong message to people who may wish to come forward. It is frequently described as a pendulum, that has moved from scepticism to belief; allowing it to swing back would undermine the progress that has been achieved. Some argue that the work in institutionalising belief has still not gone far enough.

6.5 There is an equally strong view that “believing” is not what the police should be committing themselves to doing. Any suggestion that the police have a mind-set and or potential bias, even if confined to the earliest part of an investigation, is wrong and that it is not the role of police to believe or not, but to start and continue an investigation in an open-minded way and present facts to any criminal justice decision maker.

6.6 It is positive, however, that on both sides of this argument there is common agreement that barriers should not be put up to prevent crimes being recorded and that support for victims is important. It is necessary to build a rapport, show empathy, avoid scepticism and external signs of disbelief, thus ensuring people are listened to and treated professionally.

Consultation and Evidence

7.1 I have listened to the thoughts and perspectives of a wide range of organisations and people, listed in Appendix B. Additionally, I have reviewed some of the academic evidence in respect of victims and belief, and have conducted focus groups with officers and staff.

7.2 Interpretation of the Standards and Guidance

7.2.1 Alex Marshall’s letter says: “At the point when someone makes an allegation of crime the police should believe the account given and a crime report should be completed”.

7.2.2 What is meant by believe? A common dictionary definition is “accepting a matter as true in the absence of proof”. I have heard a range of views of what it means in practice. At one end of the spectrum the word is an ideological matter, one of faith, which has been characterised as blind acceptance and at the other end of the spectrum it is described as a conditional matter, it being more likely than not.

7.2.3 There is also a range of views about the word “account”. The crime recording guidance is based on an allegation being believed for recording purposes and the Marshall letter says “at the point when someone makes an allegation of crime, the police should believe the account given...” It appears, but is not totally explicit, that Alex Marshall is referring to an account as the initial phone call or approach to the police where the allegation is first articulated. A number of people interpret it as the point in time someone is, in effect, interviewed in order to take their more detailed account of what happened.
7.2.4 This is more than a semantic distinction as the different views on this matter can affect the approach taken by investigators. Sir Richard Henries referred in his report to the various accounts made by “Nick” the complainant and questioned which of his five accounts over six months would be seen as the one that should be believed. It has been suggested to me by a number of interviewees that the “account” must include the first interviews; it is the time a victim most needs to feel believed and it is where the exact type of crime is identified. Others will say that the first interview account is a key stage in the investigation and having a mind-set of believing the victim is wrong and unethical. When investigators were asked in focus groups I heard a range of opinions about what is the “account”, with a number of officers saying they understood it as meaning all the accounts of the victim should be believed.

7.2.5 There is no guidance in policing as to how “believe” and “account” should be interpreted in practice. The Authorised Professional Practice (APP) does not address the matter and the training outcomes and syllabus for both investigators (the PIP levels) and public protection do not deal with it. The word “account” is commonly used in APP and training materials in the context of an interview or statement, not in the making of an initial allegation for recording purposes.

7.2.6 I held focus groups in three different forces involving, in total, 55 operational police officers and staff including investigators, response officers, staff who took initial crime reports and victim care staff. I circulated a questionnaire beforehand testing what they understood of the current standards and guidance in respect of believing victims at time of reporting and the Home Office counting rules and then I held discussion groups exploring the issues.

7.2.7 This was a relatively informal process but there were consistent findings across all three forces. No one knew about the distinctions in the College of Policing letter. This is not necessarily a concern as the letter from Alex Marshall was to clarify the issue not establish a new standard. What was of more concern is that officers and staff had extremely wide and differing views about what was professionally expected. Divergent views were expressed about what believing a victim meant, when it applied, and what was therefore required in terms of conducting an investigation. No one talked in terms of the initial account or made a clear distinction between believing for recording and believing during the investigation. Many talked about believing the victim throughout the course of an investigation although most of them said they would still aim to keep an open mind.

7.2.8 In the exchange of letters on this matter, described above, Sir Tom Winsor expressed a concern that some of the public discussion on the matter might increase the risk of misunderstanding and uncertainty. Most members of the focus groups, in fact, were unaware of the public debate and said they interpreted what was required from local instructions, supervision and training.

7.2.9 What was encouraging in the focus groups was a general acceptance that they should accept allegations for investigation, they should not be exhibiting disbelief or scepticism and that they had a responsibility to treat people with care and respect. Ultimately officers and staff must make sense of difficult, messy and often dysfunctional human interactions and all guidance and instruction needs to be supported by values and humanity. I was greatly encouraged by the values that obviously underpinned a lot of what the focus groups discussed.
7.3 **Academic Evidence**

7.3.1 The evidence shows that a fear of disbelief or being blamed for what has happened is a barrier to people coming forward and reporting their crimes, especially for sexual offences or more personal crime\textsuperscript{xvii}. A large proportion of victims of abuse or sexual offences do not tell anyone about the crime for a long time, if indeed ever. When surveyed one of the main reasons for not doing so is a fear of disbelief. Fear of not being believed or taken seriously, or being blamed for what has happened, is a common thread. This is not confined to the police but includes other people in the lives of victims; families, friends, associates and the criminal justice system\textsuperscript{xiv}.

7.3.2 The police are, of course, key gatekeepers in opening an investigation and progressing towards justice or resolution so it is important how they are perceived in the process. On the whole fear of disbelief is frequently cited in the context of facing scepticism, challenge and rejection. What is less commonly explored is whether that translates into an expectation of a victim that they will be believed. One academic in commenting on the current approach observes that there is “a false assumption that the antidote to the insidious problem of police disbelief is its polar opposite”\textsuperscript{xv}. Victims commonly express a wish for the crimes being taken seriously\textsuperscript{xvi} and properly investigated but there is less research that describes what victims or potential victims expect the police mind-set to be and what they view the police role as being.

7.3.3 Additionally, victims surveyed do not distinguish between the taking of a first account and the remainder of the investigation. In fact, it is apparent in the various reports and surveys that the fear of not being believed extends to the whole process of investigation, to court and beyond the criminal justice system, way outside the limited context of the current policing standards and guidance in respect of the reporting process and early account.

7.3.4 Victims are not the sole participants in a process of investigation. Research has shown that the overall legitimacy of the police in the eyes of both participants and observers rests on procedural justice\textsuperscript{xviii}. This is a legitimacy largely fostered by the perception of police fairness, people thinking officers will treat them with respect, make their decisions fairly and take time to explain them, and be friendly and approachable. The research shows that fair police decision-making and positive public interaction is not only important in their own right but crucial to the way police operate and their overall effectiveness\textsuperscript{xviii}.

7.3.5 Victims commonly talk about wanting to be taken seriously. Clearly being serious about the allegation rather than dismissive is important but there are a range of actions or approaches can have the effect of leaving a victim feeling supported or undermined, shaping their feeling about whether they are believed or disbelieved. Dr Elly Hanson extracted these in an overview of the research on belief and describes them as “validating actions”. These are:

- Taking the allegation seriously
- Empathic listening and warmth
- Conducting a thorough investigation
- Assessing safety and taking action where ongoing abuse or intimidation is described
- Attention towards the victims emotional and physical welfare
- Statements that convey knowledge of the crime type and non-acceptance of the crime.

The so called “validating actions”, described above, overlap with words and actions that promote respect, trust and acceptance, reflecting the principles of procedural justice.
Elements of the above approaches are covered in various parts of APP and training material produced by the College of Policing but are not collectively and consistently addressed.

7.3.6 These actions are important in setting the right tone for victims and are not contingent upon investigators having a mind-set of belief. But there are a number of internal stances that can influence behaviours. For example, it has been found that police officers who more strongly believed that many, if not most, rape allegations were false had less knowledge of effective victim interviewing\textsuperscript{xxix}. Also, some research has shown police may treat victims in a less validating fashion when there is a less chance of a successful prosecution because, for example, the perpetrator has not been identified\textsuperscript{xx}. This may be because such an approach will save resources rather than a lack of belief in the victims account but it is an internal stance that will affect the way the investigation is approached. Similarly, when officers ask detailed questions their motive can be misinterpreted. Some victims perceive such questioning as reflecting a disbelieving stance but careful explanation of the process can help prevent them drawing such an inference\textsuperscript{xxi}.

7.3.7 Thus, regardless of whether we change the word “believed” in the crime recording rules if we wish to address the anxieties of victims about the whole process of reporting and investigation then we will have to look at our response in a more sophisticated way. As Dr Elly Hanson comments:

“Although officer’s beliefs cannot and should not be mandated (especially in relation to particular victim accounts) they are likely to make changes to their perspectives on the basis of guidance and training that, for example, promotes self-reflection, and educates about the dynamics and impact of abuse. This then, in tandem with more action-focused guidance, is likely to have a knock-on effect upon practice.”

7.4 Wider Examination of the Problem

7.4.1 In the course of this review, I have been introduced to a number of examples of failures in criminal investigations where a mind-set may have had a role to play in blinkering the investigators to wider relevant evidence. What is difficult, if not impossible, to prove is whether the failures were caused by a particular mind-set, a lack of knowledge, insufficient capacity, poor processes or incompetence.

7.4.2 There is no doubt that there has been a substantial increase in the recording and investigation of complex cases\textsuperscript{xxii}. One interviewee described it as “an industrialisation” of non-recent and current sexual abuse investigations. The sheer scale of digital material in many individual cases dwarves the handful of relevant documents that might have been examined and disclosed during an investigation only five years ago. There is a widespread concern that the overall skill levels, digital forensic capacity and quantity of experienced investigators have not matched the growth of demand.

7.4.3 In respect of crime recording, all police respondents, especially the focus groups, described a substantial change in culture in respect of accepting crimes for recording. The push initiated by HMIC in the 2014 inspection has had a substantial impact and their original set of recommendations have made a difference.

7.4.4 In the course of discussions with officers and staff most (but not all) said they were not chased to meet targets, thus distorting behaviours. A few, however, commented they felt they were
being judged on outcomes, especially convictions, in rape and sexual allegations. Some complained how difficult it was to take a crime off the books if they judged it false, so called “no-criming”. This has been addressed in some forces by removing any expectation on officers to do so and the tone of the focus group in the force where that had been made absolutely explicit was much more accepting of the crime recording regime and how it operated.

7.5 Consultation

7.5.1 There is near unanimity among the legal profession that requiring the police to believe the allegation at the onset of an investigation is wrong. This is reflected in Sir Richard Henriques’s recommendation but is a common view held among most of those I consulted who had a legal background, especially the judiciary and the Senior Presiding Judge for England and Wales, but also practicing solicitors, and others closely engaged in the CJS. One High Court Judge pointed out that the police, while a gatekeeper, were not the only player in the system. He felt that taking a stance of believing a complainant, even for the purposes of recording a crime, was wrong in principle. He said the police should not feel they are the ones to put the wrongs of the system or society right by adopting a flawed approach.

7.5.2 Victims advocate groups have varied views. One organisation consulted had a publicly shared view on this subject: “Victims of abuse need to know that they will be listened to and taken seriously. This is not the same as being automatically believed. No victim can or should be guaranteed that their testimony will be assumed to be the truth”xiii. One organisation was clear that the police should be avoiding disbelief and scepticism, while the third felt that believing a victim is important throughout the investigative process. Groups that represent the interests of defendants are clear that it is unfair to have an approach of believing the victim even for reporting as it immediately creates a biased mind-set.

7.5.3 The representative of the Police and Crime Commissioners was very strongly in support of retaining the concept of belief in reporting and saw no problem if it extended into the wider interactions that an investigator has with a victim. She, along with a number of others I interviewed, felt that as it could not be proven that a mind-set of belief had the effect of negatively influencing the outcome then we should not change our approach.

7.5.4 It was suggested by two interviewees during the course of this review that the medical profession builds trust because they believe their patients. Having discussed this with doctors, nurses and two Professional Bodies in medicine I could find no evidence of such an ethos. They emphasise listening and respecting the patient’s account. Some apply, as one GP described it, an “assumption of truthfulness when they walk in the door, tested as the consultation commences”.

Discussion and Recommendations

8.1 The core of this matter stems from the Crime Recording Rules. They currently say “the intention is that victims are believed...” In this section I lay out three options in respect of the wording, although I have come to a clear conclusion for change reflected in my recommendation. There are two additional recommendations drawn from my wider research. I lay out my key considerations below to promote the broadest debate and allow Professional Committee or others to reach a conclusion based on their collective judgement.
8.2 In making recommendations about change I have had three outcomes in mind:
Maintaining and enhancing progress in encouraging people to come forward and report
crime, especially those who are vulnerable or hurt.
Ensuring that disbelief is not a factor in deterring people to come forward
Maintaining trust by demonstrating the approach to crime recording and investigation is
unbiased, impartial, fair, and respectful to both victims and suspects.

8.3 The distinction between taking an account for the administrative act of recording a crime and
the taking of a victim's account as part of the investigation is poorly understood and there is
confusion among investigators and staff over exactly what is to be believed and how far belief
should extend. If the College retains the status quo then it is essential it is clarified and
explained to the profession exactly what is expected.

8.4 Listening to the debates I realised that, in trying to explain or defend the current position,
people were making artificial distinctions within a complex set of complementary and
overlapping activities. The process of recording allegations, taking accounts and investigating
crimes is not, and should not be seen as, a clinical division of separate activities. It is not at all
surprising that, for officers and staff, “believe” and “belief” have leaked into the wider
investigative environment. Good investigative practice involving active listening, open-
mindedness and impartiality should apply from the very earliest stages even the first act of
listening to an individual's account of what has happened. The recording gap can be addressed
by instruction to adhere to existing crime recording rules, not by an instruction to believe. In
any case mandating a mind-set is problematic, some say unethical. A professional body should
focus on laying out and mandating expected behaviours not mind-sets.

8.5 The external perception that the police have a policy requiring investigators to adopt a mind-
set of belief has gained traction. Many external observers, like internal staff, do not
understand the distinction being made between recording and the subsequent investigations.
While this could be more comprehensively explained to the outside world (and will need to be
if the College retains the status quo), the legitimacy of policing is based on all in the
community seeing it as fair.

8.6 I could not conclusively identify evidence that crime investigations had been distorted by a
mind-set caused by officers or staff believing accounts (however that is defined) but it is also
not possible to prove the opposite. The most common public expectation is that the police
will treat people with respect and professionally and impartially investigate the allegation. This
is what the police service must work on. Maintaining a stance involving believing victim
accounts, however limited, has potential to undermine the legitimacy of the process. Policing
must be seen as fair by all involved in the legal process as well as wider society.

8.7 If the word “believe” is changed in the crime recording standard there is a significant risk that
headlines could appear that say police have stopped believing victims, and this might have an
impact on the confidence of people who may be reluctant to report their crimes as well as
sending the wrong message to our staff. However, anyone who examines closely what is being
proposed will realise this has nothing to do with the police taking a disbelieving stance, quite
the opposite, and any press or publicity that frames the change in a misleading and negative
way can be firmly challenged.

National Police Chiefs’ Council
Throughout the review a number of people have suggested returning to the original wording of the 2002 Metropolitan Police Notice that an allegation should be initially treated as if truthful, something Dame Elish Angionlini comments upon. This has merit as it is not an instruction about mind-set but one of approach, however some people argue that such a phrase is also open to interpretation and may confuse matters. After consideration I believe that the related APP and training material, if sufficiently comprehensive about the appropriate professional behaviours (addressing the factors described in 7.3.5 above), can ensure a supportive and accepting approach.

The College of Policing has three options:-

that the word “believe” is retained in the counting rules but provide significantly more clarity in APP, internal police training and external communications, about how “believe” and “account” should be interpreted and what is expected;

propose a change to the counting rules removing “believe” but replacing it with a phrase that talks about any allegation being initially “treated as being truthful”, with associated explanation in APP and training materials that this is not about a mind-set but an accepting, informed and open-minded approach;

propose a change removing the word “believe” but reinforce that fact that any crime will be treated seriously. In taking matters seriously it means that the investigation commences immediately, accounts and investigation will not be conducted in a frame of mind of “belief” or “non-belief”, but in a supportive and open-minded way, with active listening and a full explanation to the person making the allegation about the impartial and independent role of police and the way they will be supported in providing the best evidence to support any possible legal proceedings.

I recommend the third option, below.

Recommendation 3: The College of Policing and NPCC should approach the Home Office to amend the crime recording counting rules to remove the words “The intention that victims are believed” to “The intention is that victims can be confident they will be listened to and their crime taken seriously”. If accepted the College of Policing APP and training materials should be reviewed to support this approach.

In the course of this review I have looked at the APP and College of Policing guidance and training materials. I was looking at the extent to which this body of material addressed the expected behaviours and knowledge of investigators in overcoming a victim’s fear of disbelief and other barriers to recording and investigating crime. There is some excellent material, especially in the more recent vulnerability, domestic abuse and sexual assault APP and training, but standards and guidance across the board are not consistent in addressing these points, and the training is not consistently delivered across forces.

In looking at the APP and training materials the following are areas that that could be more consistently embedded and delivered:

What it means for any investigation to be conducted with professional empathy and an open-minded approach including ways to challenge assumptions and encourage reflective practice
An understanding of the impact of crime on victims, especially victims of abuse and sexual crime, and what this may mean in respect of accounts and evidence
Guidance on how accounts (including initial accounts) can be clarified, tested and appropriately challenged in the most supportive and explanatory way possible. An understanding for all investigators of the evidence base of false reporting and other factors that can subconsciously influence them in being less welcoming of criminal allegations.

In the course of this review a number of participants (victims’ groups as well as officers and staff) offered to assist in reviewing the training materials to assess the extent to which it is victim focused and procedurally fair.

8.13 **Recommendation 4:** The College of Policing consider how the aspects described above in 8.12 could be embedded across all APP and training to ensure it is victim focused and procedurally fair for both victims and suspects. The College of Policing should consider with the NPCC and HMICFRS how greater consistency can be achieved in the delivery of investigative training and standards across forces.

8.14 In defending the use of the word “believe” some people are concerned about any form of reversion to the “bad old days” of rejecting allegations and failing to take a crime seriously. Having observed, through the focus groups, some extremely positive attitudes I am not convinced the culture will spring back in the absence of one word, especially if the training, APP, and the application of the Victims Code are reviewed to ensure the required behaviours are maintained. HMICFRS will continue to maintain a focus on crime recording but there are wider steps that could be taken to help ensure consistency in the service provided to victims.

8.15 I was introduced to the work of Ombudsmen in different sectors and also the proposals of the Victims’ Commissioner for victims’ advocates. The police complaints system is an extremely poor mechanism for seeking resolution of victims’ concerns and the police service could play a part in shaping alternative mechanisms for responding to issues raised by victims.

8.16 **Recommendation 5:** The NPCC Lead for Victims and Witnesses engages with the Ministry of Justice and Victims’ Commissioner and considers how appropriate compliance with the Victims Code and proposals (such as Victim Advocates) could be progressed to ensure victims can ensure their crime is being taken seriously and dealt with in a reasonable and appropriate way.

Rob Beckley  
Assistant Commissioner  

February 2018

---
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APPENDIX A

Terms of Reference for a Review into Believing the Victim and the Victim/Complainant Terminology

A review to consider two matters. The first is the standards and guidance that exist in policing in respect of believing victims, and the second is the use by police, during the recording and investigative process, of the term “victim” rather than “complainant”. These two matters were highlighted by Sir Richard Henriques in his review of the Metropolitan Police Service’s handling of non-recent allegations in respect of persons of public prominence (Operation Midland).

Commissioned by the College of Policing for Report to the Professional Committee.

Identify what is laid out or advised about “believing a victim”, at the time of recording a crime and during an investigation, in APP or other sources owned by the College, HMICFS, NPCC leads, or any other relevant body. Likewise assess the provenance and use of the term “victim” as opposed to “complainant” and any guidance in respect to the use of such terminology.

Review the extent of the evidence base (of all types) that has a bearing on these matters.

Take stock of the views of people and organisations with an interest in this matter. This will include professional views within policing (College leads, NPCC business areas, HMICFRS, forces, PCCs and the S23(1)); victim and offender advocate groups; CPS and the legal profession; others with a legitimate perspective.

From the above steps, identify the key points of contention and debate.

Assess and weigh up the evidence and the differing perspectives, including the risks and challenges of maintaining the status quo, of making any change, or of delaying a decision.

Make any recommendations including, if applicable, considerations in respect of implementation.

Estimated time scale of three months, to include research, meetings with interested parties and discussions with practitioners.

Rob Beckley
Assistant Commissioner
Organisations and Individuals Consulted during this Review:

College of Policing Crime Faculty and Training Staff
College of Policing Evidence and Research Team
Focus Groups of Police Officers and Staff in
   Avon and Somerset Constabulary
   Metropolitan Police Service
   Durham Constabulary
Interviews and discussions with Chief Constables and Senior Officers
NPCC Portfolio Leads
Operation Hydrant
National Crime Agency
POLKA Community, National Detectives Forum
Dame Vera Baird, Police and Crime Commissioner for Northumbria

Victim Support
NSPCC
SafeLives
Educational Action Challenging Homophobia (EACH)
Baroness Helen Newlove, Victims’ Commissioner
Margaret Gardener, False Allegations Support Organisation

Wendy Williams, HMI, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services
Home Office Safeguarding Unit
Home Office National Crime Registrar
Ministry of Justice Policy Leads
Crown Prosecution Service, Policy and Media Leads

Senior Presiding Judge, England and Wales
His Honour Judge Christopher Price, Presiding Judge Durham
Group discussion with Liverpool based Judges at the Judges Lodgings
Richard Atkinson, Tuckers Solicitors, Chair, Law Society Criminal Law Committee

Royal College of General Practitioners
British Medical Association

Dr Elly Hanson
Portsmouth University
The Police Foundation
Cardiff University Innocence Project
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Revised Protocol on the appropriate handling of stalking or harassment offences between the National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Crown Prosecution Service
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Withheld in full S36(c)
Protocol on the appropriate handling of stalking or harassment offences between the National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Crown Prosecution Service
This protocol has been approved and authorised by:

…………………………

Chief Police Officer [insert Police Area]

…………………………

Chief Crown Prosecutor [insert CPS Area]
1. **SECTION 1 – PARTIES**

1.1. The Parties to this Protocol are XXXX Police and the XXXX Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).

2. **SECTION 2 - INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE PROTOCOL**

2.1. The commitment to end stalking and harassment is embedded in the cross-government Ending Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) Strategy: 2016 to 2020. The strategy is underpinned by effective partnership working at both a local and national level. The successful prosecution of these cases and safeguarding of those victims involved relies on strong and collaborative partnership working between the police and prosecutors.

2.2. The VAWG approach recognises that victims of stalking are disproportionately female. The approach acknowledges VAWG as a fundamental abuse of human rights and women’s rights. The UK government has signed and ratified the United Nation’s call to all states to prevent and respond to violence against women. The police and CPS are committed to all victims of crimes grouped together

---

1 VAWG is the most widespread form of abuse worldwide, affecting on average one third of all women globally in their lifetime (WHO, MSC and LSHTM, 2013).
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as 'VAWG' and to that end, are inclusive in their approach. All VAWG policies are applied fairly and equitably to all suspects and victims of crime – irrespective of their gender. The CPS Public Statement on male victims is relevant to this Protocol.

2.3. Chief Constables have overall responsibility for the investigation of alleged criminal activity in their individual force area.

2.4. The CPS is the principal prosecuting authority dealing with criminal prosecutions in England and Wales. The CPS is fully committed to prosecuting fairly and effectively all those who carry out harassment or stalking behaviour.

2.5. The safety of victims is paramount. Failure to identify and robustly deal with harassment or stalking behaviour at the earliest opportunity allows suspects to continue their behaviour. This may leave victims exposed to escalating risk, including sexual assault and homicide. The risks to victims must therefore be carefully considered in these cases. This is not only in respect to the direct risk from the suspect to the victim, but also in regard to anyone connected to victims, such as their children and dependents, family members and friends.

2.6. This document sets out the principles governing the investigation and prosecution under sections 2, 2A, 4 and 4A of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 (PHA 1997) and covers all forms of harassment or stalking. The purpose of this protocol are:

To achieve improved and consistent performance in the identification, investigation and prosecution of stalking or harassment cases;
Ensure a robust and appropriate criminal justice response to stalking or harassment;
Establish early and effective liaison between the police and CPS in stalking cases;
To improve the service to victims of stalking or harassment;
Increase public confidence more widely in the ability of the Criminal Justice System to deal with stalking or harassment cases; and
To reflect the College of Policing’s Authorised Professional Practice and CPS policy.

3. **SECTION 3 - INVESTIGATION, RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT**

3.1. From the outset, it is important that police officers interrogate all relevant information. The Joint NPCC and CPS Stalking or Harassment Evidence Checklist (the Checklist) is referred to throughout this protocol and should be used by investigating officers and prosecutors. Additionally, the Joint CPS NPCC Domestic Abuse Evidence Checklist will be relevant in domestic abuse cases and should be referred to.

3.2. The police and CPS understand that stalking or harassment is characterised by its serial nature and the potential long term obsessive nature of behaviours.

3.3. When investigating an incident the police will explore the motivation, behaviours, background and context of the suspect as well as the impact on the victim in order to ensure a balanced consideration of the account provided and to enable all available evidence to be gathered.

3.4. The police will investigate potential defences put forward by the suspect. The investigation could consider:

- Are there any signs of injury to the suspect upon arrest?
- Have any allegations been made of other non-violent behaviour that fall within the description of stalking, harassment or domestic abuse?
- How plausible and consistent is the suspect's account? What counter allegations, if any, have been made?
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Are there any contradictions in the suspect’s account?
Does the suspect accept they have committed some or all of the alleged behaviours but denies that they intended to cause alarm/distress?
Does the suspect believe the victim has misunderstood their intention, and what explanation is given?
What evidence is there that the suspect’s behaviour is unreasonable?
Is there evidence that the suspect has invested a disproportionate level of time, effort or resource in pursuit of the victim?
Is there evidence that the suspect’s behaviour has caused alarm and distress?
Has consideration been given to the full range of evidence that may be available via social media, digital and surrounding witnesses including work colleagues and friends?
Have enquiries been made into any previous bad character information including previous convictions and relevant intelligence including information about other victims?
Has the suspect made no comment during interview from which an adverse inference can be drawn?
Does the suspect say that the behaviour was:
- Pursued for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime;
- Pursued under any enactment or rule of law or to comply with any condition or requirement imposed by any person under any enactment; or
- In the particular circumstances of the case was the pursuit of the course of conduct reasonable?

3.5. In cases involving stalking or harassment, the range of alleged offending behaviour, with particular reference to other crimes, must be considered. This can include but is not limited to digitally enabled crime, criminal damage and malicious communications. The police and prosecutors should be alert to evidence supporting allegations that indicate a course of conduct which would suggest control, coercion, domination or exploitation of a victim. Identification of the triggers for abuse will assist in understanding the context of the offending. These issues should be considered as risk factors, rather than as causal links to the offending behaviour, and will assist prosecutors in their consideration of the public interest. This will also assist when considering factors to be taken into account for bail applications and/or terms for restraining orders. Police and prosecutors should also be aware that conduct can take more than one form at the same time. For example on-line and off-line conduct.

3.6. Clear and coherent accounts from victims are reliant upon their powers of recall/concentration, their understanding of the events and their ability to communicate. A number of issues can impact on the precision or the detail of the account provided e.g. drug and alcohol use, mental health and physical disabilities. Police and prosecutors should refer to the Toolkit for Prosecutors on Violence Against Women and Girls Cases Involving Vulnerable Victims.

3.7. The police should ensure that the Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence risk assessment (DASH)\(^3\) or other appropriate risk identification or screening tool (including SASH\(^4\)) is used to assess the risk to the victim and inform the development of safeguarding plans in relation to all victims of stalking or harassment. First response staff and their supervisor should identify risk factors, establish who is at risk and decide what level of intervention is required. Training in the use of risk screening/identification tools and their application is therefore essential. The risk identification process must remain on-going. Events and circumstances may undergo rapid and frequent change resulting in increases to the risk for victims. The assessment must be kept under constant review. High risk cases may well require a multi-agency response and should be considered where appropriate for referral to the relevant risk management panel i.e. the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) in cases of domestic abuse and/or Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel (MAPPA).

3.8. The police will ensure that alleged incidents are not considered in isolation, and where victims report incidents that may be typical of stalking behaviour, the police will interrogate their systems to identify whether there are any linked incidents that could indicate a pattern of behaviour. Additionally, when a case is passed to the CPS, the prosecutor will carry out a check of the CPS Case Management System (CMS) against the suspect or defendant’s name to determine if the CPS holds any record of similar

---

\(^3\) It is recognised that the DASH model is under review and a refined model is currently being piloted. Additionally, DASH should only be used for DA cases. Where there is no ongoing relationship at all a specialist stalking assessment is preferable

\(^4\) https://www.stalkingriskprofile.com/stalking-risk-profile/stalking-assessment-screen
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previous behaviour against this or any other victim.

3.9. In cases of stalking or harassment some victims may be afraid of the suspect. In the most serious cases, they may fear that the suspect will assault, harm or even kill them. However, such fear is not present in all cases. Therefore, it is essential that victims are asked if they have altered their behaviour (even in subtle ways) in response to the alleged behaviour or activities.

3.10. In each case that is identified as harassment, the police and CPS will specifically consider if this is indeed a case of stalking to ensure that appropriate risk screening and management for both victims and suspects can be put in place and that the CJS can have an appropriate and consistent response to this crime.

3.11. Police Information Notices (PINs) will not be used in stalking cases. The provision of PINs in cases where there has been ongoing and consistent stalking behaviour can mean that victims are unable to obtain appropriate justice, risk screening and risk management. In cases of low level harassment, consideration maybe given to the use of Early Harassment Notices in accordance with any College of Policing Authorised Professional Practice.

3.12. Stalking offences can also be committed in an online environment, e.g. through social media platforms. The principles for investigating ‘online’ stalking are the same as those that apply to any form of stalking. Investigating officers should, however, be aware of the CPSguidelinesonprosecutingcasesinvolvingcommunicationssentviasocialmedia.

4. SECTION 4 – REFERRAL AND CHARGING

4.1. To facilitate effective referral and charging practices between the police and the CPS, all police forces and all CPS Areas will appoint Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) for stalking and harassment cases. A list of SPOCs will be contained as a separate annex for police forces and the CPS which will be held by the CPS and NPCC Stalking and Harassment Lead. The police and prosecutor SPOCs should make contact monthly to discuss: reporting, referrals, charging, and prosecutions, in relation to stalking or harassment within their area. Role descriptions will be developed by the police and CPS to support this work. Agencies should work together to identify opportunities in awareness raising and improving the support to victims and witnesses.

4.2. In some cases, the distinction between a victim of stalking and a victim of harassment will not be clear-cut, as the definitions can overlap. There is no specific legal definition of stalking. However, for police and prosecutors it is helpful to know that in cases of stalking there is a pattern of unwanted, fixated and obsessive behaviour which is intrusive. It can include harassment that amounts to stalking or stalking that causes fear of violence or serious alarm or distress. Where the course of conduct involves elements of stalking behaviour, a charge under section 2A or 4A of the PHA 1997 will always be the starting point where the relevant evidential and public interest thresholds are met.

4.3. The Director’s Guidance on Charging sets out arrangements prescribed by the Director of Public Prosecutions for the joint working of police officers and prosecutors during the investigation and prosecution of criminal cases. The police do not have to refer every case involving stalking or harassment to the CPS, (although all domestic abuse cases do require referral to CPS for a charging decision). Where the investigating officer is unclear or uncertain whether the behaviour is stalking or harassment, where the case is complex or involves challenging issues, or where it involves stalking, the investigating officer should consider contacting the police SPOC and where appropriate seek Early Investigative Advice from the CPS. Chief Constables and Chief Crown Prosecutors will agree local arrangements for full and early consultation to take place.

4.4. Prosecutors and the police will work closely together to build cases, ensuring that all possible avenues of investigation are explored and that where the appropriate thresholds are reached that the correct charge is identified.
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4.5. The police will ensure that any statements supplied to the prosecutor at the pre-charge stage will, where required, be accompanied by a completed MG2 to ensure that any requirement for special measures receives early informed consideration. The police should use an appropriate risk screening or risk assessment tool with all stalking or harassment victims and ensure that the documentation is supplied to the prosecutor at the pre-charge stage.

4.6. When considering what charges (if any) are applicable, prosecutors will examine the impact on the victim as well as the conduct of the suspect to determine whether someone has been stalked or harassed. The detailed statement from the victim, along with a Victim Personal Statement will help determine the right charge. Prosecutors will also consider the history of the case, including any previous convictions or intelligence, breaches of restraining orders or non-molestation orders in relation to this victim or others, and bad character evidence. Consideration should also be given as to whether enquiries need to be made of other forces where there is evidence that a suspect has spent time in other police force areas. Previous use of PINs may also be used as bad character evidence.

4.7. Prosecutors will ensure that MG3s contain a full record of the decisions taken with reasons for those decisions. Every MG3 will also contain an action plan unless there is no additional or outstanding work required from the police. To ensure cases are managed efficiently, action dates will be agreed between the CPS and the police and recorded on the action plan.

4.8. At all times, police and prosecutors must consider the impact of their decisions on the risk to the victim. The use of postal requisitions may have unintended consequences which impact the risk to the victim. Police and prosecutors should seriously consider the effect of using postal requisitions in cases of harassment and should not use them in stalking cases.

4.9. Prosecutors will inform the police promptly when a charging decision is made. The police will notify the victim of the charging decision at the earliest opportunity.

4.10. Where the police seek a charging decision based on an application of the threshold test as per the Code for Crown Prosecutors, they will provide detailed and comprehensive information to enable the prosecutor to determine whether the application of the threshold test is appropriate and to fully consider issues surrounding opposition to bail. The police will also provide details of the further evidence likely to be obtained which will have a significant impact on the case. The police will gather and forward the further evidence identified, within the timescale required, in order to support a charge on the Full Code Test that properly reflects the level of criminality.

4.11. In cases where the police may grant pre-charge conditional bail under section 47 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984, the police will seek the victim’s views regarding the conditions to be imposed and will consider imposing the same conditions as would be appropriate in a Restraining Order.

4.12. Prosecutors will remind the police of the option to use conditional bail where appropriate. It is essential when police officers are making a decision as to whether a suspect will be asked to attend voluntarily or where postal requisition is being considered that police officers recognise that these may limit the protection that can be offered to the victim as the case moves through the criminal justice system. This is both in terms of the limitation to impose conditions to reduce risk to the victim and the risk of further offending.

4.13. Where suspects breach bail conditions before their first court appearance, the police will take expeditious and robust action. The police will investigate this as potential continued stalking or harassment of the victim and in addition to breach of bail, further offences or an enlarged stalking charge where appropriate will be considered. The breach of bail conditions may necessitate the Threshold Test being applied, where previously the grounds for applying this test were not met.

4.14. Early consultation with the officer in the case and contact with the Witness Care Unit will help prosecutors to understand and recognise the risks in the case. This can ensure that any further offending reported is addressed as quickly as possible; as such stalking behaviour can often escalate in frequency and seriousness and place the victim at increased risk of harm.
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5. **SECTION 5 – CASE PREPARATION**

5.1. Prosecutors should work closely with the police and other specialist agencies to ensure that the best evidence is gathered and presented to the court. The case should have a clear narrative pre-empting and challenging any assumptions/associated myths and stereotypes. A strong and cohesive prosecution team is required to proactively build and manage a case.

5.2. If the suspects indicate that they will plead guilty, then in every case the police should ensure that, in addition to the usual material, the CPS is provided with a copy of the risk screening tool and any other relevant risk assessment together with the Victim Personal Statement. The victim’s view on any conditions that could be included in a restraining order should be clearly set out. This information should be provided to the CPS as soon as possible (ideally with the pre-charge request) to enable a full consideration of the risk posed by the suspect to the victim. This in turn will inform applications for bail and Restraining or Criminal Behaviour Orders.

5.3. When a victim asks the police not to proceed or withdraws their support for a prosecution, the police will take a written statement that will:

- Fully explain the reasons for withdrawing support;
- If the original account has to be amended, provide an explanation as to why this is the case;
- State whether the original complaint was true;
- Set out whether the victim has been pressurised to withdraw their complaint by any person;
- Details of those with whom victim has discussed the case especially anyone who has advised them (e.g. solicitor); and
- Confirm whether the victim is pursuing any civil action.

5.4. In addition, the police will provide a report that will set out:

- The officer’s views on the case, including the veracity of the statement, any suspicions of witness intimidation or pressure (if not already included in the withdrawal statement), and a general assessment of the reasons given by the victim;
- The officer’s views on how the case should be dealt with, including proceeding against the victim’s wishes;
- How the victim might react to being compelled to give evidence;
- Details of any identified risks to the safety of the victim, children or any other person;
- Details of the support available to the victim prior to the allegation being retracted or support withdrawn and whether this was a reason for the change in position (for example, access to an Independent Stalking Advocacy Caseworker (ISAC), Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA), Young Persons Violence Advisor (YPVA), Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA) or other support organisation, or whether the offer of special measures was made etc.);
- Whether any support organisation assisting the victim has expressed a view; and,
- The likely impact on the victim and any children/dependents of proceeding or not proceeding with the case.

5.5. If it is suspected that the victim has been pressurised or is frightened, the police will investigate further and assess any support that has been offered and whether the intervention of a specialist support service could make a difference. The prosecutor will, if appropriate, ask the court to delay any hearing to enable this to be done^6.

5.6. If the victim confirms that the complaint is true but still wants to withdraw, the police and CPS will consider the feasibility of continuing without the victim’s evidence and whether to do so against the victim’s wishes.

---
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5.7. The issue of a witness summons is a last resort; full consideration should be given to the specific facts of the case and impact on the victim’s safety and wellbeing. Where a victim is reluctant to attend court and it is decided the case can only continue with the victim’s evidence to prove the case, Section 169 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows the court to issue a witness summons if it considers it to be in the interests of justice to do so.

5.8. Before the decision to apply for a witness summons is taken, prosecutors must make enquiries to satisfy themselves that the safety of the victim, any children and/or other dependents will not be endangered. This information could be sourced from the police, and other sources such as any support organisations involved with assisting the victim. Prosecutors should familiarise themselves with the section on witness summons within the CPS Domestic Abuse Guidelines for Prosecutors.

6. **SECTION 6 – VICTIMS AND WITNESSES**

6.1. Investigators, prosecutors and Witness Care Units need to know what support agencies are available for victims within their local area and nationally. Victims must always be afforded the opportunity to be referred to specialist VAWG services and not subject to automatic referral without their consent. The police will endeavour to ensure the victim is provided with access to such support.

6.2. At the beginning of any investigation the police will ensure that victims are referred to relevant specialist support services. Victims will be provided with information about specialist support services (both national and were appropriate local services) together with information on how to contact them. Police and prosecutors should familiarise themselves with Table 3 of the Toolkit for prosecutors on VAWG cases involving vulnerable victims which outlines the support that should be given to vulnerable victims throughout the CJS.

6.3. It is important for police and prosecutors to remember that these cases may involve some of the most vulnerable victims and witnesses who may have the least confidence in the criminal justice process. They may also need support mechanisms not just during the prosecution process, but also after the case concludes. Victims of stalking or harassment are entitled to an enhanced service under The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime; CPS Legal Guidance (Victim’s Code). The police and CPS will comply with their responsibilities as set out in the Victims’ Code.

6.4. In every stalking or harassment case, the police will obtain the victim’s agreement on who is to be their specific point of contact (SPOC) and their preferred means of contact (telephone, text, email or other). The identity of the SPOC should be shared with the CPS and the Witness Care Unit so that it is clear who is responsible for communicating with the victim and recording any actions arising. Thought should be given to succession planning in preparation for when a SPOC moves on or has any absence from work. Consideration should also be given to establishing a safe number or method of communication to ensure effective communication.

6.5. At the outset of the case police officers will explain to victims and their supporters the available special measures and their advantages and disadvantages, including any potential impact on the proceedings. They will obtain victims’ informed views and pass them to the CPS to inform any special measures application. This should include the name of any supporter, including any IDVA, ISVA, YPVA or ISAC that the victim wishes to accompany them in court or a live link room. The CPS should make applications for special measures, bad character and hearsay evidence at the earliest possible opportunity. Police and prosecutors should remind victims of the services offered by the Witness Service such as pre-trial familiarisation visits.

6.6. The police and prosecutors will consider holding early special measures meetings to cover the requirements of witnesses for special measures and to enable the investigating officer to inform the prosecutor of the views of the witnesses. Prior to this meeting the investigating officer will contact the

---

7 However, this should be discussed with the victim; some victims may find a summons a useful tool to demonstrate that they had no choice but to attend court

8 This Specific point of contact is not the named CPS or Police Force Area lead SPOC referenced in paragraph 4.1
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relevant support service for an update on the victim’s situation and any recent developments.

6.7. In cases of stalking or harassment, the impact of the alleged behaviour on the victim is considerable. It is therefore essential that victims are given the opportunity and are supported to provide Victim Personal Statement (VPS) s. Where a VPS has not been obtained, the CPS will be provided with information setting out why the VPS was not taken and any background information that may assist the prosecutor. The purpose of a VPS is to assist the court by enabling the victim to describe the effect the alleged behaviour has had on them and their lives and to express an opinion on bail and other issues. Victims are entitled to say whether they would like to read their VPS aloud in court or whether they would like it read aloud or played (if recorded) for them. In all cases, the VPS and the information about the victim’s preference will be relayed to the court at the first hearing by the prosecutor.

6.8. Victims will be given the opportunity to make an addendum VPS at each significant stage of the case, particularly after a guilty plea or conviction after trial.

6.9. Where the CPS decision is not to charge or ends all proceedings in relation to the victim, the victim should be informed of their right to have the case re-reviewed as part of the Victim’s Right to Review (VRR) scheme.

7. **SECTION 7 - PLEAS**

7.1. The reviewing prosecutor will give clear instructions to the advocate conducting the case at court regarding the acceptability of pleas, in accordance with the Attorney General’s Guidelines on the Acceptance of Pleas and the Prosecutors’ Role in the Sentencing Exercise.

7.2. Where stalking is charged and the suspect offers to plead guilty to harassment, prosecutors will not accept pleas unless there are compelling reasons to do so. Prosecutors will have regards to:

- The victim’s views;
- Whether any new evidence that undermines the evidential test has been obtained since the original charging decision was made;
- Whether there have been any changes in circumstances since the decision to charge stalking was made;
- If the victim is reluctant to attend court, whether it be in the public interest to witness summons him or her;
- The strength of evidence to demonstrate behaviours associated with stalking.
- The reasons given by the defence for suggesting that a plea to harassment should be accepted;
- The possible explanation to a victim who felt that they had been stalked why a plea was taken to harassment.

7.3. If a decision is taken at court to offer no evidence or accept a lesser plea the views of the victim will be taken into account before a final decision is reached and the advocate will speak to the victim to directly or indirectly through an interpreter/an appointed person e.g. an ISAC, to explain the issues surrounding the decision. The prosecutor should seek the authority of their manager or instructing lawyer (if an agent) before the victim is approached for their views. A plea to harassment in place of one of stalking should only occur on the rarest of occasions.

8. **SECTION 8 – TRIAL**

8.1. Prosecutors should familiarise themselves with the CPS Speaking to Witnesses at Court guidance which emphasises the need to ensure witnesses are properly assisted and know more about what to expect before they give their evidence. It sets out what is expected of prosecution advocates, outlining what they can and cannot say to witnesses and explaining the difference between assisting a witness to be better able to deal with the rigours of giving evidence and witness coaching.

8.2. The prosecuting advocate will introduce themselves to the victim at court prior to the commencement of Protocol on the appropriate handling of stalking or harassment offences between the National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Crown Prosecution Service.
the trial. This is especially important if a special measures meeting with the victim has not taken place.\textsuperscript{9} Prosecutors should be aware of the potential for the witness to feel further victimised and/or traumatised and, to minimise this, should ensure that witnesses feel valued and involved in the court process. Particular care needs to be taken to make sure they understand what will happen in court.

8.3. Witnesses should be reassured that the prosecution can object to intrusive/irrelevant cross-examination and the judge will decide whether the questions need to be answered. The witness should be advised that the judge’s decision must be followed.

9. \textbf{SECTION 9 – RESTRAINING ORDERS}

9.1. Restraining orders\textsuperscript{10} will often be essential to ensure the on-going safety and security of victims of stalking or harassment. The police will explain to victims that restraining orders may be applied for on conviction, or where possible, on acquittal.

9.2. The police will explain to victims what a restraining order is and the protection it seeks to provide. At the earliest opportunity they will obtain the victim’s views and those of any other specialist services working with the victim as to whether a restraining order is necessary and will provide accurate and up to date information to support an application for a restraining order. This will entail, for example, checking the accuracy of addresses and ensuring these details are reflected in a draft restraining order setting out the proposed prohibitions. Given that in most cases there will be delay between the suspect being charged and the case being finalised at court it is essential that officers check that the initial information provided to prosecutors is still accurate in case any alterations to the conditions are required. For example, where a victim has changed address.

9.3. The police should provide information to support an application for a restraining order to the prosecutor as early as possible. If the CPS is required to make a charging decision the information supporting the application should be recorded in the MG3. Where the case has not been submitted to the CPS for a charging decision the information should be recorded in the MG6. The police officer should also remember to complete the MG5 notifying the suspect that such an application will be made.

9.4. Prosecutors will remind the court to inform the police if a restraining order is granted by the court. The police will promptly inform the victim of the particular conditions of the restraining order and where appropriate also share these with the IDVA/ISAC or other specialist agency and the probation service.

9.5. Police and CPS should be aware that breach of a restraining order (as well as being an offence itself) is often evidence of further stalking or harassment. When this occurs the police will take expeditious and robust action to deal with the breach and to bring such alleged offending before the court in a timely manner.

10. \textbf{SECTION 10 - SHARING LESSONS LEARNT}

10.1. Both the local police and CPS will monitor these cases and provide feedback about good practice and areas for improvement including for CPSP through an agreed frequency of meetings between the police and the CPS lead. This includes lessons learnt from CPS Local Scrutiny and Involvement Panels (LSIPs).

10.2. Where appropriate lessons learnt should also be shared with local specialist support agencies either through existing forums or by arranging ad-hoc meetings as well as with CPS Headquarters so that good practice can be shared nationally.

11. \textbf{SECTION 11 – SIGNATORIES}

\textsuperscript{9} Where special measures will be used in stalking cases special considerations should be given as to whether a special measures meeting should be held

\textsuperscript{10} The CPS has legal guidance on restraining orders which and can be found here: http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/p_to_r/restraining_orders/

Protocol on the appropriate handling of stalking or harassment offences between the National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Crown Prosecution Service
11.1. This protocol will take effect in respect of all stalking and harassment investigations and prosecutions commencing on or after xxxxxxx 2018.

Alison Saunders
Director of Public Prosecutions

DCC Paul Mills Wiltshire Police
National Police Chiefs’ Council
Joint NPCC and CPS Checklist – For Use by Police Forces and CPS in Cases of Harassment or Stalking

Date:  
Officer in case:  
Staff number:  
Case reference:

The Police are to complete each box on the Checklist and send to the CPS in every case where charging advice or a charging decision is sought. The form is an important part of the evidential file - it should be fully and accurately completed. If the case also involves Domestic Abuse (DA) then the DA checklist should also be completed. This form does not replace the DA check list, but complements it.

Ensure that: timely decisions are made; a charging checklist is completed for each victim (where more than one is involved); and the overall allegation is considered through the assessment of all available evidence, including the role and behaviour of the suspect.

The checklist does not replace the MG3, but should supplement it. The CPS should comprehensively endorse the MG3 including addressing any evidential weaknesses.

The safety of victims, their friends, children and dependents is paramount. The risks to them, must be carefully considered in these cases. Where possible, referrals to Independent Stalking Advocacy Caseworkers (ISACs), Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs), or equivalent specialist service support should be made at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Police must refer to the College of Policing Authorised Professional Practice here. Further information about charging cases of stalking or harassment is available here. Further information charging cases of domestic abuse cases is available here.

| POLICE OFFICER - Before starting this checklist have you collected all available evidence, and have you given consideration to the wider pattern of behaviour, its cumulative impact and the context of the behaviour? Please ensure that all documentation referred to in the checklist is included with the file i.e. risk assessments, statements etc. |
|---|---|---|
| **In cases of stalking, there is a pattern of unwanted, fixated and / or obsessive behaviour which is intrusive. It could be harassment that amounts to stalking or stalking that causes fear of violence or serious alarm or distress. Have you considered why this case does not meet the description of stalking?** | YES | NO | COMMENT* |
| Risk screening / risk assessment tool | | | |
| 101 / 999 Call | | | |
| 101 / 999 Call supplied to CPS Direct | | | |
| Body Worn Video | | | |
| Victim statement - refer to all previous incidents if relevant and the impact the behaviour has had on the victim) | | | |
| Photographs; of tangible evidence such as damage and any injuries (taken over time as injuries develop). Photographs of perishable items i.e. flowers. Consider screenshots of text messages electronic communications etc. Consider CSI advice. | | | |
| Admissions – especially were admissions are made about contact via social media. | | | |
### Medical evidence / DNA (if available at the time); signed consent form; medical exhibits i.e. hair, presents

### Other statements – children, attending officer, disposition of victim/offender, IDs of other persons present, and if relevant neighbours, family members, doctors, employers and work colleagues as well as specialist support services

### Passive data/Comms data/Financial data e.g. data mining foot prints, social media/other electronic evidence, messages, diaries, spyware technology, apps, bank-records CCTV. Check all devices for incoming and outgoing data, WIFI and cell site data, including spyware (NB: communications data can be collected retrospectively from the service provide).

### Relevant information to include from Police Records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|Risk of reoffending. Any previous risk screening / identification checklist with outcome (
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any civil orders/proceedings and whether there has been previous breaches in any previous case (including DVPOs / DVPNs/PINs/court bail).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any previous allegations (with URNs and including other victims) and how these allegations were concluded (if case did not proceed why not?) DVDs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police to inform CPS of any breach or further offences, submit files to CPS and supply interview record in a timely way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were any firearms used? Does the suspect or members of the household have a firearms licence or are there any intelligence reports linking the suspect and/or household members to weapons?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information regarding the victim and/or incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Personal Statement; if the victim wishes to provide one (which should be updated throughout case proceedings and include the impact).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of victim (victim’s views and specialist support service views if applicable).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether victim has been contacted by suspect/friends/family whether contact is supportive or intimidating – detail within comments section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter allegations/defence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to support an application for bad character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraining Order – does the victim want one and if so with what terms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail conditions that do not restrict the victim and any children. Include locations to avoid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawing support/retraction. There may be a number of reasons why the police might be asked not to proceed further including fear of further harm or repercussions. See CPS Legal Guidance for further information and steps to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Including the need for an officer’s statement on the appropriateness of a summons.

| Ability/willingness of victim to attend court, give evidence and any special considerations. |
| Special measures needed? And type (views of victim and specialist support service) need to complete an MG2. |

* The comment box must be completed if no evidence available or if the section is not applicable

### CPS Prompts for Prosecutors

Prosecutors must refer to the CPS [LegalGuidanceonStalkingandHarassment](#).
The table below provides some helpful prompts for prosecutors to consider and record in the MG3 and any case review.

| Provision and gathering of wider information in addition to this evidence gathering checklist. |
| If further evidence is required from the police ensure this is articulated in a clear and concise action plan, and discussed with the Officer as appropriate. |
| Find out whether there are any concurrent or imminent public law or private law family proceedings or civil proceedings and remedies involving the victim or suspect. |

### Assessing the suspect/defendant.

Consider in every case of harassment that is referred through if this is a case of stalking?

Ensure timely applications for; admissions, hearsay evidence and/or bad character.

Has the credibility of the defendant been fully considered? E.g. Are there any previous instances of misconduct/convictions. Check CPS systems including CMS?

#### Do any of the statutory defences apply?

- Was the behaviour pursued for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime;
- Was it pursued under any enactment or rule of law or to comply with any condition or requirement imposed by any person under any enactment; or
- In the particular circumstances of the case was the pursuit of the course of conduct reasonable?

Are there any other possible defences?

A plea to harassment in place of one of stalking should only occur on the rarest of occasions. When considering the acceptability of pleas has proper consideration been given to CPS [LegalGuidance](#) and the [AttorneyGeneral’sGuidelines](#)?

### Victim and witness support following a decision to charge.

| Victim Personal Statement obtained and updated throughout the case progression. |
| Timely consideration of; special measures, Pre-Trial Witness Interviews, expert evidence and other support measures. |
| Identification and consideration of vulnerabilities (BME, physical or mental impairment, LGBT, age). |
| On-going communication through Witness Care Units/other specialist services on case progression and any other useful information. |
| Where there is a withdrawal or retraction; see CPS Legal Guidance for further information on the possible reasons including fear or coercion, which should be fully explored with victim/WCU/Specialist support. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The purpose of this paper is to update Chief Constables on the progress of the programme of the review into the national resilience of investigators since the recommendations were supported in full at Chief Constables Council in January 2018.

1.2. Since that report:

- HMICFRS have refreshed their data on qualified investigators
- HMICFRS have published recommendations in their PEEL effectiveness report
- A national 'Summit' has been held
- A Pay and Rewards submission has been made
- ACC Chris Shead and ACC Jason Hogg have agreed to support strands of work.

1.3 Detail on each of these points is outlined below.

2. REFRESHED DATA CAPTURE

2.1. As was detailed in the January paper, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) collected data in July 2017 from forces to try to establish the accurate picture of the gap in qualified investigators. As a result of this initial data collection, the HMICFRS estimated that 22%, or 4800 investigator posts, were vacant or filled with staff who are not fully qualified.

2.2 Following that collection of data, the HMICFRS allowed forces to resubmit data following their inspection and in the period immediately prior to publication (when forces complete their pre-publication checks). Following these data resubmissions, Forces report that they have 17% fewer investigators than they need. This amounts to a shortfall of over 5,000 investigators in England and Wales (as reported in July 2017). This data is reflected in the HMICFRS PEEL 2017 effectiveness report published on the 22nd March 2018.
3 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2 In their PEEL Effectiveness 2017 report, the HMICFRS made a further recommendation in relation to the national shortage of investigators. –

‘By September 2018, all forces with a shortage in qualified detectives and/or other investigators should develop an action plan. The plan should set out in detail what the force will do to address the shortage in the short, medium and long term. It should be in line with the national plan to develop investigative capacity and capability that all chief constables in England and Wales have agreed.’

This plan should draw on the information in the force management statement about:

• The investigative demand the force expects to face in the next four years; and

• How the force will change and improve the condition, capacity, capability, serviceability, performance and security of supply of its workforce and other assets to cope with that demand.

To make sure the plans are consistent, the National Police Chiefs’ Council lead on investigative resilience has agreed to provide advice on the areas each plan should cover by April 2018.

3.3 By the end of April 2018, the programme team will prepare and provide advice to all forces on the areas each plan should cover.

4. NATIONAL ‘SUMMIT’ LEARNING EVENT

4.1 The College of Policing continue to update their National report relating to the list of current interventions available and what each force is adopting to address the shortage. This report has now been made available across the service.

4.2 On the 9th February 2018, a ‘Summit’ learning event was held for all forces to further facilitate the sharing of experience and for leading organisations to present feedback on the progress of the interventions adopted. Senior Leaders and representatives from 40 forces attended along with representatives from CoP, ROCU and [S23(1)].

4.3 In order to assess how successful the ‘out of the norm’ interventions have been, funding has been secured from NCTPHQ to support an independent evaluation and discussions are currently in place to identify suitable evaluators.

5. PAY AND REWARD

5.1 As was detailed in the January CCC paper, the programme team supported the National Reward Team in arranging eight focus groups across four regions, as in 2017, the Police Pay Review Body asked for evidence from officers on their views about pay. In February 2018, the National Reward Team sent their submission to the Review Body and it is anticipated that the outcomes will be available during summer 2018. The report on the focus groups of Detectives is attached.

5.2 The National Rewards Team have also separately drafted a wording on possible bonus payments for detectives which have been identified as ‘hard to fill’ roles and this is currently at discussion and consultation stage.
6. RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND WELLBEING OF INVESTIGATORS

6.1. A Recruitment, Retention and Wellbeing of Investigators working group has been developed with CC Jukes chairing the strategic group. The group will be separated into three distinct sub groups as is reflected in the attached Governance Flowchart. The first of these meetings will take place in April 2018 and will include representation from the S23[1] and CT to understand capacity requirements and future recruitment needs for national functions.

6.2. The Recruitment and Initial Development Working Sub Group will be chaired by ACC Hogg and will work towards providing a consistent and coordinated approach to recruitment and development of investigators and to provide guidance and learning for forces planning to adopt recruitment interventions. Along with other stakeholders, representatives from the College of Policing will be invited to ensure that as the current recruitment initiatives evolve, they take account of the Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF) and the Higher Level Apprenticeship (HLA).

6.3. The (Re) Mobilisation Working Group will be chaired by ACC Shead and will work towards establishing a pool of suitably qualified investigators who can be drawn upon to fulfil surge and other investigative needs across the Police Service in England and Wales. The group will also carry out a watching brief and remain engaged with the progress of the concept of ‘Reservists’.

6.4. The Wellbeing Working Group will engage with the National Wellbeing Group but will focus specifically around detectives. They will also engage with the Learning Leaders work of the NPCC as this group seeks to deal with aspects of the ‘blame culture’ that is reportedly affecting detective resilience. This group will also continue to engage with the National Reward Team in respect of detective pay and conditions and look at marketing opportunities to celebrate the role of a Detective.

Matt Jukes
Chief Constable
Investigative Resilience Programme
Fourth Submission to the Police Remuneration Review Body

February 2018
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1. Introduction

The 2018 Submission

1.1. This submission is the fourth to be presented to the Police Remuneration Review Body ("PRRB") by the National Police Chiefs’ Council ("NPCC").

1.2. In accordance with the requests set out in the remit letters issued by the Home Secretary we plan the following items:

- set our annual request for an annual pay increase taking into account the more flexible approach to public sector pay. This is set out for all ranks including chief officers
- considered our skills shortages
- described our proposed approach to apprenticeship pay
- described the next stage of the NPCC’s plans for a new pay structure and timetable until 2020

1.3. Given our current funding position we are acutely aware of the need for pay discipline and to ensure continued affordability and sustainability. This will constrain our current flexibility and may impact on our future ability to implement a new pay framework. However, we have begun to set out a methodology that we wish to move towards. Following the submission of this report we will be starting a consultation process with our stakeholders which will enable us to provide definitive proposals for the 2019 submission, with final implementation from 2020.

Recommendation 1 - Annual pay uplift

1.4. We are recommending a pay increase for all officer ranks of 2 per cent to be applied to current pay points from 1st September 2018.

1.5. This has been a difficult decision for forces to determine and has been arrived at on the basis:

- our officers continue to work in challenging times and deserve a higher rise than we have been able to offer in recent years
- the public sector pay cap has now been removed and therefore an annual rise of more than 1% should be considered
- funding will increase for forces for the year 2018/19. However, the effect of the increase, if available, varies across forces from a projected 1.6% increase in the local force budget, to a maximum of 3.6%, the median for forces being 2.5%. The effect of these increases is not sufficient for the majority of forces to fund more than a 2% increase for officers. Forces also continue to face other inflationary and operational demands for additional investment
- the additional monies allocated to officers in the form of an unconsolidated payment of 1% last year will end in August 2018

Comparison with pay awards, particularly others in the public sector.

Whilst initial benchmarking of rank based pay against comparators might indicate some differences, this work is in its early stages and has not been shared with or tested by stakeholders.

Targeting of pay based on roles has been considered in previous submissions. Forces continue to face different pressures in terms of recruitment and retention. The temporary
flexibility around bonus payments, although not yet implemented, will enable specific targeting where financial issues are a factor.

**Recommendation 2 - London Weighting**

1.6. The MPS have provided a separate submission around the London Weighting. NPCC recognises the desire for greater flexibility but is concerned about the potential impact on neighbouring forces, in particular given the scale of the requested increase.

**Recommendation 3 - Dog Handlers' Allowance**

1.7. We recommend an uplift in the annual dog handlers' allowance in line with the increase in base pay. The dog handlers' allowance would therefore be increased by 2 per cent.

**Recommendation 4 - Apprenticeship Pay**

1.8. We recommend that we set a new starting rate for apprentice constables, reducing pay point 0 to £18,000, enabling forces to set apprentice pay based on local market factors and in line with current market comparisons for higher level apprenticeships. This recommendation will be considered outside the normal submission timetable. This pay rate will apply for the first year of the constables' apprenticeship. A set of principles will be drafted that will help to inform the local process for setting an appropriate salary level.
2. Background

2.1. This section sets out the background to this submission, covering a picture of policing 2017/18, our workforce numbers and workforce transformation.

Policing in 2017/18

2.2. This pay submission is being delivered at a time when policing in the 21st century is facing new challenges, due to new and emerging types of crime and, also, the increasing complexity, sophistication and diversity of what is required in order to deliver an effective, ethically-based, professional and accountable service to the public. The police service needs to change and adapt to this new modern policing environment and the new demands placed upon policing, so that it can continue to fulfil the mission of policing.

2.3. 2017 was particularly challenging. Policing is being stretched with new demand from complex and serious threats, such as counter terrorism and serious organised crime, and increase in more traditional crimes, together with additional associated investigating demands and rising number of calls for service. At the same time the service needs to invest in problem solving and preventative measures:

Crime is now on the increase and is becoming more complex in nature: after a long period of decline, police recorded crime in 2016/17 has increased by 10% as compared to 2015/16 and increased by 8% in the previous year. We are seeing significant increases in complex fraud cases; cybercrime; child sexual abuse and exploitation; human trafficking and modern slavery as well as coercive domestic abuse. These types of crimes are not properly recorded in official crime statistics and due to rising complexity are becoming considerably more costly to solve (in some instances we have seen double digit growth in both incidence and costs of solving)

Record levels in calls for service: 999 calls have in particular seen a significant rise, 11.3% in the 12 months to June 2017¹. Some forces have reported that June 2017 was their highest ever month for 999 calls. Greater Manchester Police, for example, recorded 50,368 calls in the month following the Manchester Arena attack, which is 9,000 more than in the same month in 2015.

The increased terror threat is placing considerable strain on forces for instance, in the 7 days following the Manchester attack an indicative total of 29,713 officers were deployed nationally alongside 3,890 police staff to respond to the incident and increased threat level. Similar proportions were reported by the Metropolitan police following the Westminster attacks.

Shunting responsibilities from other public services: a growing share of police workload consists of non-crime demand. The impact of austerity in other public services, has caused the public to rely more than ever on the police service to provide assistance, particularly to vulnerable individuals, diverting resources away from other areas of policing. These problems range from supporting non-mental health incidents for extended periods while awaiting ambulance treatment, or being called out to non-suspicious deaths in care homes when in practice other agencies have a primary obligation to attend.

¹ Based on data returns from 31 forces received January 2018
2.4. These pressures are set against a backdrop of forces that have experienced 7 years of austerity. The police officer workforce is at 1985 levels and at March 2017, it was 18.7% (45,813 posts) lower than in March 2010.

2.5. Within forces there is considerable concern that these combined challenges mean the balance between preventative and responsive activities of policing is under threat. The volume of policing capability devoted to reducing demand is falling leading to a more reactive service as demand is increasing. HMICFRS concluded that the legitimacy of policing is at risk as the relationship with communities that underpins all activity is fading to a point where prevention, early intervention and core engagement that fosters feelings of safety are at risk of becoming ineffective.

**Our Workforce in 2018**

2.6. The workforce is the major component of police spending (the National Audit Office put the figure at 79%) and, as budgets have fallen, so has staffing. The police officer workforce is at 1985 levels. At this time, the UK population was circa 56.5 million. Since then has increased by circa 10 million and is projected to reach 70 million by 2027.

2.7. There were 123,124 full-time equivalent police officers at March 2017, a reduction of 20,593 (14.3%) from March 2010. Officer numbers have fallen each year since 2009/10. Overall, the total police workforce (including police staff, police community staff officer etc.) reduced by 1.1% over the one year period to March 2017, and is 18.7% (45,813 posts) lower than in March 2010. The reduction in police officers numbers has occurred over a period when the overall population continued to increase.

2.8. The table overleaf shows the reported numbers for year ending March 2016 and March 2017, showing the numbers of officers within each force grouped by the annualised percentage changes.

2.9. Efficiency has to some degree enabled the service to make these changes. Capabilities should not be assessed simply on the number of officers. However, policing remains a highly labour intensive service. There are few operational policing services capable of full automation. The growing crimes against the vulnerable need direct contact. At times of high security threat or during public disorder, the mobilisation of numbers of officers is critical.

2.10. The critical strain on numbers is increasingly evidenced in signs of stress in the workforce. The number of officers on long-term sick leave grew by 22% from 1,928 in 2013 to 2,358 in 2017. As a proportion of the workforce, this represents an increase from 1.5% to 2.0%. In each of the past three years, over half of police officers who responded to the Police Federation of England and Wales annual survey said their own morale was low.

---

4 Source: Home Office data January 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force name</th>
<th>Mar 15</th>
<th>Mar 17</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, City of</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>32,125</td>
<td>31,517</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mercia</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon &amp; Somerset</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>6,297</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed-Powys</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>4,501</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124,056</td>
<td>123,142</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11 In common with other public servants, such as prison officers, the lead time from recruitment to a deployable officer means that the return on investment in policing is not immediate.

2.12 The Annual Survey, Appendix M, highlights the applications, promotions, leavers and retirees.
Workforce Transformation - 2017 to 2018

2.13 Forces have continued to work with the College of Policing on Workforce Transformation, in the last 12 months and in this submission we have highlighted where this will have an impact on officer pay and conditions. There is still a full programme of work to complete which we explain in more detail in section 4.

2.14 Achievement of the Workforce Transformation underpins all of the College's initiatives. They are organised under six principal headings, all reflecting fundamental aspects of workforce transformation. They are professional areas towards which the police service should specifically direct its attention, so as to achieve the professional transformation that lies at the heart of the reform agenda articulated by Policing Vision 2025\(^6\). These headings are:

- attraction and recruitment into the police service
- professional development of the workforce
- well-being and engagement
- leadership in policing
- pay and grading
- organisational development

2.15 A full commentary on the work which is being presented to forces is included at Appendix B.

\(^6\) NPCC Policing Vision 2025, published November 2016
3. Funding

Police funding 2018/19 and beyond

3.1. Since the 2015 spending settlement, police forces have begun to experience additional pressures. Forces are concerned that the current settlement for policing no longer:

- ensures the resilience of police forces to respond to increases in demand
- accounts for the ongoing changes to the national security environment
- provides a preventative model of policing that is needed to ensure our communities can thrive

3.2. During Autumn 2017 the Association of Police & Crime Commissioners ("APCC") and NPCC collated evidence from across all 43 police forces in England and Wales and presented its findings to Government. The Government responded in December 2017. We asked for additional funding.

3.3. The Police Grant Settlement for 2018-19 provided all police forces with the same amount of core Home Office revenue grants as in 2017-18. In addition the Settlement provided PCCs with the flexibility to raise their local council tax precept by up to £12 a year for a band D property. Should all PCCs take full advantage of this precept flexibility it will raise an additional £270m in England and Wales. However, this increase is not uniform across all forces. As the following tables shows the annual percentage increase in direct resource funding ranges from 1.6% in Merseyside to 3.6% in Surrey (listed in alphabetical order), with an average increase of 2.5%.

3.4. Whilst the increased budget offered by greater flexibility on precept was welcomed by NPCC, it was below the level requested for policing. The NPCC/APCC budget bid identified the financial pressures caused by operational priorities. It made no provision for pay uplift above that included in previous medium term financial plans (1%). Therefore any increase to pay assumptions will reduce the amount allocated to operational growth (which is already below the necessary level).

3.5. Since the public sector pay cap was abolished in the Autumn Statement all forces are now required to incorporate a realistic and affordable provision for future pay awards, within their annual budgets and medium term financial plans.

3.6. The Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers Society ("PACTTS") has issued a budget survey for 2018-19. Based on replies to date from 33 of the 43 forces in England and Wales, 30 have made financial provision for a 2% police officer pay award in 2018, one has assumed 3% but two have assumed just 1%. The table below explains the current funding for 2017/18 and 2018/19.

3.7. Chief constables discussed this at the last NPCC meeting on 25th January 2018 and there is real concern about how the recommendation for the next annual pay uplift may affect forces. It should be borne in mind that as rises affect forces five months into the financial year (from September 2018) any unexpected increases in salary costs, like an increase beyond the NPCC's pay uplift recommendations, will not have been allowed for in this financial year 2018/19. This will inevitably affect future operational capability and capacity.
Comparison of Government Core Funding and Direct Resource Funding between 2017-18 and 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;DIRECT RESOURCE FUNDING&quot; everything, including NICC and council tax</th>
<th>&quot;GOVERNMENT CORE FUNDING&quot; police core settlement, allocation under rule 1, ex DCLG, 2 welsh grants</th>
<th>&quot;DIRECT RESOURCE FUNDING&quot; everything, including NICC and council tax</th>
<th>&quot;GOVERNMENT CORE FUNDING&quot; police core settlement, allocation under rule 1, ex DCLG, 2 welsh grants</th>
<th>Change in Direct Resource Funding since 2017-18</th>
<th>Change in Core Funding since 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon &amp; Somerset</td>
<td>£ 273,740,350</td>
<td>£ 159,254,132</td>
<td>£ 281,751,216</td>
<td>£ 159,254,132</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>£ 101,400,056</td>
<td>£ 62,771,904</td>
<td>£ 104,344,277</td>
<td>£ 62,771,904</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>£ 129,798,389</td>
<td>£ 71,886,598</td>
<td>£ 133,833,202</td>
<td>£ 71,886,598</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>£ 172,361,246</td>
<td>£ 104,762,579</td>
<td>£ 177,544,969</td>
<td>£ 104,762,579</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>£ 55,909,819</td>
<td>£ 51,301,130</td>
<td>£ 56,809,819</td>
<td>£ 51,301,130</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>£ 123,150,729</td>
<td>£ 83,499,754</td>
<td>£ 125,392,182</td>
<td>£ 83,499,754</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>£ 100,428,168</td>
<td>£ 58,710,055</td>
<td>£ 102,953,044</td>
<td>£ 58,710,055</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>£ 162,658,421</td>
<td>£ 98,436,746</td>
<td>£ 167,140,994</td>
<td>£ 98,436,746</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>£ 282,040,984</td>
<td>£ 163,528,888</td>
<td>£ 290,530,890</td>
<td>£ 163,528,888</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>£ 120,486,984</td>
<td>£ 57,749,130</td>
<td>£ 124,647,641</td>
<td>£ 57,749,130</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>£ 113,034,512</td>
<td>£ 78,558,004</td>
<td>£ 115,452,898</td>
<td>£ 78,558,004</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed-Powys</td>
<td>£ 96,615,770</td>
<td>£ 49,312,645</td>
<td>£ 99,669,552</td>
<td>£ 49,312,645</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>£ 267,044,909</td>
<td>£ 156,495,139</td>
<td>£ 275,894,230</td>
<td>£ 156,495,139</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>£ 106,472,142</td>
<td>£ 53,167,997</td>
<td>£ 109,782,230</td>
<td>£ 53,167,997</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>£ 545,394,197</td>
<td>£ 402,305,636</td>
<td>£ 555,761,674</td>
<td>£ 402,305,636</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>£ 120,942,177</td>
<td>£ 71,486,789</td>
<td>£ 123,951,928</td>
<td>£ 71,486,789</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>£ 304,494,307</td>
<td>£ 180,590,341</td>
<td>£ 314,136,375</td>
<td>£ 180,590,341</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>£ 182,812,668</td>
<td>£ 106,256,551</td>
<td>£ 189,008,029</td>
<td>£ 106,256,551</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>£ 171,370,692</td>
<td>£ 112,222,838</td>
<td>£ 175,216,571</td>
<td>£ 112,222,838</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>£ 279,350,799</td>
<td>£ 170,464,271</td>
<td>£ 288,028,686</td>
<td>£ 170,464,271</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>&quot;DIRECT RESOURCE FUNDING&quot; everything, including NICC and council tax</td>
<td>&quot;GOVERNMENT CORE FUNDING&quot; police core settlement, allocation under rule 1, ex DCLG, 2 welsh grants</td>
<td>&quot;DIRECT RESOURCE FUNDING&quot; everything, including NICC and council tax</td>
<td>&quot;GOVERNMENT CORE FUNDING&quot; police core settlement, allocation under rule 1, ex DCLG, 2 welsh grants</td>
<td>Change in Direct Resource Funding since 2017-18</td>
<td>Change in Core Funding since 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>£ 260,344,289</td>
<td>£ 177,197,008</td>
<td>£ 266,455,239</td>
<td>£ 177,197,008</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>£ 170,545,490</td>
<td>£ 103,525,776</td>
<td>£ 175,096,812</td>
<td>£ 103,525,776</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>£ 110,566,868</td>
<td>£ 57,906,638</td>
<td>£ 113,893,210</td>
<td>£ 57,906,638</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>£ 307,495,527</td>
<td>£ 232,019,550</td>
<td>£ 312,681,489</td>
<td>£ 232,019,550</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPAC</td>
<td>£ 2,474,103,972</td>
<td>£ 1,588,743,515</td>
<td>£ 2,516,964,812</td>
<td>£ 1,588,743,515</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>£ 148,904,732</td>
<td>£ 77,888,291</td>
<td>£ 153,187,334</td>
<td>£ 77,888,291</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>£ 143,216,633</td>
<td>£ 71,727,522</td>
<td>£ 147,258,440</td>
<td>£ 71,727,522</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>£ 140,696,410</td>
<td>£ 67,761,858</td>
<td>£ 145,141,451</td>
<td>£ 67,761,858</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>£ 122,037,414</td>
<td>£ 66,408,428</td>
<td>£ 125,543,459</td>
<td>£ 66,408,428</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>£ 260,141,801</td>
<td>£ 214,456,585</td>
<td>£ 265,284,451</td>
<td>£ 214,456,585</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>£ 190,467,715</td>
<td>£ 124,291,344</td>
<td>£ 194,966,811</td>
<td>£ 124,291,344</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>£ 262,787,051</td>
<td>£ 157,406,561</td>
<td>£ 269,470,832</td>
<td>£ 157,406,561</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>£ 240,747,301</td>
<td>£ 175,571,668</td>
<td>£ 245,651,401</td>
<td>£ 175,571,668</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>£ 177,732,333</td>
<td>£ 104,935,554</td>
<td>£ 182,630,994</td>
<td>£ 104,935,554</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>£ 112,694,862</td>
<td>£ 62,701,339</td>
<td>£ 116,244,956</td>
<td>£ 62,701,339</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>£ 210,163,846</td>
<td>£ 90,105,073</td>
<td>£ 217,651,215</td>
<td>£ 90,105,073</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>£ 256,016,636</td>
<td>£ 149,598,320</td>
<td>£ 264,631,015</td>
<td>£ 149,598,320</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td>£ 376,882,056</td>
<td>£ 212,103,350</td>
<td>£ 389,562,154</td>
<td>£ 212,103,350</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>£ 90,800,611</td>
<td>£ 47,782,856</td>
<td>£ 93,706,419</td>
<td>£ 47,782,856</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mercia</td>
<td>£ 201,179,190</td>
<td>£ 108,201,666</td>
<td>£ 207,460,055</td>
<td>£ 108,201,666</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>£ 524,416,684</td>
<td>£ 425,070,634</td>
<td>£ 533,873,579</td>
<td>£ 425,070,634</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>£ 408,269,132</td>
<td>£ 296,630,298</td>
<td>£ 417,190,420</td>
<td>£ 296,630,298</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>£ 105,046,949</td>
<td>£ 57,354,188</td>
<td>£ 108,648,259</td>
<td>£ 57,354,188</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Efficiency savings**

3.8. However, in the face of these pressures it is important to re-emphasise our commitment to continued modernisation and efficiency. HMIC have noted that forces have reported savings totaling circa £1.6bn from 2010/11 to 2015/16 whilst rating the majority of forces as “good” or “outstanding.” This is about 5.8% of the budget allocated to the police for the period. This compares favourably to efficiency savings of £2.3bn\(^7\) achieved by central government departments in the year 2015/16 against a Departmental Expenditure Limit budget of £293bn, implying efficiency savings in that year of 0.8%.

3.9. Since 2015, we have focused more on self-reform. The APCC and NPCC have worked together to create Vision 2025 to guide the next phase of transformation and set out our change ambitions. So far, our focus has been on improving digital policing; establishing a national cyber security centre; more efficient use of specialist capabilities; better provision for protected persons services and planned efficiencies in forensics provision.

3.10. The reforms outlined above will contribute towards securing the long-term resilience of the police force and its associated agencies as a whole. We also recognise the importance of making efficiencies in the shorter-term and are well on track to do so. In 2015, forces were asked to achieve £350m worth of procurement savings by 2020 and to date we have made £219m (equivalent to 4,000 officer posts).

3.11. However, to meet our target we will need to engage in more fundamental transformation of our operations. Through the work of our newly established National Commercial Board we are also considering opportunities for greater back and middle office shared services, more opportunities for income generation and improved management information to support more efficient decision making.

---

\(^7\) Cabinet Office (February 2017), “Savings delivered in 2015/16 in government departments”
4. Methodology & evidence

Methodology to produce the report

4.1. This submission was prepared by the NPCC Reward Team reporting to the Lead for Police Officer Pay and Conditions, Chief Constable Francis Habgood. The reward team was newly formed after November 2016, funded by Workforce Transformation monies and sponsored by the Home Office.

4.2. The brief to the reward team was to design a new reward framework for officers by March 2018. However, given the structure of forces, i.e. that they are separate entities, and given the lack of current infrastructure supporting officer reward within the NPCC, it became clear that we first needed to construct the evidence to follow through with appropriate consultation and lead to successful implementation.

4.3. Therefore after the submission for the 2017 review was made, the team has concentrated on collecting evidence to justify a new framework to the PRRB. At this stage, evidence has been collected directly from forces and officers to help form a draft framework. This is described in this submission. In 2018, using this evidence, the NPCC will then start formal consultation on the details and reinforce this evidence.

4.4. It is important to note that the issues the reward team have encountered, are different from a conventional reward exercise of this type, for the following reasons:

   The need to co-ordinate and consult with multiple stakeholders namely the PRRB itself, the team at the Office Manpower and Economics, the Home Office, the NPCC (including 43 chief constables who are each individual employers), the College of Policing, the APCC, Police Federation, Police Superintendents Association ("PSAEW") and Chief Police Officers’ Staff Association (CPOSA)
   The need to separately contact 43 forces for data and information. Data is completed by a range of personnel and, depending upon the responder, interpreting our requests differently, so making some responses unreliable. There are networks that the Home Office uses for its own data collections for the creation of the police census data however these personnel were not necessarily suitable for our purposes
   Practical day to day understanding of officer reward is principally held by local force finance teams rather than HR personnel. When asked, local personnel do not necessarily have a view or clear evidence of what they need or want. Local reward specialists are a rarity, exceptions being in the larger forces or where there are collaborations. Where they exist they are also be focused on staff remuneration and generally do not have full knowledge of officer pay and conditions, or a full understanding of regulations
   There was no prior incumbent or NPCC reward team, so all information required to complete the exercise needed to be identified and collected by the reward team across the stakeholders. No one person or stakeholder holds the necessary records or materials to carry out this work

4.5. During the initial 6 month period, the team focused on meeting with the key stakeholder associations and linking into their networks. This has included:
working with the staff associations Police Federation, Superintendents Association and the APCC trailblazer team working on **apprenticeships** (collaboration between the College of Policing, forces representatives)

College of Policing team working on **advanced practitioners** (collaboration between the College of Policing, forces representatives)

**hard to fill roles** we have surveyed forces generally and specifically worked with the team established by CC Matt Jukes to consider the issues besetting investigators

**data collection** we have worked with the Home Office to help with its workforce census, allowing us to understand data held by forces and how to properly calculate costs of changes to the reward network. Also meeting with other stakeholders, including CoP, PFEW and OME to understand what types of data are held and can be shared, as appropriate, for mutual benefit. We had a meeting with the MPS allowing us to understand the breadth of the data they hold and what analysis is possible. Several forces are updating their HR systems, making completion of some the data requests from ourselves and Home Office difficult to complete. This will be positive for future analysis, although for some making retrospective analysis more difficult

4.6. In the second half of 2017, we then turned our attention to gathering evidence for this year's submission. We decided that we needed up to date evidence directly from officers and forces, and that the most appropriate way to achieve this in an easy format would be to take a two pronged approach:

Focus groups: we needed up to date views across forces. To provide evidence we used a question and answer format using a software package which would allow officers to give us their views by way of a voting system. This automatically collects answers and views for analysis and discussion allowing the focus group leader to better understanding the thinking behind the answers

Survey monkey: we established this as a way to collect information directly from force colleagues on current reward practice, views and issues. We were also able to utilise this on behalf of the College of Policing

4.7. A summary of the focus group findings can be found in section 14 and Appendices E, F and G. The survey reports can also be found at section 14 and Appendices K, L and M.

**Evidence requested by PRRB**

4.8. In their 2017 report, the PRRB asked for evidence to be submitted by the NPCC on a number of items in our next submission. The table below lists out the items requested and where these can be found within this submission (table overleaf).

4.9. In some instances we were not able to comply with the requests made. Where this applies we have explained why and how we might be able to comply in our next submission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>2017/18 Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.15 – further evidence on the nature of changes to the policing environment and the effect on police officers.</td>
<td>See Section 2, Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.34 – further evidence on affordability considerations including efficiency plans of police forces.</td>
<td>See Section 3, Funding including force budgets for 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.81 – the NPCC to provide a complete analysis of shortage groups covering all police forces.</td>
<td>See Section 12 on shortage groups, 12.5 to 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.83 – analysis of annual recruitment data including the numbers applying, the quality of applicants, and the numbers joining plus data on the reasons for not joining and early leavers. Also data and assessments on the range of recruitment initiatives underway – Police Now, BME Progression 2018, direct entry superintendent, direct entry inspector and fast track inspector.</td>
<td>See analysis of CoP data Appendix C, SEARCH Recruitment Assessment Centre, Appendix M, Annual Survey Return Summary of Key Findings January 2018. There is also a review of National Policing Attraction and Recruitment Review January 2018 by the CoP. This looks at police recruitment across the force and the national landscape as a whole, identifies the current state pain points for police recruitment, identifies solutions and views on the way forward. Specific recommendations have not been made at this stage. A copy of this report can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.86 – retention data including retention rates by length of service and the reasons behind voluntary resignations. Assessments might include: early years retention; levers to retain mid-career officers; and retaining specialist or shortage groups.</td>
<td>See Section 13 and Appendices J and M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.99 – the NPCC should address the absence of a national survey of police officers.</td>
<td>There continues to be no force wide survey at present and neither is there a current appetite to introduce this across forces. However many forces run surveys regularly and some of these ask questions about pay satisfaction. The most commonly survey provider is Durham University. They are currently looking at providing an overview to us of what material may be relevant to the PRRB and we hope to have this available prior to oral evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.103 – assessing the equality impact of pay proposals for reform, including any interim proposals, and force level assessments when implementing local flexibilities.</td>
<td>Equality impact assessments of any changes have not yet taken place but will do so in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.24 – any review of allowances should re-establish the rationale, the evidence base and the arrangements for regular review.</td>
<td>A programme of works is being developed and these items will be covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.25 – the early review of On-call Allowance.</td>
<td>The on-call allowance will be considered in Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.28 – the review of the London and South East package as part of wider pay reforms.</td>
<td>A review of the allowances was carried out by the reward team in summer 2017 however no decision was made in respect of a way forward. The Met are now considering how this might help with attraction issues which is discussed in Section 10 and Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.39 – evidence on pay rates for police office apprentices including the implications for recruitment, the design of the programme, estimated numbers, training costs, abstraction rates and implementation strategy.</td>
<td>Apprentice pay rates are discussed in Section 11 and Appendix P and the design of the role is also attached to the Appendix. The estimated numbers are specified in Appendix M, Annual Survey Return summary of Key Findings. Training costs, abstraction rates and implementation strategies are still being worked on by the CoP and Trailblazer Group. The most up to date survey of these activities is summarised in Appendix Q, a survey of all forces, which also provides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.41 – longer term evidence on systematic workforce planning and how apprenticeships will change the recruitment landscape for policing.</td>
<td>See Appendix Q, Longer term planning comes under the heading of the CoP work mentioned above concerning recruitment generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.52 – assessments of shortage groups including overall supply problems, ineffective career pathways, the nature of the shortage and the levers to alleviate.</td>
<td>Shortage groups are discussed in Section 12 and Appendix M, Annual Survey Return summary of Key Findings, and Appendix Q, all Detective Ranks and Trainee Investigator Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.57 – updates on the developments of arrangements to allow local flexibility to chief officers to make additional payments to officers in hard to fill roles and in superintending ranks.</td>
<td>This is discussed in Section 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.31 – update on an integrated police workforce and pay reform plan through to 2020 specifying the strands of reform, their purpose, lead responsibilities and the implementation strategy.</td>
<td>The update is provided in Section 6 and the implementation programme of works in 6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.35 – update on progress against the three PEQF routes including assessments of the graduate market, competition with other sectors, and career and pay progression.</td>
<td>See Appendix Q, Longer term planning comes under the heading of the CoP work mentioned above concerning recruitment generally. Graduate pay rates are discussed in Appendix P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.36 – the outcomes of Advanced Practitioner pilots.</td>
<td>See Section 12, 12.10 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.37 – for the 2018/19 pay round, the NPCC to produce a plan for pay reform setting out key activities, timelines and resources to deliver a new pay structure.</td>
<td>This plan is still be to be fully developed. A programme of works and consultation is described in Section 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 5.3 – evidence on a more flexible approach to pay awards including a pay bill approach to manage pay awards and other elements of the package within overall parameters.</td>
<td>This is discussed in Sections 6 and 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Workforce transformation & College of Policing update

Update on activities

5.1. We now outline each of the initiatives and highlight how they will affect the design of a reward framework and what changes are considered.

5.2. A full commentary on the work which is being presented to forces is attached at Appendix B and the commentary below draws on this document. This document is being circulated to forces to communicate the breadth of the work to date and to explain what they will need to do and why. This will be regularly updated as the work progresses.

Attraction and Recruitment into the Police Service

5.3. Workforce transformation must begin with attraction and recruitment into the service. As is the case with all modern professions, policing is having to come to terms with changing attitudes to careers and career progression. We are but one of a number of high-profile professions operating in an increasingly competitive market place. Our strategies for attraction and recruitment need to adapt accordingly, and the status of policing as a rewarding professional vocation needs to be maintained and developed.

5.4. A range of professional strategies need to be put in place, enabling policing to attract high-quality new recruits in a modern employment market. We are developing workforce initiatives (some are already in place) that will tap into the widest possible talent pool of those contemplating a career in policing, expanding the breadth of skills and experiences upon which the service can draw, in order to meet its ongoing recruitment needs.

5.5. Critically, this programme of work is aimed at attracting people to join the police service with new perspectives and from diverse backgrounds more reflective of the communities we serve, and who will support and enhance the ongoing development of the profession.

5.6. Specific programmes of change include:

- reform of initial recruitment systems and processes
- development of new entry routes into policing for the Police Community Support Officer role
- development of new entry routes into policing at the rank of Police Constable, including a Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship, a pre-join degree entry programme, and an entry route for degree holders
- development of new investigative entry routes into policing
- direct entry routes at the ranks of inspector and superintendent

5.7. The new officer reward framework needs to ensure that it is fully integrated and complements this programme of work. A new working group is to be established by the NPCC reward team to ensure this happens involving the College and force specialists.
Professional Development of the Workforce

5.8 The public has a right to expect that the decisions and powers used by the police are consistent, fair and undertaken by properly equipped, qualified and licensed professionals. Those who work in policing and make decisions that affect the public (including decisions that require powers) should be educated, qualified and licensed to carry out their role. They should be supported by their employer and professional body and given access to the knowledge and standards required to succeed.

5.9 It is a key deliverable of workforce transformation that those who work in policing should see themselves as members of a profession and adhere to the disciplines of professional practice. It is a reality that policing is a profession, but it is equally true that the professional infrastructure does not yet exist to enable policing to be formally recognised as such. National initiatives are underway that will facilitate formal recognition and accreditation of the complex roles and responsibilities of those working in the policing environment.

5.10 Police practitioners and decision makers should be confident professionals able to operate with high levels of autonomy and accountability. All professions support the responsibility of the individual to engage in ongoing professional development. Policing offers a variety of professional opportunities for the individual, including membership of the College of Policing, which is freely available to all police officers and staff. (Membership of the College enables access to a variety of resources and support for continuing professional development.)

5.11 But we can always do better. Organisational structures within policing need to provide effective, coordinated professional development and career progression opportunities for members of the service, across all ranks and roles. Acquisition of critical new skills will be central to this professional agenda, as will be an organisational culture and style which allows all to perform at their best. By giving people an improved, broader range of professional routes and avenues for them to develop and utilise their skills and the service will reap the benefits of improved performance.

5.12 New initiatives under the heading of professional development and professional recognition include the following:

- The Policing Education Qualifications Framework ("PEQF"): a standardised national framework setting professionally-related qualification levels for the police service, by rank or organisational level of responsibility. The PEQF will also provide appropriate education routes for the Special Constabulary
- The Professional Development Programme (PDP): development of a national infrastructure and tools to improve professionalism, performance, progression and promotion throughout policing
- Development of, and formal recognition for, advanced practitioner roles (specifically at police constable rank), which will contribute towards building knowledge and standards based on such knowledge
- An accelerated fast-track promotion (to Inspector) and development programme for serving police constables
- A Competency and Values Framework (CVF) relevant not just to selection and recruitment processes, but also professional performance and CPD. The CVF is central to successfully embedding of the Code of Ethics in policing practice
License to practice: introduction of a national system in policing overseen by the College of Policing, to support and provide ongoing professional development for individuals working in high-risk/high-harm areas of policing

5.13. As may already be seen from the above, we are by no means under-estimating the professional complexity of modern policing. The mission of policing itself is simple and clear: to make communities safer by upholding the law fairly and firmly; preventing crime and anti-social behaviour; keeping the peace; protecting and reassuring communities; investigating crime and bringing offenders to justice. Execution of this mission can be difficult, demanding, pressurised and highly stressful upon the individual.

**Well-being and Engagement**

5.14. The service recognises the importance of workforce well-being and resilience, and within our professional framework there needs to be increased professional emphasis upon the welfare of our police officers and staff.

5.15. Initiatives under this heading comprise:

- the Blue Light Wellbeing Framework (hosted on the Oscar Kilo website), intended to address the wellbeing of the police service
- the College of Policing’s Police Welfare Project. Deliverables include:
  - practical support for the implementation of the Blue Light Wellbeing Framework
  - an evidence base to support early trauma interventions
  - delivery of evidence-based practical welfare services to officers and staff
  - training and development interventions relating to resilience
  - facilitation of tailored, local force wellbeing interventions
  - development of an evidence-based Mental Health Strategy that supports everyone in policing

**Leadership in Policing**

5.16. Policing requires effective leadership and management, and Policing Vision 2025 identifies the need to ‘equip leaders of the future with the skills and knowledge to succeed’ as well as broadening leadership experience and perspective.

5.17. The policing profession should benefit from, and be steered by, effective leaders at all levels within the service. Accordingly, we need to develop and enhance visible, modern, responsive and principled leadership in policing. Implementation of the recommendations of the College of Policing’s Leadership Review will be key to achievement of this aim.

5.18. The direct entry programmes referred to previously enable people to join policing at different organisational levels, importing with them leadership skills from other organisations. Other, more specific transformation programmes relating to leadership include the following:

Development of a leadership delivery framework, a new model of leadership and management training, delivered through a range of methodologies and accessible to all within policing, both police officers and staff
A review of the leadership pathway to chief officer (as well as the progression of senior colleagues from under-represented groups)  
An improved focus upon continuing professional development opportunities for senior leaders in policing

Pay and Grading

5.19. Pay and reward is specifically highlighted by the College. Policing Vision 2025 is clear that ‘the current employment model needs to provide the right reward and recognition outcomes for police officers and staff, as well as be affordable for communities.’

5.20. Initiatives in this area include:

A review of rank and grading structures in policing, how the service views and utilises current ranks and grades and how colleagues are developed. (This also aligns with other initiatives mentioned previously.) Rather than look at the numbers of ranks or grades, forces have been encouraged to review the numbers and levels of decision makers to ensure that these are set at the appropriate place. The decision by the MPS to remove the ranks of chief inspector and commander was reversed by the incoming Commissioner, but their focus is still on delayering in structural terms.  
A new reward framework for police officers, which will form the basis for both future annual base pay increases and market benchmarking of pay and conditions (discussed in section 6)  
Development of a digital platform explaining to forces and officers how any changes will affect them

5.21. The aim (working in collaboration with police representative bodies, including staff representative bodies) is to ensure that police forces are able to recruit and retain the right people and ensure that officers are rewarded fairly in the future.

Organisational Development

5.22. As well as our people, it will be seen from the above that successful workforce reform is also dependent upon effective, organisational development. The overall purpose of organisational development is to increase the capability of policing to continually improve service delivery and business efficiency.

5.23. Everyone in policing will need to ‘develop the flexibility, capability and inclusivity to adapt to change’ this is a core statement of the transformation agenda outlined in Policing Vision 2025. The workforce must therefore be actively guided and supported through a significant period of organisational change that will have an impact on officers, staff and volunteers alike.

5.24. National initiatives relating to organisational development include the following:

A Transformation Framework, developed and published by the College of Policing, setting out a standard approach to underpin strategic, organisational-level peer review, police force transformation and business change. This provides a way of thinking about how organisations work and behave, and can be used in conjunction with other modelling tools to support transformation and business change. Specifically, it provides a basis for a consistent standard to underpin peer review and peer support for forces seeking assistance in improving performance.
Workforce Futures incorporates a Business Change Handbook specifically for those who are working on managing change relating to the future of the policing workforce

**Exit and re-entry into policing**

5.25. Finally, in terms of facilitating a more flexible workforce, we need to look at exit from and re-entry into the profession. It is a modern workforce reality that individuals will have a huge range of differing work and career aspirations and needs. We should no longer be expecting all new recruits to view a career in policing as a career for life. Many modern professionals will undertake a number of roles during their careers, and the police service needs to be more open to providing an individual who may join and leave the police service (for a time) with viable options for re-joining. We can benefit from the enhanced professional perspectives that such career mobility could bring into the service.

5.26. We are therefore working to introduce:

- less restrictive re-join processes for those who have left the police service and wish to return
- opportunities for potential leaders in policing to gain external experience through secondments

**What will workforce transformation deliver?**

5.27. The above outlines essential elements of a new workforce framework to meet the demands of both the present and the future, capable of developing, fostering and enhancing the skills and capabilities we need to meet the evolving challenges of twenty-first century policing.

5.28. Every aspect of the policing profession will contribute to, form part of, and benefit from this workforce transformation. All of the initiatives we are undertaking are intended to achieve the following specific benefits for policing:

- Attraction, development and retention of a more diverse and capable workforce, with a range of skills, knowledge and backgrounds, through creation of more flexible entry and re-join routes into policing
- New approaches within the service to training, education and continuing professional development for all those working in policing
- Opportunities for professional progression that will reflect the career aspirations of those in policing, as well as those who wish to enter the profession
- Formal recognition of policing as a profession and professional parity with other professions with which policing comes into contact
- Improved ways of working within the profession; greater sharing of knowledge and skills; learning and expertise; more opportunities for lateral mobility
- A workforce that is responsive to change and flexible in the modern sense i.e. adaptable and able to respond proactively to changing professional circumstances
- Based upon all of the above, development of a more highly-skilled workforce, capable of working more autonomously, and demonstrating enhanced skills and performance as problem-solvers, communicators, negotiators and leaders
- Improved support for leadership and leadership roles within the service
An improved professional environment in which to work; greater emphasis on welfare support, professional wellbeing and resilience
Reward and remuneration systems appropriate to the needs of the service

5.29 Some of the initiatives outlined in this document (e.g. direct entry routes into policing at senior ranks) are already in place. Some (e.g. the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship entry route into policing) have recently been launched. Some (e.g. the Advanced Practitioner scheme) are currently being piloted. Other initiatives are at advanced or ongoing stages of development. Others still are in initial scoping stages (e.g. the College of Policing’s major national initiative to improve staff welfare and wellbeing).

5.30 As part of this programme of workforce transformation the College has published a timeline, which will be updated regularly. This is intended to help with workforce planning, by providing the latest up to date information, in a single place, about the various products, services and reforms outlined in this document, when they will become available to the service, or are expected to be implemented.

5.31 There is no doubting the commitment of the entire police service, irrespective of rank or role, to deliver a modern, enhanced service to the public. We owe it to the workforce to ensure appropriate professional structures and evidence-based approaches are in place to enable all of us to achieve that professional aim.

Role profile work

5.32 During 2017 the College of Policing carried out a comprehensive review of rank and role profiles across the policing profession to support its other initiatives. The drivers of this initiative are:

- out of date Policing Professional Framework
- profiles redeveloped and enhanced for policing on a national basis, new roles added
- having a range of generic profiles provides consistent approach across the sector
- the Professional Development Programme; Professional Development Review’s, ARC and CPD
- development of Career Pathways
- support to the PEQF
- align to a new License to Practice/Registration

5.33 The new profiles are designed to:

- articulate the skills and professional standards, competencies and behaviours for policing on a national basis
- define the expectations and accountabilities of the roles
- aim to be future focused, strengths based and concentrate on what can be achieved professional profiles will replace the Policing Professional Framework

5.34 This work is important for the new reward framework because of the wish to ensure that the role profiles are aligned with it. For example, role profiles are a key component of benchmarking to understand the level at which a role should be matched within a salary survey. Draft profiles for all the key officer ranks have now been made available to forces for use and comment. Copies of the current working drafts have been appended at Appendix H.
5.35. Work on this project continues into 2019, the key outstanding items being:

- core rank (constable up to chief constable) and PCSO profiles have undergone significant revision and are published as working documents
- work is ongoing to finalise the remaining profiles in batches. It is envisaged that 188 profiles will be available in batches from the end of March 2018
- work to develop user guidance for Individuals and line managers is to be completed
- work to develop guidance for forces needs to be completed
- a Professional Development Platform infrastructure is being designed and populated
- creation of process for review and maintenance and new profile development is being progressed

5.36. The role profiles including the key rank profiles will continue to evolve and in particular the College will need to make changes to the wordings around the PEQF, due to the future consultation on senior qualifications that will shortly happen. In addition the superintendent and chief superintendent role profiles are to be reconsidered at a workshop in February 2018.

**Overall timeline**

5.37. The overall timeline for the College’s work can be found on pages 16, 17 and 18 of Appendix B. The timeline extends from now until October 2020. This will be online and will be updated on a regular basis for forces. Part of the update will be the new timetable about the reward work. Once agreed with stakeholders, this will be added to the document.
6. Designing a new reward framework

Introduction

6.1. The new reward framework will be designed as a simple mechanism which any new recruit or officer can easily understand and which will provide greater confidence as to whether they are and will be fairly paid and rewarded for their work.

6.2. Typically, there would be a balanced package between base pay related to the core role, additional allowances reflecting extra relevant skills, overtime payments and employee benefits relevant to the nature of the role plus an employer sponsored pension.

6.3. This would mean that:

- base pay would be set within a benchmarked banding which would be reviewed on a regular basis
- benchmarking would take place every year by reference to an agreed methodology linked to published data and/or salary surveys. This would be on the basis of considering base pay, total cash and total remuneration
- rates of base pay would then be reviewed and varied according to inflation, salary inflation and force budget and linked to the expectations of what an incumbent is expected to achieve depending on their role, depending upon whether they are progressing up a pay scale or have reached the top of a pay scale
- additional payments, currently referred to as "bonuses" or extra payments would be determined. These would be paid for example by reference to a specific role, exceptional performance and may be linked to a period of time
- allowances and benefits would be reviewed say on a three yearly basis, or, if there are significant changes in market practice or taxation
- pensions would be reviewed say every three to five years to determine how these complemented the package

6.4. There is still a significant amount of work to do at this stage and no formal proposal has been made or discussed with the members of the Police Consultative Forum (PCF). Following this further work and consultation throughout 2018 described in section 4 the intention is to return to the PRRB 2019 with a formal proposal.

6.5. The breadth of work for 2018 is as follows:

- defining a reward framework which allows us to position pay in future according to criteria such as market medians and that also explains the differences between an officer role and non-policing role
- part of this framework will take forward an initiative begun in 2017 looking at explaining the differences between officer roles and non-officer roles. This seeks to positively develop the “X” factor which Winsor referred to in his 2011 report. Effectively this justifies
what police officer pay rates might be above the median but will also provide a means for discussion about how roles within policing differ and why some roles may eventually be paid differently. Base pay will continue to be determined according to officer rank. A mechanism for benchmarking pay will be determined and this will be informed by a better understanding of the range and scale of police roles, using the role profiles as developed by the College of Policing. The benchmarking will produce a pay band for each officer rank and it is possible that pay bands may overlap between ranks. As previously agreed it is intended that movement up through the prescribed pay points will only take place if the officer has achieved the satisfactory level of competence and skills. The current pay points applying to ranks will be reviewed in the next submission in the light of benchmarking with a view to aligning them with the new professional standards being developed. A proposal has been made regarding a new starting pay point to accommodate the introduction of apprenticeship constables. Future consideration will focus on whether pay progression will be adapted so that the apprentices re-join the pay scale at the point where they graduate where other pay points need to be re-positioned (whether higher or lower) a strategy and timeline to move to a more appropriate level will be determined by September 2020. New allowances will be developed to reflect the new career pathways being created by the CoP and new qualifications. We will need to have a debate about whether these affect base pay or are an addition linked to specific roles, while the officer is carrying out the role existing allowances will be reviewed in 2018 to consider amendment and consolidation where appropriate and how these will be affected by new payments so that we are not distorting the package and behaviours.

6.6. We discuss progress to date on additional payments and bonuses in section 12.

**History of Police Officer remuneration**

6.7. To establish a basis to start considering a future framework we have reviewed the past history of officer pay and conditions, to understand where we are today and see what we can learn. There have been more than a dozen major reviews into police pay and conditions since 1835, the details of which are captured in Appendix D.

6.8. The foundations of the current reward framework were laid down by The Desborough Committee in 1920. The majority of the reviews have been triggered by a recruitment and retention crisis or the need to save money and the majority have recommended uplifts in pay (often substantial).

6.9. Most reviews have struggled when attempting to benchmark police pay and, with the exception of Sheehy, acknowledge policing’s unique position. Only the Royal Commission in 1960 proposed a formula for calculating pay, with the remainder using public and/or private sector pay comparisons and a variety of guiding principles to make decisions.

---

8 Work on higher skills lead by the CoP is currently being considered and the results of this need to be reflected in the framework.
6.10. In overview the main theme seems to be the absence of a consistent methodology and any ongoing review process to keep police pay current. Almost every review has taken a different approach to reach its conclusions and no mechanism has been agreed and adopted to help mitigate against the need for future reviews. Without this, there is inevitably a gradual decline after each review (real or perceived) and the need to repeat the review process once the situation reached crisis point.

6.11. What is also clear is that, due to the rigid structure that any changes may have significant knock on effect. Therefore significant changes need to be carefully introduced to ensure that any distortions which may affect recruitment and retention are minimised.

6.12. The establishment of the new pay review body has led to the creation of an enabling body to facilitate the development of a new reward framework. Given the reforms being carried out as part of Workforce Transformation this is an ideal time to do this, particularly if we provide a flexible mechanism so we can manage police pay and conditions for the foreseeable future, replacing the prescriptive model which is encompassed within regulations.

**Officers’ understanding of their pay and conditions - evidence from focus groups Autumn 2017**

6.13. To help us gain the current understanding of pay and conditions, and the possible impact of changes that we might make, we ran focus groups in forces across England and Wales with uniformed police constables, detectives of all ranks and some officer applicants.

6.14. Our intention in running these groups was to:

- establish levels of knowledge and views about their reward package. This will help us communicate in a more informed way about a new reward framework and pay issues in the future
- learn what preconceptions officers currently have about reward across the service, good, bad, right or wrong
- understand the impact of providing officers with more information generally and to what extent this would affect their views
- whether officers would react favourably if offered additional payments e.g. hard to fill roles and how they would prefer these to be applied

6.15. The results from these focus groups are summarised in the Appendices E, F and G. We have used these findings throughout this submission as evidence for PRRB purposes and will also refer to these for the purposes of consultation, with the intention that we can supplement the findings with more focus groups in 2018.

**Establishing Fair Pay**

6.16. One of our first tasks has been to consider what we might mean by fair pay. This is a term that is generically used as a marker of a good employer throughout the UK. We already use this term within the forces for both officers and staff. We want our officers to feel and believe that they are valued both internally and externally and that the rate of pay is acknowledged to be fair for the service that they provide to the public.
6.17 Fair pay is not a specifically defined term for officers. We would like to do this so that we have a reference point by which to judge our recommendations to all parties involved in officer pay and ultimately to the PRRB. These must not be aspirations but logically argued reasoning which we believe we can then translate into meaningful figures through benchmarking and other evidence. We can also learn from other public sector colleagues who have both defined a methodology and reviewed their structures.

6.18 There has been some attention paid to fair pay in the public sector. The Hutton Review9 of fair pay was directed to look at pay for senior public servants although much of the work has a more general relevance for us. For example, he recommended that pay accurately reflects responsibilities of roles and that pay is linked to performance so the public can see this.

6.19 We asked the PFEW about their definition of fair pay. They draw their definition of fair pay from the academic concept of distributive justice which concerns the nature of a socially just allocation of goods in a society. A society in which incidental inequalities in outcome do not arise would be considered a society guided by the principles of distributive justice. The concept includes the available quantities of goods, the process by which goods are to be distributed, and the resulting allocation of the goods to the members of the society.

6.20 Often contrasted with just process, which is concerned with the administration of law, distributive justice concentrates on outcomes. This subject has been given considerable attention in philosophy and the social sciences.

6.21 In social psychology, distributive justice is defined as perceived fairness of how rewards and costs are shared by (distributed across) group members. For example, when workers of the same job are paid different salaries, group members may feel that distributive justice has not occurred. Certainly attitudinal survey returns from PFEW consistently show that police officers overwhelmingly disagree that they are fairly paid.

**Consultation 2018**

6.22 The NPCC reward team are proposing that two new working parties are created to allow for both the development of the new reward framework and for continual consultation:

New working parties of HR/reward/payroll/finance personnel from forces and together with representatives from the College of Policing will represent forces and look at the detail of a new reward framework and changes
There will then a Police Consultative Forum working party similarly looking at the details proposed for onward progress to the PCF, including regulations changes

6.23 As we have only recently agreed this with the CIPD HR forces group forces the details are yet to be agreed but we would expect these to be broadly as follows:

---

9 Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the public sector March 2011
Principles of benchmarking (March - May)
Benchmarking of ranks (August to December)
P factor - relevance and usage (March to May)
Apprenticeships and other entry routes (February to April)
Variable payments (February to July, needs to incorporate current hard to fill work and then design a transition)
Impact of lateral career pathways e.g. advanced practitioners (April to July)
London weighting and regional allowances (August to October)
Communications programme (September to December)

6.24. Due to the need to provide evidence for the next PRRB submission, much of this work described will need to be carried out, and ideally completed, by the end of October 2018, to be in time to be included in our next submission.

6.25. Throughout this process we will be able to take advantage of our survey and focus group facilities, all of which can be fed back to the PRRB.

**Impact of pension**

6.26. As the pension scheme(s) do not fall into the remit of the PRRB we will not be covering this in detail. However it will be important in terms of creating the reward framework as it inevitably forms a significant aspect of it. In particular because as a final salary pension arrangement it weighs the package towards retirement compared to more modern private sector packages.

6.27. In terms of pension, longer serving officers expressed disappointment about the two recent cuts to the pension and mistrust as to whether further cuts would follow. Younger officers still seem to regard the pension as one of the best and a positive benefit. However, officers appear to think pension information is uniformly poor. Many said the pension statements are confusing with no one to answer their queries.
7. **2018 Pay Review**

**Introduction**

7.1. The pay uplift for 2018, effective 1st September 2018, is despite the more positive recent budget settlement, to take place in the context of continuing budget constraint.

7.2. In making a recommendation we have considered and discussed the following issues:

- given the removal of the Government 1% pay cap, what is the appropriate pay uplift for 2018?
- what is affordable?
- how do we deal with the non-consolidated (i.e. non-pensionable) 1% award given to all superintending and federated ranks in 2017? If it is removed then officers will effectively suffer a pay cut?
- what is the current mood in the workforce regarding pay (for both police officers and police staff)?
- the remit letter requires us to consider whether it is appropriate to target particular groups to support retention and recruitment challenges. How should this be dealt with?

7.3. As employers we need to balance the need for a fair award to staff against current budgetary constraints. It should be remembered that last year the PRRB recommended a 2% consolidated pay increase which, after considerable delay, was rejected by the Government in favour of a 1% consolidated and 1% unconsolidated for all federated and superintending ranks. Chief officers received a 1% consolidated award (as recommended by all parties).

7.4. On 19th December 2017, the Home Secretary announced a £450 million increase in police funding across England and Wales. However, this funding package assumes that all PCCs will raise the police element of council tax by £1 a month (or £12 a year) for a band D property which, collectively, will raise £270 million of the £450 million increase.

7.5. Setting the budget for 2018/19 needs to be considered in the context of an already constrained financial position as well as the additional pressures that policing faces as demand in some of the most complex and challenging areas continues to increase. Certainly, without the increase of £12 per year in council tax, as recommended by the Home Secretary, we would have to make further significant reductions in police officers and staff which would affect the level and quality of policing service we are able to offer. Financial constraint on pay across the public sector is becoming unsustainable, the question is how much of this additional funding should be directed towards pay uplift.

7.6. Given the previous government position on public sector pay, all forces had assumed a 1% pay increase in 2018/19. However, the Treasury letter to the pay review bodies (dated 21/09/17) suggested some flexibility in areas of skills shortage and where there would be returns on improved productivity. Given that many forces have temporarily absorbed the 1% non-consolidated award within existing budgets or by use of reserves, then consolidating this would place an immediate draw on the additional funds that forces might raise through increased council tax precept.
UK economy and inflation

7.7. We have considered the wider UK market and inflation.

the economy is growing at a slower rate than predicted and this will likely continue into 2018
uncertainty over Brexit is likely to remain, or worsen, for the next two years and the pound
is likely to remain weak
from 2013, inflation is running above the government target of 2% as indicated on the chart below. The Consumer Prices Index (CPI) 12-month rate was 3.1% in November 2017, up from 3.0% in October 2017; it was last higher in March 2012. It has fallen slightly in December 2017 to 3.0%. RPI is at 3.9%
the Monetary Policy Committee’s (MPC) best judgement on projection probabilities over the next three years is highlighted on the chart below (Bank of England inflation report: November 2017) within darkest central band, which is between1.8% - 2.8%. Albeit, there is a higher probability of CPI falling in the range of 1-3.5%
the Chancellor predicts CPI to fall towards the target of 2% over the next year
Government borrowing remains at unsustainably high levels, although unemployment
does continue to fall


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Q4</th>
<th>2019 Q4</th>
<th>2020 Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPI inflation</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank rate</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of austerity on officer pay

7.9. It is important to consider inflation in terms of what pay rise is given, because if wage growth
does not keep up with inflation it will affect individual spending power. The below chart shows
the police pay rises awarded from 2010-2017 against CPI inflation\textsuperscript{10}. The 2017 pay rise is highlighted in blue and is the last rise in September 2017. We have not included the 1% non-consolidated pay award given as this ceases on 31st August 2018.

\begin{center}
\textit{Officer 10 years “The salary is reasonable, but the one percent increase was lower than inflation and not good considering the pressure we are under”}
\end{center}

7.10. Calculations show that over this period, CPI has outstripped police pay rises by 10.4%. If 1% police awards continued for the next 4 years, this gap would increase by a further 8%.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{police_pay_rise_compared_to_inflation.png}
\caption{Police pay rise compared to inflation}
\end{figure}

7.11. Pay restraint on police earnings has the greatest impact on those at the top of the pay scale because they do not benefit from an annual incremental pay increase, which helps to act as a buffer against inflation. Nationally, 35% of the constable workforce fall into this category.

7.12. Police earnings for the top pay point in 2010 was £36,519 and £37,731 in 2017. The impact of inflation on pay between 2010 and 2017 averaged 2.9%\textsuperscript{11} a year. If police constable pay was adjusted to take inflation into consideration this would amount to £45,992, causing a shortfall of £7,610 over the 7 year period. Please note, the figures relate to base pay only.

7.13. Given the current funding position of forces we are not able to attempt to make up this significant difference which is common across the whole public sector. We need to focus on what we can afford in this next year and what is a fair settlement for our staff.

7.14. We now examine what levels of increases have taken place in the last 12 months in the UK.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{10} Inflation.EU Worldwide Inflation Data
UK Salary Growth 2017

7.15 We have considered UK pay rises in 2017 across the UK to understand how last year’s increase has affected officers. The Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) data\textsuperscript{12}, as seen below, shows the UK median full-time gross weekly earnings went up by 2.2% on the 2016 figure. This growth is the joint highest since the economic downturn in 2008. Although, there were some regional variations ranging from 0.8% in Yorkshire and The Humber to 3.4% in the East Midlands. Data is at April 2017.

7.16 We have also considered the whole of the UK economy and the breakdown of sectors respectively. The following chart show the lower quartile, median (mid-point), upper quartile and average of the 507 pay settlements recorded from December 2016 to December 2017 against CPI and RPI. The UK economy as a whole has shown a median 2% pay settlement compared to CPI:

\textsuperscript{12} Published 26th October 2017
Whole UK Economy

7.17 The private sector and not for profit & related services sector have had an above average median at 2-2.25% respectively:

Private Sector

Not for profit

7.18 So in comparison the public sector has been significantly worse off with a median pay settlement of 1%, like our own. If the additional 1% paid on a non-consolidated basis had been consolidated then we would have been above the median.
7.19 Overall we can see that policing, in common with others in the public sector, has continued to lag behind the overall UK market. It is too early to see what will happen with the greater flexibility above 1% cap around public sector pay.

Impact on funding, affordability & pay modelling

7.20 We have sought to give the PRRB an overview of the impact of their decisions in respect of possible pay increases on a total basis and linked to rank. This shows that each 1% increase costs in the region of £47.5 million. The table sets this out at the end of this section.

7.21 To calculate the current cost of annual pay increases, we took the total number of full time equivalent officers for all federated ranks from the Police Workforce National Statistics as at 31st March 2017. We then looked at Police Workforce Census data from 2016-2017 Supplementary Tables Main Set, to establish the number of officers at each pay point. We then calculated this as a percentage ratio and applied this weighting to the total number of full time equivalent officers. We then multiplied the number of full time equivalent officers at each pay point to calculate the total base pay (excluding pension and national insurance contributions).

7.22 To calculate the cost of annual pay increases for senior ranks which cover; Assistant Chief Constables; Commanders; Deputy Chiefs; Chiefs and all London Chiefs, we took the published pay scales from 1st September 2017 and stated a minimum of one position per force to calculate the total base pay (again excluding pension and national insurance contributions).

7.23 Please note, these figures have been compared with the current Home Office model and there are some differences. Primarily this is due to the 2013 change in constable pay. The introduction of a new pay scale for constables joining on or after 1st April 2013, was lower at every pay point than the existing pay scale. Constables who joined before this date remained on the old pay scale. Over time, as longer service constables leave the workforce and new ones enter, the ‘older’ more ‘expensive’ constables reach the top pay point or leave the workforce, and are replaced by new, ‘cheaper’ constables on the new pay range. As there are several pay points, there are still some constables on the old pay scale and this pay change still has an effect today.

7.24 In addition to this, there are also some minor modelling differences as the Home Office uses joiners, leavers and promotion data to model how cohorts progress through the model whereas

---
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the Workforce Census data assumes that the workforce will stay exactly constant in terms of officer distribution (e.g. number in rank, percentage at each pay point). This will lead to some differences in calculations of next year’s pay bill.

7.25. The Workforce Census data is due 31st March 2018 with results to follow in summer 2018 and as a result the numbers seen on the following table will be continually reviewed.

7.26. Any pay increase above assumptions contained within medium term budget plans creates additional pressure for forces. Without additional funding forces have to look at driving further cost reductions, most likely through a reduction of officers and/or staff, which is likely to impact on service delivery. It is worth re-emphasising that whilst efficiency and productivity plans are still being sought across policing, they are becoming increasingly difficult to find any savings are needed to support growing operational pressures.

7.27. As we explained in section 3 on funding, most forces have only assumed a 2% pay uplift in their budgets for 2018/19 and if this was applied then this would cost in the order of £95 million on an annualised basis, or £55.4 million in 2018/19. It should be noted that there is an outstanding claim for police staff pay for 2017 (for those forces that are part of Police Staff Council). Once settled, this will be followed by a pay claim for 2018 and so the budget uplift for all staff and officers will be considerably above this level (£95m p.a.)

**Targeting pay rises**

7.28. We were also asked to consider targeting pay rises this year.

7.29. This is the first year that we have considered the benchmarking of all the ranks against comparable positions in the workforce and also in the public sector. This work is detailed in section 8 and, for this submission has given the NPCC a steer on how to approach this year’s recommendations. It should be noted that this comparison is still in an early stage and is presented here to illustrate what will need to be done in 2018 for the future reward framework.

7.30. The data compares base pay, total cash and total remuneration against the market and other public sector roles. If accurate, and depending on which one comparator one uses, this indicates that there may be a case to target pay according to rank. However, given that we have yet to agree our future reward framework and we have not had time to validate this data and share it with stakeholders, this year does not appear to us to be a suitable year in which to make such recommendations.

7.31. The other option for targeting pay is around specific roles across policing. Section 13 details the findings from focus groups held across the country as part of the work on collecting an evidence base from practitioners to inform the new reward framework. This report also highlights the challenges that many forces are facing around investigator resilience and the work being led by CC Matt Jukes. Appendix G provides the findings from the force surveys and the posts that are hard to recruit and retain officers in.

7.32. Whilst there is evidence of vacancies there are few roles that are consistent across the country and the investigator work has shown that the reasons for these can be numerous and varied. Additional pay is not necessarily the solution in every case and in every force and so to target pay at a national level would not be the answer and is not supported at this stage by NPCC. The flexibility that bonus payments offer as a temporary measure, as recommended by PRRB in 2017, are sufficient to deal with any immediate issues. NPCC recognises the requirement to
draft a proposal and associated guidelines as a matter of urgency and will expedite this. Chief constables have been consulted on possible options and a meeting has taken place with the staff associations.

7.33 In summary, NPCC has explored options to target pay based on either rank or role and does not support either option at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of FTE officers</th>
<th>Total base pay £</th>
<th>Cost of Annual Pay Increase</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1.5%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3.5%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>4.5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>95,840</td>
<td>£ 3,444,506,851</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 17,222,534</td>
<td>£ 34,445,069</td>
<td>£ 51,667,603</td>
<td>£ 68,890,137</td>
<td>£ 86,112,671</td>
<td>£ 103,335,206</td>
<td>£ 120,557,740</td>
<td>£ 137,780,274</td>
<td>£ 155,002,808</td>
<td>£ 172,225,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>18,749</td>
<td>£ 800,798,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 4,003,991</td>
<td>£ 8,007,981</td>
<td>£ 12,011,972</td>
<td>£ 16,015,962</td>
<td>£ 20,019,953</td>
<td>£ 24,023,943</td>
<td>£ 28,027,934</td>
<td>£ 32,031,924</td>
<td>£ 36,035,915</td>
<td>£ 40,039,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>5,521</td>
<td>£ 290,728,683</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 1,453,643</td>
<td>£ 2,907,287</td>
<td>£ 4,360,930</td>
<td>£ 5,814,574</td>
<td>£ 7,268,217</td>
<td>£ 8,721,860</td>
<td>£ 10,175,504</td>
<td>£ 11,629,147</td>
<td>£ 13,082,791</td>
<td>£ 14,536,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>£ 90,741,852</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 453,709</td>
<td>£ 907,419</td>
<td>£ 1,361,128</td>
<td>£ 1,814,837</td>
<td>£ 2,268,546</td>
<td>£ 2,722,256</td>
<td>£ 3,175,965</td>
<td>£ 3,629,674</td>
<td>£ 4,083,383</td>
<td>£ 4,537,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>£ 66,138,303</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 330,692</td>
<td>£ 661,383</td>
<td>£ 992,075</td>
<td>£ 1,322,766</td>
<td>£ 1,653,458</td>
<td>£ 1,984,149</td>
<td>£ 2,314,841</td>
<td>£ 2,645,532</td>
<td>£ 2,976,224</td>
<td>£ 3,306,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>£ 27,214,065</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 136,070</td>
<td>£ 272,141</td>
<td>£ 408,211</td>
<td>£ 544,281</td>
<td>£ 680,352</td>
<td>£ 816,422</td>
<td>£ 952,492</td>
<td>£ 1,088,563</td>
<td>£ 1,224,633</td>
<td>£ 1,360,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief Constables and Commanders</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>£ 13,531,068</td>
<td>£ 67,655</td>
<td>£ 135,311</td>
<td>£ 202,966</td>
<td>£ 270,621</td>
<td>£ 338,277</td>
<td>£ 405,932</td>
<td>£ 473,587</td>
<td>£ 541,243</td>
<td>£ 608,898</td>
<td>£ 676,553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief Constable</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£ 4,945,698</td>
<td>£ 24,728</td>
<td>£ 49,457</td>
<td>£ 74,185</td>
<td>£ 98,914</td>
<td>£ 123,642</td>
<td>£ 148,371</td>
<td>£ 173,099</td>
<td>£ 197,828</td>
<td>£ 222,556</td>
<td>£ 247,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Constables</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£ 6,017,361</td>
<td>£ 30,087</td>
<td>£ 60,174</td>
<td>£ 90,260</td>
<td>£ 120,347</td>
<td>£ 150,434</td>
<td>£ 180,521</td>
<td>£ 210,608</td>
<td>£ 240,694</td>
<td>£ 270,781</td>
<td>£ 300,868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS Commissioners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£ 835,956</td>
<td>£ 4,180</td>
<td>£ 8,360</td>
<td>£ 12,539</td>
<td>£ 16,719</td>
<td>£ 14,065</td>
<td>£ 16,878</td>
<td>£ 19,691</td>
<td>£ 22,504</td>
<td>£ 25,317</td>
<td>£ 28,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£ 308,592</td>
<td>£ 1,543</td>
<td>£ 3,086</td>
<td>£ 4,629</td>
<td>£ 6,172</td>
<td>£ 7,715</td>
<td>£ 9,258</td>
<td>£ 10,801</td>
<td>£ 12,344</td>
<td>£ 13,887</td>
<td>£ 15,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 4,745,766,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 23,728,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 47,457,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 71,186,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 94,915,331</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 118,637,329</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 142,364,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 166,092,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 189,819,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 213,547,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 237,274,659</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Benchmarking of ranks

Introduction

8.1. For this submission, and in preparation of looking to establish a reward framework, we have sought to benchmark the officer ranks to see how officers currently compare to other similar roles and levels. Since the imposition of the 1% pay cap no benchmarking has taken place. Given the impact of the 1% pay cap we would expect to see that officer ranks would be lagging behind roles at similar levels in other sectors.

8.2. As explained within section 6 on the reward framework it would be normal reward practice to benchmark key roles within large organisations every year. This allows the employer to highlight how the employment market is moving and what it needs to do to react to or be concerned about now and in the future. Where a large number of employees are doing similar roles benchmarking is even more critical so that issues can be met early on, particularly where funding is critical. For the purposes of this submission we are indicating how we understand the market is moving against the rank pay points. This will then help us when we return for the next submission and project forward what we might need to consider.

8.3. The benchmarking process we have used for this submission involves comparing the current rates of pay for each officer rank using our salary tables as at 1st September 2017 and comparing against a salary database. For the purposes of this submission we have used the Korn Ferry Hay database known as PayNet Plus. The levels we have used for our comparison have been based on advice from the public sector team within Korn Ferry Hay based on their historic knowledge of the roles and more recently their work with the College of Policing on the development of new role profiles. We have made comparisons using the pay points for each rank for the purposes of base pay comparisons and then overall comparisons using the average rate of pay for each rank, total cash (base pay plus all variable cash) paid, including overtime and other allowances and total reward, which includes the value of pension contributions\(^\text{14}\).

8.4. For our submission next year we would intend to check against more than one salary database and would expect to compare officers against more than one sector. We are also likely to look to collect specific data for specific ranks. This will be considered as part of the consultation process.

8.5. We have provided the information from the Korn Ferry Hay survey on a national all sector basis and their national public market data for each quartile. We would expect each rank to be paid at least equivalent to the median of each comparison. This is the case for the national data for all ranks except the Deputy Chief Constable ("DCC") and chief constables. This is not the case against the national data comparison (which includes the public sector data). From these comparisons we have then drawn our conclusions of what issues we need to address and over what time.

8.6. There a number of considerations we needed to take into account in looking to carry out benchmarking for officers:

\(^{14}\) Figures are based on averages calculated by IFF on behalf of the Home Office for the year ending March 2017. Total reward has been calculated by adding an additional percentage of 24%, to represent the annualised value of pension.
When we started this project the College of Policing had also begun the project to update and rewrite the current officer role profiles in conjunction with a consultancy. The old profiles were held by the Ministry of Justice. There are currently nearly 200 individual profiles, although we were specifically interested in the key rank role profiles. Typically, we would expect to use the role profile as the base document for determining the appropriate levels for comparison within a salary survey. The College hoped that the initial profiles would be available in Spring 2017. Unfortunately, it became apparent that this exercise would take longer. At this stage the role profiles are now available in draft and for use by forces on a new website. They are agreed and signed off by key stakeholders, although the Police Superintendents Association have not yet signed off those for the Superintendent and the Chief Superintendent. The PSA have organised a workshop to review these w/c 5th February.

The staff associations are rightly concerned about using role profiles as they should contain all the key elements of a job which are then used for several different purposes. Given the breadth of the key ranks there is an inherent difficulty with this. The new profile description is specifically determined to encompass 70% of the role, the remainder being deemed to be determined by a local job description. For the purposes of this year we have therefore based the benchmarking on a broad understanding of the role and looked to previous exercises where benchmarking has been used. We have therefore matched our benchmarking with the data levels used in previous exercises.

Previous benchmarking exercises had highlighted, particularly for the Superintending ranks, that these did not allow for easy comparison. Where a comparison has taken place this has been over a wide banding. We wish to consider this more in conjunction with the final role profiles that the PSA agree. For example, one of the elements which is not included in the current role profile is the responsibility in terms of the geography and population. For benchmarking purposes, such criteria make for a useful marker. For the most senior roles this is often used as a key tool for correlation purposes to determine the likely rate of pay. Similarly, this approach is used for the chief constable ranks, which date back to 2003. This same issue needs to be addressed across each of the ranks. We need to be clear about the level and types of roles with which we might make our comparison. Korn Ferry Hay recommended we look at more than one data match for some ranks. This because depending upon the actual role the incumbent carries out an appropriate match for data purposes may be different. So for this exercise we have looked at both. In our next submission we wish to clarify which roles fit into which categories.

8.7 Overall a pattern looking at national data a pattern emerges whereby the more senior the rank, the more average base pay, total cash and total remuneration move away from national market rates. Korn Ferry Hay have confirmed this reflects a general trend across the public sector.

8.8 We would propose as part of the consultation process to discuss the data we have used and to verify its future application. This work is included in the consultation timetable and process for 2018.
Views of officers - evidence from focus groups Autumn 2017

8.9. Amongst all officers, knowledge about their base pay and pension was limited. For example, 57% of officers said that they obtain information on their pay through personal research or just talking to colleagues rather than police or federation websites. Many find the online pay slips confusing and hard to find. New recruits reported they had received very little information during their training about pay, progression or pension and would have liked more. Most officers of all ranks reported a lack of pay and pension help and advice available to them. They all seem to find it difficult to get help with their pay or pension queries. Many report they do not know how overtime is calculated or when it will be paid.

New recruit “We’ve never received any information about our pay. I don’t know what pay point I am on”

Officer 20 years “If you look at PolFed website you end up wading through stuff. I try and work it out from my pay slip but it only tells you what you got paid that month rather than overall. Pay slips are online and difficult to find”

8.10. Most officers know that the constable pay scale is progressed on a time served basis. Some are not sure about the rationale for this.

8.11. We wanted to understand what officers think about their pay levels and if we are to make a comparison through benchmarking how we might do this satisfactorily. Officers rightly say their role is uniquely different with its risks, dangers, responsibilities and levels of scrutiny. However when we showed them some comparisons, the officers felt a comparison might be justified if it highlighted these unique demands, especially when comparing police work to low risk roles.

Officer 20 years “We are not employees, we are warranted officers subject to a ridged discipline code. This is not the same for most other workers. To compare us with any other service apart from the military is wrong”

Officer 10 years “It’s useful to compare against other jobs especially low risk ones as it highlights the risks we take and the breadth of our role”
8.12. When asked if base pay keeps officers in the service, 60% of Response officers say that the pay does not keep them in the police. There is a notable division on satisfaction with base pay dependent on length of service. New recruits voice particular concerns about the level of their pay at the bottom of the pay scale whereas longer serving constables at the top end of the scale, notwithstanding the obvious importance of pay, were more minded to use terms such as ‘adequate’ about their pay. Some mentioned that regional allowances would help.

**Officer 10 years** “I think we are paid reasonably well and I enjoy the job. The problem is lack of care and thanks”

8.13. Response officers are equally concerned that other elements of the role and their work environment are put right, such as lack of numbers of staff, the challenges of working single crew which is mentioned by all response teams, amount of casual overtime, and detrimental changes to shift patterns where these have occurred. Many officers say they joined the police for a worthwhile job and a sense of vocation, but notwithstanding that, the need to be fairly paid is key.

**New recruit** “I never joined the police for the money but for interest and a sense of vocation”

**New recruit** “I don’t think people come into this job first and foremost for the money. We want recognition for solving crimes and doing a good job. At the moment we don’t get that recognition and that needs to be addressed. We need to think about filling detective roles as a matter of urgency”

8.14. There were issues raised due to the wide pay banding between the top and bottom of the constable pay scale. This is currently £19,971 to £38,382. Suggestions were put forward that: the pay scale could be compressed to respond to this; or the pay scale could be weighted at the bottom end of the scale; or new recruits could be given extra upon passing their probation.

**Officer 10 years** “If you have two officers in a response unit – one in their first year and the other with five years’ service, the same performance is expected of them. A shorter police officer scale and extra for specialisms would be fairer”
8.15 Many constables commented that the rank of sergeant is a challenging and responsible role which the sergeant pay scale does not adequately reward. Constables at the top of their pay scale say that with overtime they can earn as much as a sergeant yet without the high workload and levels of accountability.

8.16 Investigators feel strongly that the role of the detective must be better rewarded. The requirement to achieve a national qualification should be rewarded as a detective premium, the responsibilities, workload and scrutiny require reward. They compare this to other occupations, where employees are paid according to their responsibilities; level of role and qualifications required for the job.

8.17 Constables commented that salaries for inspectors and superintendents required review.
Current pay rates

8.18 The current pay scales for officers between the rank of constable and chief inspector for 2017/18 are illustrated below:

8.19 This shows that the distribution of the salaries, going left to right, is upwards except that the rates for London Inspectors, grouped together, distort the distribution. Similar progression applies to the most senior chief constable rank, albeit that rates vary according to a factor relating to the size of the force at DCC and CC level.

8.20 The current rates have evolved over time and there is not currently a specific relationship between the ranks. The rates of pay reflect the rates set as part of the Winsor review, uplifted by the annual pay awards (which have been limited given the pay freezes and 1% increments).

8.21 The graph below shows the current differences between the bottom and top of each rank and the pound difference between them.
8.22. The base pay structure is based on the current rank structure, and is simply based on a hierarchical, time served system, except for the highest (chief officer) ranks which have a differential weighting based on the size of the force. Like the majority of pay systems the base pay number drives the majority of the value delivered, e.g. overtime rates and other benefits are linked to this, which is why this number is key to officers. Each rank is separated, but the current distribution of pay rates within ranks and the separation between the rates have no market or mathematical relationships. The current rates were negotiated in the Police Negotiating Boards as a result of the Winsor Review. But the parameters were such that it was very difficult to come up with options (top pay rate the same, envelope for funding the same, 7 points on the scale and a lower starting point at constable rank for example).

8.23. Officers have also commented on the differences, for example the lack of differential in their view between the constable rank and the sergeant rank. The larger differences, circa £6,042 and £7,881 are between the sergeant and inspector rank, and, chief inspector and superintendent rank. The difference is important if we are to encourage officers to apply for promotion and acquire the new skills and qualifications required, i.e. if there is no discernible difference this will deter some officers from working towards this goal.

8.24. If a new pay scale was designed then we could look to smooth out these differences and the distribution between each rank. We could also want to ensure that the pay has some relationship to levels of responsibility, competence and skills.

8.25. The next sections look at each rank separately, comparing them to national all sector pay data.
**Constable benchmarking**

8.26. The current pay scale currently has eight pay points, starting at pay point 0. It covers a wide pay range of nearly £20,000. All constables share the same rank role profile. The majority of constables currently in post are at the top pay point, 7, which is £38,382 (due to limited recruitment in recent years and the impact of pay drift). Therefore this measurement point is the most important pay point.

8.27. Traditionally, as the first officer role, it has been regarded as a role under which constables are trained, so commanding a lower pay rate on joining. The constable then progresses through the scale by virtue of time and experience in the role. We have separately set out our views on apprenticeship pay for constables in section 12. We believe that this approach will be appropriate going forward and so have benchmarked this new level against the market rate of apprenticeships. We will also look to ensure that when an apprentice constable reaches the end of their training and becomes a graduate, that their rate of pay is appropriately measured against pay rates for graduates.

8.28. The graph below shows the distribution of the pay scale for constables from 1st September 2017, from left to right, highlighted in blue, measured against the survey data quartiles for the appropriate level for a constable who fulfills the requirements of the role profile. The lower quartile, median and upper quartile base pay rates are highlighted in orange. Current pay scales are as follows:

![Chart showing constable pay points and market data base pay](chart.png)

8.29. This graph demonstrates that pay point 5 is lower that the lower quartile, pay point 6 is between the lower quartile and the median and that the top pay point, 7, at which most constables are currently paid, is nearly at the upper between the median and the upper quartile.

8.30. We now turn to look at the relationship between the average rate of base pay, total cash and total reward comparisons to the national data survey figures, showing the lower quartile, median and upper quartile.
8.31 This graph shows that constable average base pay is close to the median. Total cash is closest to the upper quartile. Total remuneration is between the median and the upper quartile. From these figures it appears that the overall package is well placed against the market.

**Sergeant benchmarking**

8.32 The current pay scales for sergeants have four pay points. The data survey results we used for comparison purposes spanned two data sets. So we have compared each data sets as follows:

---
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8.33. Looking at the two sets of comparative data and the sergeant pay points it appears that, pay point 4, there might be need to be closer to the level 2 median of £45,618, to be competitive.

8.34. The graph below compares the sergeant average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to the sergeant levels against national market rates.

![Graph showing average base pay, total cash & total remuneration compared to national market rates.

8.35. Overall this shows that the total cash and total remuneration figures are comparable to the medians in each case.

**Inspector benchmarking**

8.36. The data survey results for the inspector rank as follows:

![Graph showing inspector pay points & market data base pay.

8.37. This graph shows that pay point zero is above the lower quartile, that pay point two is below the median but pay point three is close to the median and significantly below the upper quartile.
8.38. The graph below compares the inspector’s average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to the national lower quartile, median and upper quartile.

8.39. This shows that inspector’s average base pay, total cash and total remuneration are in overall terms near to the median.

**Chief Inspector benchmarking**

8.40. The current pay scales for chief inspectors against UK data market rates are as follows:

8.41. This graph shows that all the pay points are placed between the lower quartile and the median. We would expect to see this closer to the median. Please note, this graph includes a pay
point for only those chief inspector’s confirmed in post on 31st August 1994, which is also below the median.

8.42. The graph below compares the chief inspector’s average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to the national lower quartile, median and upper quartile.

- **Average base pay, total cash & total remuneration compared to national market rates**

8.43. Overall this shows that chief inspector’s package is below the median rates, and even taking account that the base pay rate is on the averaged basis, this looks below the median because there is not a significantly higher rate as chief inspectors progress, and there are fewer opportunities for variable pay.

**Superintendent benchmarking**

8.44. The current pay scales for superintendents have four pay points. The data survey results we used for comparison purposes spanned two data sets. So we have compared each data sets as follows:
8.45. The national market data demonstrates that top pay point may not be positioned at a market competitive level.

8.46. The graph below compares the superintendent’s average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to the lower superintendent’s level national rates which include the lower quartile, median and upper quartile. This shows that the superintendent rank is below the median national rates.

8.47. This graph shows that the median averages for the superintendents role are below the market medians at all levels.

**Chief Superintendents benchmarking**

8.48. The current pay scales for chief superintendents compared to market rates are set out below. This graph shows that pay points one, two and three are all below the lower quartile.
8.49. The graph below compares the chief superintendent’s average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to the national lower quartile, median and upper quartile.

8.50. This graph shows that superintendent’s base pay, total cash and total remuneration is below national market rates.

8.51. We now turn to the chief constable ranks, Assistant Chief Constable ("ACC"), Deputy Chief Constable ("DCC") and Chief Constable ("CC").
Assistant Chief Constable benchmarking

8.52. The current pay scale for ACCs has three pay points. The data survey results we used for comparison purposes spanned two data sets. So we have compared each data sets as follows:

8.53. The national market data shows we are behind the national market data.

8.54. The graph below looks at the ACC average rate of base pay, total cash and total remuneration (including pension) in comparison to national rates. However at this level, given that an incumbent is not entitled to a bonus structure, the total cash and total reward data becomes less relevant.
Deputy Chief Constable benchmarking & survey on collaboration

8.55. The DCC role takes into account the size of the force, base pay rates ranging from £114,429 to £146,217.

8.56. The graph below compares the average current pay scales for DCC to national rates over two levels. This role is towards the lower quartile of the first level. This pay rate is determined according to the force employing the officer.

8.57. Some forces had raised an issue about the effect that collaboration is having, and that it should be reflected in the base pay rates for DCCs. This was debated at Chiefs’ Council in January 2018, however it was decided, in parallel with other decisions that nothing should be recommended this year.

8.58. A survey was issued to all forces. 14 forces (47%) of the sample e.g. 14 out of 30 forces who submitted a response, stated that they collaborate with another force at DCC level. A copy of the full survey is appended at Appendix K.

8.59. The survey asked whether any form and amount is paid for collaborated roles and what form and amount was believed to be appropriate. There were 12 responses to this question. The comments were reviewed and categorised into the following options:

- same pay or equal across the two collaborated forces (2 responses)
- it varies and difficult to assess (2 responses)
- £125,000 annual salary (1 response)
- 5-10% on top of base annual salary (1 response)
- only be remunerated at the level of the host force (1 response)
- nominal amount for added responsibilities and travel (1 response)
- 4 no comments

8.60. Those forces that were currently not collaborating were asked, if they did introduce a collaborated post, how DCCs should be remunerated? There were 14 responses to this question. The comments were categorised into the following options, ranked highest to lowest:
greater remuneration (7 responses)
flexibility to recognise additional workload and risk (3 response)
reward should be assessed by industry standards (1 response)
set the salary for the regional DCC at the same rate as the SW Police DCC. The highest rate of pay of all the Welsh DCCs (1 response)
2 no comments

8.61. The above responses suggested that there is some support for extra remuneration for collaborated posts, however this issue is not restricted to DCCs. The particular issue for DCCs is the relationship between the CC and DCC spot salary – it is possible that a collaborated DCC could earn less than other DCCs in a region / alliance of forces. The options for dealing with this are to either ‘second’ the collaborated DCC to one of the forces with a higher rate of pay for the host DCC or to introduce a discretionary allowance of up to the difference between the home and top rate DCC pay within the collaboration. Given that this is likely to apply to very few officers the question was whether there is an urgent need to address this before a wider review of chief officer pay. It was decided that this issue could wait for a more comprehensive analysis as part of the wider benchmarking work in 2018.

8.62. Finally we have also looked at DCC average base pay, total cash and total remuneration. The comparison looks at the lower level comparators and shows the salary being less than the lower quartile and then falling away in terms of total cash and total remuneration.

**Chief constable benchmarking**

8.63. The pay scales for chief constables are based on a matrix according to the size of the force. For the purposes of our comparison we used an average rate. However it should be noted that the larger forces can offer rates higher than this average which are nearest to the lower quartile for each level.
8.64. Turning to the CC average base pay, total cash and total remuneration. The comparison looks at the lower level comparators and shows the salary being less than the lower quartile and then falling away in terms of total cash and total remuneration.
Public market data comparison

8.65. The table below summarises the comparison against the public sector data using the same data levels as provided for the national data. This shows that all ranks are paid above the median and in the majority of cases above the upper quartile. We have calculated a compa ratio (which shows the percentage relationship between the actual pay rate and quartile figures) against the lower quartile, the median and the upper quartile.

8.66. The comparisons with national pay data and public sector pay sets are provided for illustrative purposes at this stage as to what work will be carried out in 2018. They are not intended to be definitive and, due to the completion dates of this work, there was not time to share these with other stakeholders prior to submission. Consideration about the unique characteristics of being a police officer will also need to be included in any comparison explored further in the next section – the ‘P’ Factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top pay point 2017/18 base pay</th>
<th>Lower quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Compa ratio to median</th>
<th>Upper quartile</th>
<th>Compa ratio to upper quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Constable/DCC</td>
<td>£ 157,341</td>
<td>£153,015</td>
<td>£180,285</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>£ 236,799</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief Constable</td>
<td>£ 129,804</td>
<td>£114,000</td>
<td>£130,905</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>£ 150,287</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief Constable/ACC</td>
<td>£ 129,804</td>
<td>£ 93,509</td>
<td>£109,815</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>£ 126,667</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief Constable</td>
<td>£ 111,249</td>
<td>£ 80,631</td>
<td>£ 91,946</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>£ 105,882</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
<td>£ 85,614</td>
<td>£ 69,953</td>
<td>£ 83,412</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>£ 95,975</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>£ 77,340</td>
<td>£ 62,361</td>
<td>£ 72,218</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>£ 85,000</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>£ 77,340</td>
<td>£ 57,295</td>
<td>£ 64,225</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>£ 74,098</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector</td>
<td>£ 57,597</td>
<td>£ 47,601</td>
<td>£ 53,277</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>£ 61,303</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>£ 55,512</td>
<td>£ 42,044</td>
<td>£ 46,550</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>£ 52,823</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>£ 43,134</td>
<td>£ 36,576</td>
<td>£ 41,805</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>£ 45,767</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>£ 43,134</td>
<td>£ 32,150</td>
<td>£ 35,902</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>£ 40,057</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>£ 38,382</td>
<td>£ 28,343</td>
<td>£ 31,184</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>£ 34,341</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. P Factor

Introduction

9.1. All of the major reviews of policing that have dealt with pay and conditions have recognised the unique nature of a police officer’s role and have attempted to adjust pay accordingly. The Winsor Review of 2012 was perhaps the first attempt to define exactly what makes policing unique and described this under a number of headings as the X-Factor\(^1\). The X Factor was used to determine what elements of an officer’s pay relates to them being able to carry out full operational duties. Those officers who were classified as working to ‘limited duties’ would, after due process, lose the X factor element, which equated to 8% of their pay. Although the Regulations have been passed, the process has not been used and focus is now on a capability severance mechanism for those individuals who are not able to perform the full duties of a police officer and for whom there is no role in the force. This is likely to be in exceptional circumstances only. The X factor does, therefore, have negative connotations in policing as it has related to taking money away, rather than the added requirements of the role.

9.2. We have started to reconsider the factors which currently differentiate policing from other jobs. This has been captured in some detail and in draft descriptors, which are now being referred to as the ‘P[policing] Factor’. The P-Factors are broken down by physical; psychological; legal; social/economic factors, associated with the general role of a police officer.

9.3. While these factors might be evident in other organisations, the frequency and degree of risk makes it unique to policing. They relate directly to policing and are associated with the general role of a police officer. They are the additional considerations that make aspects of policing unique as a profession. Some will apply in absolute terms and others describe what an officer could reasonably expect to be exposed to when performing the duties in the Office of Constable. The extent to which some of the descriptors apply will inevitably vary widely depending on the duties performed but every officer has the potential for all elements of the P-Factor to apply throughout their police career.

9.4. At this stage we have not defined exactly how these might be used and consultation will take place in 2018 to explore the benefits and risks of any proposal. The alternatives could be as follows, although this list is not definitive:

a) the current police "X" factor will be redefined and presented as a "P, police" factor to support justification for current pay levels. It will provide a language for all stakeholders to understand and use to justify how policing is different from other careers and roles today and how future changes may affect police officer roles (whether positively or negatively)

b) the P factor will be a percentage of base pay and will potentially have two elements, a fixed amount which all officer participate in and a variable amount which will be targeted

c) the variable element, which is non-consolidated and non-pensionable will be payable dependent on the officer's role and duties and according to local force need. Variable

\(^1\) The original X Factor was designed and introduced in the 1970s to distinguish Armed Forces roles from civilian roles. An additional amount was paid to Armed Forces personnel who experienced the "X" factor because of the nature of their role. This element of the package has been regularly reviewed, in terms of definitions and rates payable, and is currently worth an additional 14.5% on top of a benchmarked pay rate.
P factor would only be available while the officer is actively working in the role and the value received will be determined by the local force up to the predetermined limit.

**History of “X factor” and police officer pay**

9.5. This subject was most recently, and comprehensively, examined as part of the Winsor Review (at 7.5.) in 2011/12. The term ‘X-factor’ is used to, “encapsulate those elements of police officers’ responsibilities and obligations, and terms and conditions, that are peculiar to service as a police officer, and are shared by very few workers in the public sector and even fewer in the private sector.”

9.6. The development of an X-Factor in relation to police officer pay have been captured on the table below.

---

16 Winsor Review 7.5.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act/Committee</th>
<th>X-Factor Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Desborough Committee 1920</td>
<td>“[W]e are satisfied that a policeman has responsibilities and obligations which are peculiar to his calling and distinguish him from other public servants and municipal employees, and we consider the Police entitled thereby to special consideration in regard to their rate of pay and pensions”17. Desborough added that a police officer should “possess a combination of moral, mental and physical qualities not ordinarily required in other employments”18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oaksey Committee 1949</td>
<td>Oaksey was: “convinced that police responsibilities are more exacting now than they were when the Desborough Committee reported in 1919 and are not likely to become less”19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Royal Commission 1960          | The Royal Commission echoed Desborough in its description of the constraints on the social and personal lives of police officers. Expanded on some of the earlier examples to include factors such as:  
   - Inability to take an active part in politics  
   - Disturbance to family life caused by a policeman’s transfer from one place to another.  
   - The number and variety of offences it is possible for a policeman to commit under the police disciplinary code20.  
   Like Desborough, saw that the special characteristics of policing were not all negative. For example:  
   - Sense of pride that springs from belonging to an organised force possessing a tradition, esprit de corps, and comradeship. |
| The Edmund-Davies Committee 1978    | Edmund-Davies reiterated many of the points made by the Royal Commission and Desborough. He found that what had changed was “the context – the general challenge to authority and the increasing recourse to violence”21. He was the first to highlight the restriction on police officers becoming a member of any trade union (or take strike action).                                           |
| The Sheehy report 1993             | Highlighted three factors  
   - The extraordinary powers held by the police “principally the police monopoly of the use of legitimate force”;  
   - The exceptionally high level of integrity required of police officers, and the “degree of individual discretion which the law vests in each officer irrespective of rank or length of service”; and  
   - The hazards officers face when asked “to exercise control in sensitive, quite often dangerous and sometimes explosive situations, often at considerable risk to themselves”22.  
   Sheehy was also the first to suggest that whilst it was “right that levels of police pay should reflect the risk of injury and assault and the level of disruption to personal life involved in policing”. He did not think it applied equally to all roles, saying, “it should be reflected in the pay of the particular ranks and roles where these dangers were particularly acute”. |
| Winsor Review 2011/12               | Defined 15 elements that make up a police ‘X-Factor’ and, balancing positive and negative factors, valued these extra stress that the more negative aspects could bring as 8% of base pay at the Constable rank and as a fixed monetary amount at higher rank (8% of pay point 7 on the constables’ scale.  
   Withdrew 4% of the X-Factor from officers on restricted duties for more than 12 months.  
   Recommended that the value of the deployment component of the X-Factor should be reviewed every five years by a new police pay review body.                                                                                                                                 |

17 Desborough report, paragraph 28  
18 ibid. paragraph 29  
19 ibid. paragraph 19  
20 ibid. paragraph 46  
21Edmund-Davies report (2), page viii  
22Sheehy report, paragraph 1.7 262 ibid. paragraph 2.22
9.7. Winsor defined 15 elements that make up the police X-Factor. Of these, 6 were considered more positive aspects associated with the job. He also concluded that compensation for the X-Factor should form 8-10% of base pay and opted for the 8% figure. Unlike the military pay model, this 8% is not shown separately. In determining this figure factors such as, mortality risk during working life; mortality risk following retirement; stress; and deployment. In some areas true comparators with other employment markets were not available and it ended up as a judgement call.

9.8. The additional stress at work that the X-Factor can bring was a key consideration and research showed that this typically attracted a loading on base pay in the region of 8-9%. Of this premium, about half is related to the occupation itself, with the other half related to how the job is carried out.

9.9. The 8% proportion of base pay applies to constables only and for higher ranks it was set at a fixed amount (8% of pay point 7 on the constables’ scale). The impact of the X-Factor was considered less at higher rank.

9.10. The two key X-Factor recommendations from the Winsor Review are:

- the deployment component of the police officer X-Factor should be established to be 8% of basic pay for constables. For other ranks, it should be expressed in cash terms, benchmarked at 8% of the maximum of a constables’ basic pay (Rec. 71)
- the value of the deployment component of the X-Factor should be reviewed every five years. The new police pay review body should conduct this review (Rec. 72)

9.11. The latter recommendation has not, as yet, been progressed by PRRB. However, given the fact that X Factor reductions in pay have not been implemented then that would seem appropriate.

**New P factor definitions**

9.12. The table below summarises the areas that we believe each of the P-Factors currently cover and the type of issues that could ultimately feature under each heading. For ease of reference, they are shown in four categories, physical; psychological, legal and social/economic.

9.13. The wording used is purely illustrative and neither the headings nor the descriptor will be finalised until full consultation has taken place. It is vitally important that the P-Factor accurately reflects the reality of the job and resonates with those performing the role. The intention throughout 2018, is to consult fully on the work undertaken so far and to then prepare some definitive P-Factor proposals.
### Physical

**Uniquely confrontational**

Officers do not routinely carry firearms but are expected to put themselves in constant danger and confrontational situations to fulfil their duties and protect members of the public. There has also been a shift from dealing with crime in the public to the private space e.g. mental health, domestic abuse etc. This tends to increase exposure to risk.

**High risk of physical harm and expectation of assault**

In 2016/17, there were 8,973 assaults involving injury reported to health and safety teams. In addition to this routine risk of physical harm, officers now face a greater threat of a targeted attack on or off duty by terrorists. Officers are also exposed to injury dealing with; vehicle pursuits; public disorder and searching in hazardous conditions with exposure to biohazards such as blood and saliva.

### Psychological

**Trauma of exposure to distressing incidents and materials**

The changing nature of crime requires both regular and specialist officers continually to develop, maintain and apply new skills to deal with increasingly complex and distressing cases e.g. indecency with children; rape; sexual exploitation; domestic violence etc. This often means that officers face constant exposure and having to deal with serious cases in rapid succession.

**Relentless scrutiny**

The advent of social media, a shift in public attitudes towards the actions of authority figures and the nature of media reporting has all served to intensify the need for immediate answers to any incident or event that attracts publicity and is perceived to have had an adverse outcome. This is often before the facts are known and can involve the instant ‘naming and shaming’ of officers, particularly at senior rank. Anxiety levels when responding to calls are now heightened with the knowledge that every action is likely to be filmed and potentially uploaded to social media and/or attract Independent Office for Police Conduct attention.

### Legal

**Nonfeasance - the failure to perform an act that is required by law**

As a matter of criminal law, officers are obliged to take action to prevent crime and intervene in situations whether on or off duty. This inevitably poses a risk to an officer’s safety and affects their ability to enjoy and behave in their private life as a normal member of the public would.

**Exposure to risk**

Increasingly now officers are now responders across a range of incidents hitherto not seen as core police business. These include, ‘out of hours’ social services cases, medical emergencies, as well as patient transport. Apart from putting additional pressure on officers and deflecting them from their core role, moving into this space has also exposed them to greater risk. They might be unfamiliar with case histories and may also lack the necessary levels of training and expertise to provide the best possible service. This is particularly relevant when dealing with medical emergencies, the mentally ill and other vulnerable adults and children.

**Accountability and scrutiny**

Disciplinary hearings are now in public and thus, regardless whether or not a case is ultimately proven, an officer can expect a greater intrusion on their private life when disciplinary proceedings are brought. Cases involving death or serious injury are routinely referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission, whose reports are made public.

### Social/Economic

**Restrictions on social media**

Officers must not discredit the police and must abide by the Standards of Professional Behaviour. The ability to behave interact freely online is inhibited by the need to ensure they do not discredit the police service.

**Victimisation based on profession**

Where no respect for the authority of law exists and normal standards of acceptable social behaviour do not apply, officers and their families can be targeted and harassed, based purely on their police status. Personal property can be damaged, their children bullied or threats made by those they arrest to their personal safety whilst ‘off duty’. This may involve active attempts trace an officer’s home address and in some cases families my need to be re-housed to avoid victimisation or retaliation.

**Disruption to family life**

The reduction in officer numbers inevitably affects working arrangements, such as; working patterns; requirements to work extended hours; being on-call during leave; rest day(s) and/or leave day(s) being cancelled. This is disruptive and may have adverse effects on family life. Officers are intrusively vetted and must, as a matter of regulation, disclose and manage their associations in such a way that may not apply to an ordinary member of the public. This could have an effect on an officer’s private, family and social life.

**Business activity**

All business interests, such as secondary employment or renting a property must be disclosed and approved by the Force in order to ensure there is no conflict of interest. This may inhibit an officer’s ability to earn money in such a way that would not apply to an ordinary member of the public.

**Membership of trade unions and limited political activity**

Officers are prohibited from; joining a trade union; taking part in any industrial action and they do not have the right to strike. These restrictions limit options to resolve disputes in relation to terms and conditions such as pay. Officers are also restricted from participation in political activity and are expected to be apolitical.
Officer views - evidence from focus groups Autumn 2017

9.14 In the reward focus groups, police constables and investigators were very interested to hear about the potential for a P factor initiative to identify in much greater detail the unique demands of the modern police officer role. Officers offered a rich range of examples of the risks, dangers and difficult situations that they deal with on a daily basis.

Nonfeasance “Even when off duty you are in a state of vigilance, aware of people around you”

Trauma of exposure “It’s the danger to your health and the stress levels. When you go on call you don’t know what you will face. We have all been assaulted at some point. The adrenaline is pumping, and that takes its toll over time. Single crew is horrendous”

Uniquely confrontational “On our gang teams we don’t have vehicles with blue lights, tasers or body cams, but are expected to run after gang members carrying guns”

High risk of physical harm “Added to the list of P Factors should be actual health and injury”

Disruption to family life “The work can affect your mindset. My partner says I am too cautious about the places we go to but they don’t see how scenarios can escalate”
Exposure to risk "We are expected to be multi-skilled. We are social workers, mental health workers, first respondent ambulance workers, potential firefighters. We aren’t just police officers. If someone is threatening to kill themselves, they call the police. If the ambulance or fire brigade can’t attend the police have to attend. That’s not reflected in our pay. If we get to a scene as a first responders it tends to go down on the ambulance’s queue. You might be stuck for two hours because a drug user is unable to get up and you can’t leave them. That puts a strain on resources”

Victimisation based on profession "In certain situations people want to physically hurt you. We don’t have status in the community anymore. Most people I am in contact with are resistant to the police. We are often verbally abused”

Accountability and scrutiny "As a detective inspector I decide which cases go to Crown Prosecution Service. If I have to decide there is not sufficient cause I keep my fingers crossed that the person doesn’t re-offend. I have to make those delicate judgements and take that risk all the time”

Accountability and scrutiny Officer 10 years “If we make a mistake we can find ourselves criminally responsible through no intention or fault. We have that burden of risk all the time. No other public sector work compares to that”

9.15 Officers also voted on elements of greatest personal impact they thought could be included as P factors, these are ranked in order of importance in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranked highest to lowest</th>
<th>P Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal safety on duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exposure to distressing incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shift work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public accountability and regulatory scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restrictions on family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The requirement for me to positively act if I come across something even if off duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal safety off duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Restriction on my associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Restrictions on social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future consultation and use

9.16 Development of this policing factor could be a useful means to explain a new reward framework. Therefore this work has been included in the 2018 reward work schedule.
10. London weighting and regional allowances

Update

10.1. The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) give an update on London weighting and the London related allowances in their submission at Appendix A. The MPS are also asking for a 33% discretionary uplift in the combined London allowance. The argument for this increase is to bring parity with the South-East allowance, in terms of flexibility, and provide a contingency for the Commissioner to address emerging retention issues. Whilst this is a matter for PRRB to explore with MPS, NPCC is concerned that this has the potential to destabilise the police market between MPS and surrounding forces. Neighbouring forces were given the option of a flat rate increase to the South East allowance of £1,000, rather than a percentage increase.

10.2. In relation to the South East allowances, chief officers welcomed the increase to the upper threshold in 2016 and three of the eight forces affected23 are taking advantage of their ability to increase payments. This flexibility came with no additional funding and had to be catered for within the existing budget.

10.3. By virtue of an amendment to the determinations made under Police Regulations 2003,24 forces do have flexibility to vary recruitment and retention allowances by location (where an officer is stationed). We believe that this could still impose unnecessary restrictions when attempting to deal with the volatility of local recruitment and retention. If the flexibility regarding location was extended to role, this would provide a potentially useful pay lever and enable the precise targeting of payments. The case for this will be explored further in 2018 but all the signs are that blanket recruitment and retention payments and are not the most effective way to manage workforce risks.

10.4. We know that recruitment and retention allowances are a market facing tool and are not linked to the actual cost of living in a particular area. Once a recruit joins the service the recruitment element of an allowance ceases and then it then becomes a retention payment. The present model also ignores the ‘internal’ recruitment market. We believe, therefore, that there for a potential argument to vary the base rate retention allowance in response to specific workforce risks. Internal recruitment incentives to deal with hard-to-fill roles, such as ‘hello’ payments could also be introduced. Our thinking is insufficiently developed at this stage but if, after further consideration, we believe the case for change is made out, this will be fully presented in our next submission.

23 As of July 2016; Surrey; Sussex and Bedfordshire
24 Annex F (part 2) Regulation 24
11. Apprenticeships

11.1. The decision to set a new starting rate of pay for constable apprenticeships takes place prior to there being an established marketplace for apprenticeships and a new reward framework for policing. However, we need to determine an initial starting salary so that forces who wish to begin recruiting in the near future can state the starting salary in recruitment campaigns. The early trailblazers hope to start apprenticeships from September 2018.

11.2. Given the existing timeline for PRRB, it has been agreed that this issue will be considered as an early item by the Board and parallel, informal discussions will take place with stakeholders within the PCF to assist the consultation process.

11.3. This summary gives an overview of our work looking at this question. A paper was presented to and agreed by the Chiefs’ Council on 25th January 2018. A more detailed paper containing benchmarking has been provided to the PCF and will be consulted on at the next meeting in February 2018. It should also be noted that we also asked for current data from forces in December 2017 about their intentions concerning constable apprenticeships which has just become available which is set out in the Annual Survey Return, Appendix J.

**Relationship to current starting rate**

11.4. The current pay scale for new police constables joining after 1st September 2017 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Constable Pay Points 2017/18</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£19,971</td>
<td>£23,124</td>
<td>£24,171</td>
<td>£25,224</td>
<td>£26,277</td>
<td>£28,380</td>
<td>£32,616</td>
<td>£38,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.5. We need to consider whether such a scale is appropriate for new apprentices. If we do not make any change then apprentices’ starting salary would be pay point 0, although forces can select a £ value between pay points 0 and 1, or start at 1, depending upon local need plus they may offer different salaries to different categories of recruit, i.e. those with experience may be offered pay point 1 versus pay point 0. The alternatives for apprentices are:

a) to use a pre-selected point on the current pay scales. If we start at pay point 0 this would be £19,971 and then continue along the current pay scale, or

b) to pay a different starting salary from the current pay scales and then move the undergraduate or graduate onto the current pay scale at a defined point; or

c) to pay a different starting salary and then pay the undergraduate/graduate according to a different salary scale at pre-defined times.

11.6. We checked current policy for current new recruits in November 2016 asking about pay policy in 2017/18. At that time it appeared out of 29 forces who responded, 20 forces were to pay at pay point 1, 5 forces would pay at pay point 0, 2 between the points and 2 were undecided at the time. The reasons for this were:

a) Concern that pay point 0 is not high enough to attract candidates by a specific force

b) The need to compete with other forces that were recruiting at the same time.
c) Some forces have the advantage of being able to offer regional allowances and so the initial total pay rate will be considerably increased from the levels quoted above. Outlying forces can counteract the effect of these in the first year by offering a rate above 0 or starting at pay point 1

11.7. This flexibility and ability to pay rates between pay points does not currently apply to other pay points. Therefore even considering using pay point 0 would be a change of practice for the majority of forces.

11.8. We surveyed forces again in July 2017. Of the 11 forces who responded we asked:

what is the starting salary for constables? 7 forces are currently starting at pay point 1 and four at pay point 0
what would you ideally wish to pay constables? 7 said ideally they would pay at pay point 1 and 3 wanted to pay between 0 and 1

11.9. We then asked what each force would ideally pay apprentice constables:

1 force wants to continue to pay at pay point 1
7 said they wish to pay at pay point 0
2 forces want to pay below pay point 0, and
1 force did not have an opinion

11.10. There is clearly no one ‘right’ answer but there are a variety of views and therefore by considering further use of a banding for apprentices this will allow forces to make what they believe are appropriate local choices and allow forces to take into accounts costs as they become established.

**Recommendation on constable apprenticeship starting rate**

11.11. There are a number of competing criteria to balance in determining a national rate which will be acceptable to all forces and stakeholders.

11.12. The conclusion is to recommend the adoption of a new pay point banding for apprentices. A new rate will apply to apprentice constables for their first year of service and coincides with the programme progression gateways set out by the College of Policing. Any salary progression will take place at the end of the first year of the apprenticeship. This allows forces to select an initial starting salary at or between the lowest two pay points, pay points 0 and 1, according to their local and regional requirements. The initial pay point 0 will be reduced to reflect the lower rate applicable to degree apprenticeships.

11.13. The proposal is for a two stage process to introduce the initial apprenticeship salary. Initially the existing constable pay point mechanism will be used to avoid significant changes to regulations in 2018 and then a new scale will be introduced in 2019 with two further progression points. On graduation, apprentices will then re-join the pay point scale used by graduate entrants (or prior to the adoption of PEQF those entering as IPLDP officers).

---

25 Cleveland, Devon & Cornwall, Dorset, Lancashire, Merseyside, MPS, West Midlands, Northumbria, Sussex, Surrey, TVP
11.14. When forces were surveyed to ask views about apprentice salaries there were mixed opinions, both about the starting salary and progression. Higher Level apprentices is an emerging market and it makes sense to try to reflect that market, but also be able to be flexible if the initial level is incorrect. It is much easier to increase the starting salary rather than reduce it. It is recommended that pay point 0 is reduced from its current rate on the basis that:

the general market data for Level 6 apprenticeships available to date shows a median annual starting salary circa £16,000, and an upper quartile of £18,625, both of which are lower than the current pay point 0 at £19,971. We surveyed possible apprenticeship candidates in November 2017, current undergraduates studying policing degrees and the graph below shows their views, that a salary of £18,000 would be attractive for the majority of likely applicants.

---

Fair starting point

| Starting at pay point 0 - £15,971 | 25.9% |
| Pay a lower amount than pay point 0 - £18,000 | 57.4% |
| Pay a higher amount than pay point 0 - £19,971 and £21,000 | 14.8% |
| Pay an amount between £21,000 and pay point 1 (£23,124) | 1.9% |

---

we joined with colleagues from forces to attend the apprenticeship show at the NEC in November 2017. Of 12 the largest employers at the show, 8 were offering degree apprenticeships between rates of £15,000 to £21,500. The median salary for this grouping was £18,250 per annum.

11.15. For this and other reasons, including the need for forces to determine costings of the degree apprenticeships, we are recommending amending pay point 0 for apprentice constables, starting at an annual rate of £18,000, rather than £19,971.

11.16. Forces may then locally determine, as they do now, whether to offer starting salaries at pay point 0, £18,000, or a rate above this. Current indications from forces are that they would be likely to offer in the range £18,000 to £20,000 starting base salary. However some forces may wish to offer a higher figure, in which case they can still do this. At this stage we are not recommending the pay points 1 and 2 progression values. Given the difference between the IPLDP training schedule and the proposed Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship, it is recommended

---

26 54 undergraduates studying for policing degrees now who would have been potentially eligible to join the apprenticeship scheme if already launched.

27 Airbus, BAE Systems, Dyson, IBM, JLR Retailer, Lloyds Banking, Royal Mail, Severn Trent Water
that apprentices remain on their starting salary for 12 months, rather than the current period of 6 months.

11.17 Guidance will be provided to all forces on how to determine an appropriate starting salary and monitor force practice to ensure that good practice is shared and the pay rates offered will ensure a steady flow of the right candidates.

11.18 Regional allowances will be added to the base pay as per local force current policies.

11.19 As the marketplace becomes more established in 2018 the initial recommendations will be revisited. Further recommendations and consultation will follow on pay progression for apprentices.

11.20 Therefore the recommendations determined by the Chiefs' Council were as follows:

1. To reduce Pay Point 0 to £18,000 to enable forces to set apprentice pay based on local market factors and in line with current market comparisons for higher level apprenticeships

2. Apprentice Police Constables remain on their starting salary for a 12 month period before progressing to the next pay point
12. Additional payments & bonuses

12.1. This section outlines the work progressed in 2017 on bonus and variable payments and the work to be carried out in 2018.

**Dog Handlers’ Allowance**

12.2. Firstly we would like to recommend that the Dog Handlers’ allowance is uplifted by the same percentage as the recommended pay rise, 2%. This is a small but important allowance for those affected.

12.3. We would propose as part of the recommendations on the future reward framework to consider whether such an allowance should automatically rise each year, and if so how. This will mean that dog handlers are clear about the level of allowance they are entitled to, particularly given that officers following this as a career normally make a longer term commitment to a specific type of role.

**Temporary local flexibility for hard to fill roles**

12.4. Payments in the PRRB report 2017 the following recommendation was made:

> "We recommend the introduction of appropriate targeted arrangements in 2017/18 to allow for local flexibility for chief officers to make additional payments to officers in hard to fill roles and in superintending rank. This interim measure should have a time limit through to September 2020".

12.5. In November 2017, all chief constables/forces were asked views about changes to bonus payments in light of this recommendation (which was one that was made in the NPCC submission for 2017). A large number of responses were received which were then discussed at the Workforce Coordination Committee meeting (employers’ group). In summary, the comments received were as follows:

- there was support in principle from about half of forces to introduce a bonus payment to cover hard to fill posts
- hard to fill is not a term that really applies to superintending ranks but there was mention of geography and complexity
- the payments must not be excessive as there is no additional finance must be in exceptional cases only and not the norm
- each payment must be justified
- there should be a cap in place (there were only a few comments on value but £4,000 was agreed by some)
- concern about how one differentiates between roles

12.6. PCF held an initial meeting before Christmas and will resume its attention on this matter after we have sent in this next submission to the PRRB. Subject to the agreement of chief constables and the PCF the intention is that:

- the existing regulation 34 about bonus payments is amended to a limited extent to allow additional payments for the hard to fill roles in exceptional circumstances, up to a limit of
£4,000\textsuperscript{28} per annum, and for a time limited basis. These payments will be at the discretion of Chief Constables of between £50 and £500 at any time (like the existing payment mechanism) guidelines will be developed by the PCF working group to give examples of the types of new payments that would be appropriate. These might be by reference to a specific role or specialism, and/or dictated by a region or area in a force

12.7. This strand of work dovetails with the work directed by CC Matt Jukes, looking at the issues with investigators (detectives’) recruitment and retention. This has provided us with some examples which we can share with the PCF and use to develop the guidelines. Overall, this approach will provide some clearer guidelines for forces about which additional payments may be made to officers. As recommended this will be on a time limited basis and will then need to evolve into the new reward framework from September 2020.

12.8. Work on developing these new payments will resume in February 2018 by the NPCC reward team following the completion of this submission report.

Superintending ranks

12.9. Turning to the question of an additional payment for superintending ranks a proposal to the NPCC was received from the PSA concerning additional payments for superintending ranks. This suggested that bonus payments should be made in the following circumstances:
- undertake on-call and/or cadre functions (£500 per quarter when a superintendent is on call in that period)
- work within or as part of a collaboration/regionally and/or nationally (£2,000 p.a.)
- are responsible for a large or complex command (£2,000 p.a. – however an individual would not be able to claim twice for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} criteria)

12.10. At the December 2017 Workforce Transformation meeting it was agreed that the arrangements were not intended to cover an on call allowance (there is a separate payment for on call for federated ranks). One of the NPCC principles for reward reform agreed previously was to consolidate allowances where appropriate and there was also a strong view that an on call payment was not appropriate for senior managers. Finally, there was recognition that the previous ‘big job allowance’ for chief superintendents was consolidated into the previous pay scales as a result of the Winsor recommendations and this should not be seen as a reinvention of that payment.

12.11. However, there is evidence (from the PSAEW survey) to suggest that additional recognition would be appropriate in certain circumstances and it appears that the additional payment for the superintending rank should be by reference to geography and complexity. Chief constables endorsed this approach at their meeting in January 2018.

12.12. Work on this proposal will resume after the submission of this report to the PRRB.
Update on shortage groups and hard to fill posts

12.13 During 2017 we gathered evidence of current issues.

12.14 For example, in the focus groups investigators of all ranks are not satisfied with their base pay. 88% percent of investigators said they do not receive satisfactory pay for the role they do taking into account the qualification they have to achieve, the levels of responsibility; their workload and the levels of overtime. Trainee investigators often find that they take a drop in earnings of one hundred pounds per month when they move from response as they lose the unsocial hours allowance. In addition, trainees have to buy their own plain clothes.

12.15 The Annual Survey was then used to ask forces whether there had been any ranks and roles which have been hard to fill. A summary of the key findings are appended at Appendix M. We asked forces to distinguish between the last complete financial year, 2017/17 and this current financial year, 2017/18. The findings were similar in each year.
The findings relating to the last complete financial year 2016/17 and 2017/18 to date identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Individual role 2016/17</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective constables</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectives in safeguarding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All detectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting vulnerable people detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public protection detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New trainee detective constables to start at Borough CIDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated rape unit detective constables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Sergeant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID and Child Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID and Child Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Incident Manager within Control Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, Cyber Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dispatchers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017/18 14 forces stated there were ranks that did prove difficult to recruit these ranks were also mainly sergeant and inspector the main reason for sergeants roles being unable to fulfil vacancies is due to the required standard not being met whereas the inspector role was a combination of the standard not being met and an insufficient number of applicants 28 forces stated there were roles that did also prove difficult to recruit predominantly these hard to fill roles were detective followed by firearm officers.

The individual types of specific roles identified were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Individual role 2017/18</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All detectives roles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective constables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectives in safeguarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public protection detectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New trainee detective constables to start at Borough CIDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody sergeants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability investigation teams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, cybercrime</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID and child protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty inspector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFO in mobile support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource dispatchers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confiscators/ financial investigators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rewarding officers for skills**

12.17 One of the aspects of the new reward framework will be to look to reward officers for new skills, or skills which have not previously been recognised. Advanced practitioners are the first of these and this initiative is described below.

12.18 Officers in our focus groups endorse our thinking that reward and recognition for specialist skills and qualifications should be in place to increase incentives. 65% of Response officers and 86% of Investigators said that it is reasonable to pay officers more for specific skills and training undertaken.

12.19 We will be spending some time in 2018 looking at what these reasons might be, ranging from considering the skills particular areas of policing need to acquire, in some cases these are shortage groups.

---

*Officer 20 years “There needs to be an incremental pay scale and something else too - a financial incentive for doing the very difficult roles and tasks. If you are a supervisor you are bound to select good performers to do the difficult tasks and those performers should be rewarded”*

---

*Officer 10 years “Length of service on response is not important as you are still doing the same job skills should make the difference to pay”*

---

*Officer 10 years “A detective should get more money for working towards the national qualification and dealing with complex cases”*

---

12.20 We also asked Durham University to consider this as part of a brief on performance related and skills based pay. Their report "Evidence for Performance-Related and Skills-Based Pay Implications for Policing is attached as Appendix N. The findings endorse our thinking about how to approach the development of additional payments."
Detective Inspector 10 years “In any organisation people are paid according to their accountabilities and level of decision making. We have to deal with the issue that we pay everyone the same as there is no incentive to do the high pressure roles. When we had special priority payments officers accepted that there were certain roles that attracted more money so it shouldn’t still be such an issue. Someone in CASO should be paid more than a detective in a less strenuous role”

Officer 10 years “I don’t think the pay scale is appropriate. It should reflect specialisms and regional differences”

Detective 10 years “If you take the military analogy, no one would join the SAS if they were paid the same as a Guards officer because there would be no incentive. Whereas in the police there seems to be this preconception that everyone should be paid the same regardless of their specialism or any training they undertake. That needs to change”

12.21. Amongst response and investigators we spoke to there was a strong prevailing view that the current approach of paying all officers the same needs to be reviewed. Discretionary reward and recognition for specialist skills, training undertaken and qualifications achieved should be actively considered. Public order training, advanced driving skills and taser skills are some of the skills for which there is no financial incentive.

Trainee Investigator “In other occupations you are paid according to the responsibilities of the role, how hard the job is, the qualifications required. The remuneration reflects all this. But in the police, it is simply defined by rank. We are the only organisation where regardless of your skills, the training you have done you don’t get paid anymore”
Advanced practitioners

12.22. The Advanced Practitioner ("AP") pilot launched in February 2017 in response to the Leadership Review. The College led pilot is exploring the role of advanced practitioners; a role that will provide a lateral career pathway for officers and staff, where knowledge and expertise will be recognised and rewarded without following the traditional police model of vertical promotion.

12.23. The pilot, which focusses on police constables, began with 73 APs from Cheshire, Lancashire, Thames Valley, the MPS, South Yorkshire, Humberside and West Yorkshire. For the pilot there are 6 nationally defined areas of practice; response, public protection, vulnerability, local/community policing, investigation, technology in policing as well as a group of AP tutor constables. A detailed and independently reviewed evaluation of the pilot is underway alongside the development of case studies illustrating effective AP practice.

12.24. The definition of an advanced practitioner has evolved over the course of the pilot. A draft of the final definition has been signed off by the College CEO and this will inform a final role profile that will be produced by 28 February 2018. The role has 3 domains; ‘doing their job at an enhanced level’, ‘developing others’, ‘developing practice’. All of the domains need to be undertaken for the advanced practitioner status to be designated and maintained, with ‘doing their job at an enhanced’ level being the primary focus and noting the flexibility in the time spent on each domain.

12.25. The definition is:

Advanced Practitioners’ primary role is in force as a serving practitioner operating at an enhanced level. They support and develop others and have the capability to improve policing practice
they are recognised for undertaking their primary policing role in their own force at an enhanced level and acting as a ‘go to’ person, supporting others in the area of practice in which they work, providing leadership, support and coaching
they help further policing practice, utilising research skills and working with others, keeping practice in their area of expertise up-to-date and at the forefront of current thinking
the expert status of Advanced Practitioner, which must be maintained, is demonstrated through a combination of expert knowledge, skills, behaviour and experience, in a specific area of practice in which the AP is working the balance of time spent on each aspect of the AP role is flexible, but always with ‘doing their job at an enhanced level’ being the primary role. However it is the combination of the three components that define the AP

12.26 Advanced Practitioner Competencies are as follows:

**Knowledge:**
throughout up-to-date knowledge within specific designated field informed by research evaluates own working practices to ensure they are in line with evidence based practice

**Behaviours:**
able to lead and work collaboratively with others, influencing others to drive development in their field perseverance to ensure implementation and embedding of good practice in their field demonstrates reflective practice

**Skills:**
effectively communicates and develops practice of others within a specific designated field through applying presentation, coaching, training and/or mentoring skills

**Experience:**
has led on in-depth work in their designated field of practice
has acted as an advisor, in formal or informal contexts, to their force contributing to decision making in relation to service delivery in their field of practice
has participated in networking activity outside of their force to develop and share good practice in relation to service delivery in their field of practice

12.27 AP competencies will be linked to the Code of Ethics and Competency and Values Framework (CVF). Examples of Advanced Practitioner activity drawn from the AP pilot are as follows:

1. **Public order medic:** works closely with the HQ safety officer team ensuring practice is up to date with legislation and working practices. Has been involved in local, national and international networks, presenting to a number of different groups and bringing back ideas for further improving practice

2. **Rural APs:** this is a group of 9 APs within one force (where the geography is 75% rural), acting as expert advisers, with responsibility for different strands of rural policing, providing assistance for large scale crime investigations across the force and support to other forces at a national level – establishing strong local and national networks, provision of CPD and working with partner agencies

3. **Force lead on stalking:** AP status has validated officer’s current role as SPOC on stalking. Example activities include: providing tactical and investigative advice to colleagues, representation on NPCC Working Group, providing CPD input in force and beyond (NHS, Home Office and other forces), ongoing research and analysis of investigations/crime re-cording and response, reviewed guidance on APP with CPS and College of Policing
4. **Constable in Youth Offending Team:** recognised as an expert and highly experienced ‘go to person’ across the force, providing significant support to colleagues through advice and guidance on how to deal with different scenarios, works to identify ways to improve practice including evidence of a reduction of first time entrants into the criminal justice system, has evaluated new ways of recording information on the force crime management system, shares practice nationally (including to 240 Police Now students)

12.28. Other examples of activity from a range of officers include:

- coaching and mentoring in local teams, where those committed to being recognised for their knowledge and skills have begun to pass on insights to officers with less service
- a review of the stages in the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) process from charge to conviction, identifying some failure points and bringing the learning back into force to improve convictions
- development of improved practice and support amongst tutor constables, based on research and evidence, for officers during their probation period in the areas of recording of traffic offences, file quality, investigative skills and the taking of statements – with a plan to evaluate the interventions to understand the extent of their impact

12.29. A final proposal for a national rollout of advanced practitioners will be shared with key policing groups and a final decision to proceed will be sought from the College executive by 30 May 2018. The College is working towards a potential national roll out from late 2018, subject to the outcomes of the pilot. Further information about the pilot is available at; www.college.pnn.police.uk/advancedpractitioners

12.30. We propose to include this as the first example of a new career pathway that should be rewarded with an additional payment.
13. Recruitment and retention

Recruitment

13.1. As part of our submission we are specifically asked to consider recruitment and retention. We have referred to this in several of the previous sections. Here we focus on an up to date picture of all forces, data being gathered up to December 2017.

13.2. There were two surveys conducted in 2017 which covered recruitment and retention. The first was a recruitment and retention survey issued to 14 forces \(^{29}\) in June, 2017 to understand:

- external recruitment
- transfer & resignations
- internal recruitment
- posting of officers

13.3. The questions relating to internal recruitment were to establish the extent of what roles had become hard to fill and the underlying reasons. A hard to fill role was defined as;

“one in a particular policing discipline that has not been possible to fill from the internal officer workforce, despite continuous advertising and/or posting attempts, and has resulted in an ongoing and unacceptably high vacancy rate (against the defined force establishment for the area of policing concerned) for a continuous period 3 months or more”

13.4. There were a number of roles found to be hard to fill, based on the following reasons, which are ranked highest to lowest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Main Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporary skill shortage and stress of ongoing case load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stress of ongoing case load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Temporary skill shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perceived career or personal risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unpopular and stress of ongoing case load</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.5. The second survey conducted, was the Annual Survey which was completed by 37 forces in December 2017, which looked at:

- recruitment and retention
- apprenticeships
- promotion
- internal recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Main Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hard to fill roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motivation and morale survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.6. The questions relating to recruitment asked about officer numbers that had been recruited in the last complete financial year 1st April 2016, what has been recruited in this financial year

\(^{29}\) Cleveland, Devon & Cornwall, Essex, Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Kent, Leicestershire, Merseyside, MPS, Surrey, Thames Valley, West Midlands and West Yorkshire
30th April 2017 and where possible for the next three years. The table below shows that for the last complete financial year (16/17), there was a healthy number of applicants across all officer levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer level</th>
<th>Number of recruits wanted</th>
<th>Number of applicants</th>
<th>Number of successful recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constable Regular Entry Route</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td>29,044</td>
<td>3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Pre Join i.e. Foundation Degree or CKP</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>11,973</td>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Police Now</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry Inspector</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track Inspector</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry Superintendent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers all levels</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-joiners all levels</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other i.e. Detective Constable Pathway</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,565</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.7 This correlates with the number of applicants attending the SEARCH Assessment Centre\(^{30}\), as there has been an upwards trend in attendance numbers. Details of this are provided in Appendix C.

13.8 The table below shows that for this financial year (17/18), there was again a healthy number of applicants across all officer levels, but significantly less than prior year. Please note, these figures are only for a part year, so equivalent to 8 months’ worth of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer level</th>
<th>Number of recruits wanted</th>
<th>Number of applicants</th>
<th>Number of successful recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constable Regular Entry Route</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>3,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Pre Join i.e. Foundation Degree or CKP</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>8,255</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Police Now</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry Inspector</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track Inspector</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry Superintendent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers all levels</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-joiners all levels</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other i.e. Detective Constable Pathway</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,605</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,811</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{30}\) National Police SEARCH Five year data
Retention

13.9. The annual survey asked a number of questions around why officers voluntarily left the service, the number of years’ service completed, age/role/rank of officers and the main reasons for leaving.

13.10. The results showed that out of the 36 forces who responded, there were a total of 1,991 officers who voluntarily left the service prior to completing their full potential pensionable service in this financial year. The MPS had the most officers leave (696) and Cleveland had the least (3), this can be seen on the graph below, please note a logarithmic scale of 10 has been used:

13.11. The survey also asked how many years’ service officers had achieved at the point of leaving in the last 2 financial years, the results were:

   most officers left after having achieved 11-15 years’ service (895) in the last complete financial year
   most officers left after having achieved 0-5 years’ service (739) in this financial year

13.12. We also looked at how many officers left in each age group in the last 2 financial years:

   most officers left in the 51-55 age group (781) in the last complete financial year
   most officers left in the 51-55 year age group (623) in this financial year

13.13. We also looked at how many officer left at each rank and the main reason for leaving in this financial year:

   78% of leavers were constables
   main reason was due to resignations (24 forces)

13.14. The full details of these surveys can be found at Appendices J and M.
14. Officer focus group and attitudinal surveys

NPCC focus groups

14.1. The national reward team during September to November 2017 ran 27 focus groups with uniformed response officers in the following forces:

- Cleveland
- Metropolitan Police
- Essex & Kent
- Surrey
- Devon & Cornwall
- Thames Valley
- Hertfordshire
- West Midlands
- Lancashire
- West Yorkshire

14.2. In these forces we ran three focus groups split by length of service; new recruits; officers with 10 years plus service and officers with 20 years plus service. Sometimes, for operational reasons we met with two focus groups in a force and not three. In total we met 82 uniformed police officers.

14.3. In November 2017 we ran four focus groups with 1st and 2nd Year police Foundation Degree students at Oxford Brookes University and Bucks New University. We met 54 students.

14.4. Also in November 2017 and in partnership with the National Resilience of Investigators Project, established in response to an HMIC report identifying a national shortage of investigators, we ran eight focus groups with detectives and trainee investigators in the following regions:

- Swansea for the South Wales Region (Gwent, Dyfed Powys and South Wales)
- Ipswich for the Eastern Region (Norfolk and Suffolk)
- Fulham for the London Region (London boroughs and safeguarding units)
- Liverpool for the North West Region (Merseyside, North Wales, Cumbria, Lancashire, Cheshire, Greater Manchester Police)

14.5. We split the focus groups into trainee investigators and all other detective ranks. We met 96 trainee investigators and detectives of all ranks. In total we met with 232 police officers and new applicants. This was a wider brief than the groups set up by the National Reward team. Therefore we have included all the material gathered to put the survey results on reward in context.
**Purpose**

14.6. The purpose of these focus groups was to establish in greater detail levels of knowledge and opinion about police pay and conditions from officers and students and to test out some of our wider reward theories.

14.7. We wanted to gather evidence directly from officers about their pay and the challenges of their role and to hear their ideas about what might be adjusted or improved. We wanted to get beyond hearsay and to verify our understanding of what officers think about pay and conditions. We also wanted to capture the views of new officer applicants who are experiencing the police service for the first time and seeing it with fresh eyes.

**Methodology**

14.8. Individual forces invited and convened the focus groups on our behalf and the national reward facilitator led the focus groups discussions.

14.9. Each focus group lasted for between one and two hours. A PowerPoint presentation provided some background information on police pay but the majority of the time was prioritised for a series of questions for delegates to answer using an electronic voting system. With the agreement of each focus group, the facilitator recorded the discussions using a hand held recorder. This enabled accurate transcribing of the comments from delegates.

14.10. Each individual was provided with a handheld keypad on which to select their answers. A full record of their voting choices is outlined in this report and is held by the national reward coordinator.

14.11. Delegates would either vote yes or no to a question or would give an opinion to a question ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

14.12. After each vote delegates would be shown how the whole group had voted on a question. That would provide an ideal opportunity to discuss the issue further. Delegates did not have to share their views or how they had voted but many were keen to do so. Discussion was encouraged and evidence captured. Full detail and direct quotes from officers and students are set out in Appendices F, G and H below.

14.13. We conclude that the process of using an electronic voting system which enabled officers to vote anonymously encouraged levels of honesty and debate. Most of the officers had not used this type of discussion tool before and responded well to using it. The ability for delegates to see how those around them had have voted without knowing who voted for what, created a healthy and open atmosphere in the room for probing on issues of importance and concern.
Overall comments about the focus groups

14.14. The focus groups engaged well and it was clearly an opportunity for police officers to voice views and concerns. One detective described the process as ‘cathartic.’

14.15. We visited forces all over England and Wales and despite obvious differences dependent on geography and social demographic, there was a consistency of views about pay and conditions.

14.16. The MPS did present the most variance as some boroughs appeared to be working well and we perceived others less so. It was not possible, with the number of groups we ran, to gather a consistent overall MPS view although many comments chimed with other England and Wales forces. All officers appear to be experiencing pressure due to lack of staff and resources, the detectives vocalised this very strongly.

Key findings from the focus group exercise

UNIFORMED RESPONSE

Pay and pension

14.17. Overall, police constables at the top end of the pay scale feel their base pay is adequate. Officers at the bottom end would like more and some longer serving officers expressed concern about the disparity between the two salary levels when essentially they are doing the same job.

14.18. Officers say there need to be financial incentives for additional training undertaken in new skills such as advanced driving or taser. 65% of response officers said it was reasonable to pay officers more for specific skills and training. Increasingly officers are not willing to undertake the training and the responsibility that goes with new skills for no extra reward.

14.19. The annual special priority payment is missed by many as a helpful recognition of good performance done. Officers seek recognition for good performance done, and often it is not always financial recognition that matters but having their work noted. Ideas such as ‘officer of the week’ ‘good deed’ ‘great DS, great team’ were put forward.

14.20. Uniformed constables at top of the pay scale observed that with overtime they can earn more than a sergeant which is regarded as unfair considering the considerable workload and responsibilities of sergeants.

14.21. Officers were divided on the issue of paying specific roles more, e.g. firearms and safeguarding roles in PPU. Many feel that they work as much in these areas (looking at images/working with abused children) as PPU officers.
**Resources and workload**

14.22. Uniformed response are concerned about their levels of staff, lack of equipment and training available. Lack of staff and resources was the biggest issue raised. Operating as single crews was raised as a significant problem across all forces. Universally officers feel vulnerable and do not like it.

14.23. Caseloads are high and officers say it is very hard to progress their cases when they can be called out on response at any time.

14.24. The pattern and balance of a shift pattern is very important to a response officer. Night shifts are hard and take their toll. Evidence showed that shift patterns vary and work better in some forces than others. Where it works, the shift pattern does offer a structure and work life balance that works for officers and is one of the reasons why response officers do not want to join investigation teams, where overtime levels are higher and unplanned.

**Relationship with partner agencies**

14.25. There is a great deal of concern about work that flows from partner agencies, particularly social services in the area of missing children or people missing from hospital.

14.26. Many officers cited problems with partner agencies and many question the role of the police in this area. There are tensions evidenced in relationships with fire service and ambulance crews and boundaries between their roles.

14.27. The consequence is that officers report they have no time to work proactively with families and the vulnerable to try and help prevent problems reoccurring.

**DETECTIVES AND TRAINEE INVESTIGATORS**

**Reward – Pay, pension, allowances**

14.28. Detectives seek higher reward and recognition for the role they do with its workload pressures; long hours; required overtime; high risks and high scrutiny as well as recognising the national qualification investigators have to achieve to become a detective. Detectives mentioned the idea of a detective premium; a gold warrant card; and extra pay for extra responsibilities such as night cluster payments for detective inspectors.

14.29. There are strong views that the current parity of pay across all officers can no longer be sustained and this issue needs to be grasped. Investigators think discretion should now be available to reward officers with very high levels of responsibility and risk attached to their role and to any other specific hard to fill or specialist role or to any role that requires specialist training and qualifications. Detectives view their role as hard to fill due to the national shortage of investigators.

14.30. Detective inspectors raised the issue of being unable to claim overtime and yet consistently working extended hours. They describe it as possible for detective sergeants claiming overtime to earn more than their detective inspector.
Staff resources and workload

14.31. Workload is reported as very high and the level of essential, unplanned overtime is very high.

14.32. Detectives are concerned about the changing nature and level of the crime they are asked to investigate. They report that most levels of domestic violence and domestic abuse cases are coming to CID and changing the profile of CID work. This is building resentment and low morale and the increasing caseload creates an inability to offer a quality service to witnesses and victims.

14.33. Many detectives report they are now required to do safeguarding/sexual offences work when they don’t want to with no exit strategy. Trying to move or transfer appears difficult. Teams are told not to bid for officers. Trainee investigators know they will be placed in safeguarding.

14.34. Detectives found it difficult to answer about whether they feel valued and it was hotly debated as an issue. On the whole investigators feel valued by their colleagues and immediate team and their manager, but feel far less far valued by the wider organisation, the public and the government.

14.35. Detectives reported wellbeing concerns and adverse impact on normal family life due to required overtime. Many commented that they can cope with the shifts, it’s the overtime that makes life difficult. People go off sick.

14.36. Evidence was reported of officers unable to vary their hours or take annual leave easily and that many are contacted on their rest days regularly.

Access to training and further development

14.37. There was widespread evidence that investigators are not accessing the training they need or the time off to do it. Inexperienced detectives report they are asked to carry out tasks without the requisite training.

14.38. All respect the need to do the national investigators exam (NIE) but evidence shows there is insufficient support for trainee investigators to help them through the rigorous process of study and revision. Investigators say far more recognition should be made of a trainee passing the NIE and PIP process, both in terms of financial reward and an improved graduation ceremony.

14.39. Trainee investigators on the whole lack mentors or tutors and have to pay for all their own study aides and crammer courses (with some good pockets of good practice) themselves. In addition investigators have to pay for all their own plain clothes with no financial assistance.

14.40. A consistent national approach to training and supporting trainee investigators is sought.
Conclusion

14.41. The evidence we have captured from this process has been detailed, illuminating and helpful. It has been a very useful snapshot of current officer opinions. Delegates were engaged and committed in the discussions and we thank all the officers and students for their time and commitment to the process.

14.42. We consider this to have been a successful and worthwhile approach to gaining granular detail on how police officers view pay and conditions; the things that matter to them and need to be further examined.

14.43. We plan to continue this approach and to run more focus groups in 2018 to verify our understanding as well as our theories about reward.

Officer attitude surveys

14.44. At this time the NPCC does not have a forces wide survey for all officers. The Pol Fed and the PSA continue to operate their own surveys to which we have sight of.

14.45. 26 forces currently conduct a workforce survey of which 14 are currently conducted by Durham University. However another 12\(^{31}\) continue to operate their own individual surveys, including the MPS, which they refer to in Appendix A.

14.46. Although many forces work with Durham University, only some of these, 9, have pay satisfaction questions included. We have asked Durham to summarise these, but they were not able to provide a report in time for our submission.

Chief Constable rank attitude survey

14.47. The Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) had requested that a chief officer pay and morale survey be conducted for the 2018 submission. This new survey has been carried out by the Reward Team and is based upon a similar survey which has been used historically by the Office of Manpower Economics for the Armed Forces. The questionnaire covered:

- Current remuneration package;
- Value of increments and promotion;
- Working hours and motivation

14.48. The survey was distributed via an email sent to the attention of all Chief Constables with CPOSA. There was a 50% response rate (134/267 membership). Key findings were:

---

\(^{31}\) The number reflects the survey returns but we believe that more than 14 have used Durham. So it might be that some of the individuals completing the questionnaire did not know the survey was conducted by Durham.
88 (68%) of chief police officers are either very satisfied or satisfied with their base salary.

![How satisfied are you with your base salary?](image)

46 chief police officers are satisfied with their pension benefits and 14 very satisfied. 42 chief police officers are dissatisfied with their pension benefits and 9 are very dissatisfied.

![How satisfied are you with your pension benefits?](image)

69 chief police officers are either very satisfied or satisfied with their overall remuneration package. 28 (22%) of chief police officers are dissatisfied with their overall remuneration package and 5 very dissatisfied.

![How satisfied are you with your overall remuneration package?](image)

14.49. A more detailed summary can be found at Appendix L.
15. Appendices

15.1 Below is a complete list of appendices which are available as separate documents:

A - MPS Submission
B - Workforce Transformation
C - SEARCH Recruitment Assessment Centre
D - History of Police Officer Pay Framework E
   - Uniformed Response Officers Report
F - New Officer Applicants Report
G - All Detective Ranks and Trainee Investigators Report
H - Rank Role Profiles
I - Rank Role Profiles Guidance
J - Recruitment and Retention Survey
K - DCC & Collaboration Survey
L - Chief Officer Attitude Survey
M - Annual Survey Return
N - Durham University Skills Based and Performance Based Pay Report
P - Apprenticeships Report
Q - Apprenticeship & PEQF Survey
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Wildlife Crime & Rural Affairs Strategies
2018-2021

18 April 2018/Agenda item: Regional

1. INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE

1.1 The National Rural Crime Network Survey 2015 strongly suggests that over time rural communities have lost confidence in the police and are less likely to report crime. The inaugural Wildlife Crime and Rural Affairs strategies aim to provide a platform to ensure we as a society safeguard our wildlife and provide a national framework to tackle rural crime, strengthening safe and prosperous rural communities.

1.2 Using the successful inclusive and consultative approach and methodology in the development of the NPCC Citizens in Policing portfolio, North Yorkshire Police has used this experience to develop the NPCC Wildlife Crime and Rural Affairs portfolio and the two new proposed strategies.

1.3 All police forces and key partners have been included throughout the development of this work. The supportive and constructive feedback has ensured that the purpose and detail are accurate to provide a platform to build on over time.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 **Wildlife Crime** - The conservation and preservation of wildlife is very important to both our natural world and our society. The continued protection of wildlife ensures biodiversity and promotes economic growth. The conservation of species and the prevention of animal cruelty is the responsibility of all. This will ensure wildlife is conserved for current and future generations and animal welfare is protected.

The trafficking of wildlife is increasingly recognised as both a specialised area of organised crime and a significant threat to many plant and animal species. HM Government’s 2018 report; A Green Future: Our 25
Year Plan to Improve the Environment support this statement by saying “The illegal wildlife trade is the fourth most lucrative transboundary crime, with an estimated value of up to £17bn per year”.

The National Wildlife Crime Unit (NWCU), based in Stirling, supports Police forces and partner organisations across the UK, in their efforts to prevent and combat wildlife crime. The Unit is recognised on a global level for its work in this important field.

On a more local basis, trained Police Wildlife Crime Officers (PWCOs) in police forces provide knowledge and experience in this specialised area and are often used as an advisory point of contact in force. This training is often a skill used alongside other operational police roles. PWCOs work activity will include investigation, conduct proactive operations, develop intelligence and promote prevention. The NWCU will also support local investigations.

2.2 **Rural Affairs** - The extent of the cost of rural crime is outlined in the 2017 NFU Mutual Rural Crime report which identifies the insurance claim cost in 2016 to be £39.2m, £5.4m of this cost is identified as Agricultural Vehicle Theft alone. Crimes such as livestock theft also have a significant cost of £2.2m in the same year.

The 2015 National Rural Crime Survey replied to by 17000 people living and working in rural communities, describes the fear of crime as increasing and a low satisfaction rate of police performance in rural areas. Crime in these areas as underreported which affects the true understanding of the extent crimes.

A national benchmarking exercise was undertaken in October 2017 to better understand the environment and current investment being made into rural policing across the UK. Whilst appreciating that all rural areas of UK will be covered by police patrols, the exercise also focused on understanding the extent of dedicated rural crime police resources dealing with bespoke rural crimes. Results from the benchmarking have shown that there is a patchwork of approaches and arrangements across forces.

3. **PROPOSAL**

3.1 The introduction of two separate but interlinked NPCC strategies will provide a governance and operational direction in order to tackle these crimes, develop stronger relationships with rural communities as well as key partners.

- The NPCC Wildlife Crime Strategy 2018-2021
- The NPCC Rural Affairs Strategy 2018-2021

3.2 **NPCC Wildlife Crime Strategy 2018-2021** – (attached as Annex A)

Through harnessing the passion, expertise, and contributions of partners joined with the policing effort the Wildlife Crime Strategy 2018-2021 will:

- Adopt a clear philosophy based upon intelligence led and evidence based approaches, inclusive partnership, infrastructure that drives improvement, prioritisation against greatest risk, effective prevention, engagement and communication
- Develop plans at the strategic, regional, and local levels
- Recognise and plan for both operational and organisational requirements
- Agree priorities and support those through sound infrastructure
- Incrementally build on successes which are appropriately resourced, tested and assessed for benefits

Findings from partners and police consultation demonstrated the need for a coordinated approach nationally with clear governance arrangements to develop, consult, approve, and manage initiatives and overall service delivery. A service specification was drawn up that captures the main inputs and objectives of this portfolio.

Accordingly, the first steps are to:

- Establish senior officer leads for all police forces in tackling Wildlife Crime and raising internal police awareness
- Continue to develop the briefing notes available on the College of Policing’s Authorised Professional Practice (APP) to assist investigators and call handlers
Train and develop the understanding of wildlife crime for members of the Crown Prosecution Service and courts to improve convictions and deliver proportionate sentencing
- Focus on online and dark-web wildlife crime
- Widen the number of recordable wildlife crimes so as to better understand and reflect the range and scale of the portfolio
- Develop academic engagement
- Secure future funding for NWCU and dedicated wildlife crime officers
- Seek accreditation for national training for WCOs from the College of Policing
- Develop a clear communication plan
- Strengthen approach to tackling OCGs

Operational Priorities have been formed through the 2018 Wildlife Crime Strategic Assessment and The Wildlife Crime Conservation Advisory Group (WCCAG), these include conservation and Wildlife Crime priorities:
- Poaching – Hare, deer and fish
- Badger Persecution
- Bat Persecution
- Freshwater Pearl Mussels
- Raptor Persecution

Priority Delivery Groups for all of these operational priorities will be developed with a prevention, intelligence and enforcement approach with a membership of both police and key partners

3.3 **NPCC Rural Affairs Strategy 2018-2021** – (attached as Annex B)
Findings from the national surveys and key stakeholder engagement have demonstrated the need for a clear organised approach nationally with transparent governance arrangements to develop, consult, approve and manage initiatives and overall service delivery. A service specification was drawn up which sets out the key areas to develop:
- Creation of a Rural Affairs strategy, delivery and communication plan
- Governance Structure and creation of an Assurance Group made up of key partners
- National Intelligence Model products to support prosecution of offenders
- Enhancing the policing service to rural communities
- Accredited rural training

First steps are to:
- Establish senior NPCC leads for Rural Affairs and Wildlife Crime which has now been achieved
- Draft and consult upon a national infrastructure encompassing national, regional, and local decision making
- Develop a national rural crime strategic threat assessment

Operational priorities have been developed through analysis looking at the key issues raised by police and partners and have been categorised as:
- Farm Machinery Plant and Vehicle Theft
- Livestock Offences
- Equine Crime
- Fuel Theft
- Fly Tipping *The police service is contributing to this national issue as a member of the DEFRA lead National Fly-Tipping Prevention Group.

In addition to these priorities ‘Poaching’ offences were identified as a Rural Affairs priority. The Poaching Priority Delivery Group has previously fallen under the governance of the Wildlife Crime portfolio. However, due to the cross-over between the animal welfare issues and the antisocial behaviour, threats, gambling, and damage that comes with crimes like hare coursing, fish and deer poaching; this Group will now sit as a priority with both Wildlife Crime and the Rural Affairs strategies.
Priority Delivery Groups for all of these operational priorities will be developed with a prevention, intelligence and enforcement approach with a membership of both police and key partners

3.4 Progress made to date
   - Portfolio Structure of senior leads established GOLD, SILVER, BRONZE
   - Operational Priority Leads identified and groups formed or forming
   - Regional Groups formed in lined with ROCU structure

3.5 Research
All research and development to date has been undertaken within North Yorkshire Police’s own budget. If and when further developmental work is needed then consideration of financial support will be given then.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 The strategies concerned were supported by the National Crime Operations Co-ordination Committee on 6th March 2018,

4.2 The implementation of the two strategies will provide a platform to provide focus and strategic oversight of Wildlife and Rural crime operational priorities.

4.3 Both strategies will be developed and taken forward using an academically robust evidence base. Delivery work will be prioritised, resourced and managed in line with agreed governance arrangements.

4.3 This is a platform to help build confidence and relationships between the police and our rural communities.

5. DECISIONS REQUIRED

5.1 Members are asked to approve:
   - The NPCC Wildlife Crime Strategy 2018-2021
   - The NPCC Rural Affairs Strategy 2018-2021

CC Dave Jones

Chief Constable, North Yorkshire Police
NPCC Wildlife Crime & Rural Affairs