

Security Classification	
NPCC Policy: Documents <u>cannot</u> be accepted or ratified without a security classification (Protective Marking may assist in assessing whether exemptions to FOIA <u>may</u> apply):	
OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE	
Freedom of information (FOI)	
This document (including attachments and appendices) may be subject to an FOI request and the NPCC FOI Officer & Decision Maker will consult with you on receipt of a request prior to any disclosure. For external Public Authorities in receipt of an FOI, please consult with npsc.foi.request@npfd.police.uk	
Author and Contributors:	Cathy Willis, Vicky Reay, Mark Farey and Nazmin Lalaounis
Force/Organisation:	NPCC
Date Created:	28 September 2022
Coordination Committee:	NPCC Central Office
Portfolio:	N/A
Attachments @ para	N/A
Information Governance & Security	
In compliance with the Government's Security Policy Framework's (SPF) mandatory requirements, please ensure any onsite printing is supervised, and storage and security of papers are in compliance with the SPF. Dissemination or further distribution of this paper is strictly on a need to know basis and in compliance with other security controls and legislative obligations. If you require any advice, please contact npsc.foi.request@npfd.police.uk	
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/security-policy-framework/hmg-security-policy-framework#risk-management	

Chief Constables' Council Minutes

28-29 September 2022

Attendees

AC Martin Hewitt	NPCC Chair
CC Sarah Crew	Avon and Somerset
DCC Trevor Rodenhurst	Bedfordshire
CC Nick Dean	Cambridgeshire
CC Mark Roberts	Cheshire
AC Paul Betts	City of London
CC Mark Webster	Cleveland
CC Michelle Skeer	Cumbria
CC Rachel Swann	Derbyshire Constabulary
A/CC Jim Colwell	Devon and Cornwall
T/DCC Sam De Reya	Dorset
CC Jo Farrell	Durham
CC Dr Richard Lewis	Dyfed-Powys
CC Ben-Julian Harrington	Essex
CC Rod Hansen	Gloucestershire

T/ACO Zoe Durrant	Gloucestershire
CC Stephen Watson	Greater Manchester
CC Pam Kelly	Gwent
CC Ben Snuggs	Hampshire
CC Charlie Hall	Hertfordshire
CC Lee Freeman	Humberside
DCC Paul Anderson	Humberside
CC Alan Pughsley	Kent
DCC Tim Smith	Kent
CC Chris Rowley	Lancashire
CC Rob Nixon	Leicestershire
CC Chris Haward	Lincolnshire
DCC Julia Debenham	Lincolnshire
CC Serena Kennedy	Merseyside
DCC Ian Critchley	Merseyside
AC Helen Ball	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Nick Ephgrave	Metropolitan Police Service
Cmsr Mark Rowley	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Matt Jukes	Metropolitan Police Service
CC Andy Adams	Ministry of Defence Police
DCC Richard Debicki	North Wales
CC Paul Sanford	Norfolk Constabulary
DCC Simon Blatchley	Northamptonshire
CC Craig Guildford	Nottinghamshire
ACC Steve Cooper	Nottinghamshire
CC Winton Keenan	Northumbria
ACC Scott Young	Northumbria
CC Lisa Winward	North Yorkshire
DCC Malcolm Graham	Police Scotland
DCC Mark Hamilton	Police Service for Northern Ireland
ACC Alan Todd	Police Service for Northern Ireland
CC James Vaughan	South Wales
DCC Tim Forber	South Yorkshire
CC Chris Noble	Staffordshire
CC Stephen Jupp	Suffolk
CC Gavin Stephens	Surrey
CC Jo Shiner	Sussex
CC John Campbell	Thames Valley
DCC Alex Franklin-Smith	Warwickshire
CC Pippa Mills	West Mercia
CC Sir David Thompson	West Midlands
CC John Robins	West Yorkshire

CC Keir Prichard	Wiltshire
CC Lucy D’Orsi	British Transport Police
CC Simon Chesterman	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
CEO Andy Marsh	College of Policing

S23

Colonel Kris Rotchell	Royal Military Police
Wg Cmdr Mike Dixon	Royal Airforce Police
Wg Cmdr Nicholas Card	Royal Airforce Police
Cmdr Dean Oakley	Royal Navy Police
CO Ruari Hardy	Guernsey Police
CO Robin Smith	States of Jersey Police
CO Gary Roberts	Isle of Man Police
CC Chris Eyre	Sovereign bases of Royal Cyprus Police
Cmsr Ian McGrail	Royal Gibraltar Police

In attendance

Act Exec Dir Yvonne Cooke	Garda Police
DCC Janette McCormick	Operation Uplift
Professor Paul Taylor	NPCC Chief Scientific Officer Policing
Lianne Deeming	CEO Bluelight Commercial
DCC Jason Hogg	Thames Valley Police
DCC Tyrone Joyce	PRAP
Lucia Leon	Workforce Coordination Committee
John Harrison	Workforce Coordination Committee
Kevin Smith	Workforce Coordination Committee
Sir Tom Winsor	
HMI Andy Cooke	HMICFRS
Suzette Allcorn	HMICFRS
S40(2)	HMICFRS
DCC Kate Meynell	Nottinghamshire Police
ACC Peter Ayling	Kent Police
DCC Maggie Blyth	NPCC VAWG Lead
Jim Pearce	Devon and Cornwall
Sara Crane	Norfolk Constabulary
Dr Matt Bland	Cambridgeshire University
ACC Owen Weatherill	NPoCC
Gemma Stannard	NPCC Strategic Hub Lead
Hannah Hart	NPCC Strategy, Planning and Performance (SPP) Lead
Richard Hampson	NPCC Business Support Manager
Anil Mander	NPCC Staff Officer to NPCC Chair
Mark O’Donoghue	NPCC Staff Officer to Strategic Hub Lead
Sherry Traquair	NPCC FOIA Officer
Fiona Greenlees	NPCC FOIA Officer

Andy Begent	NPCC Data Protection Manager
Victoria Arnott	NPCC Government Liaison
Nicola Growcott	NPCC Head of Communications
Tom Keating	NPCC Communications Officer
Vicky Reay	NPCC Business Support Officer
Mark Farey	NPCC Business Support Officer
Cathy Willis	NPCC Executive Assistant to NPCC Chair
Nazmin Lalaounis	NPCC Business Support Officer

SESSION 1:

MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes for the previous meetings held were agreed:

Decision: July 2022 – Agreed

Action Log

1.2 : Session 2 (July 2022) – Joint Data Controllership Agreement – (Action Owners: Jo Farrell and Aimee Reed): Creation of NPCC constitutional instrument (coordinated by IMORCC now DD&TCC) for sign-off by all relevant Chiefs at September QA Panel and Chiefs’ Council meeting.

Response – Update was circulated to all chiefs as part of the regional papers process to the September Chiefs’ Council meeting. A full paper will be submitted through the regional process for chiefs’ feedback in prep for the December Chiefs’ Council meeting.

1.3 : Session 5 (July 2022) – Policing Protests (Action Owner: BJ Harrington and Owen Weatherill): (Action 1): NPCC Lead to circulate report to all chiefs. (Action 2): NPCC Lead with NPoCC to look at creating 2011 riots lessons learnt document through the regional mobilisation leads group which can be shared with all chiefs.

Response – Report was circulated to all chiefs on 14 July.

1.4 : Session 9 (July 2022) Police Science and Technology – Coordination Model- (Action Owner: Paul Taylor): (Action 1): Paul Taylor with the Chair of NPCC Finance Coordination Committee will pull Task and Finish Group together to look at testing and accessing funding opportunities to help support implementation of the model and strategy. (Action 2): Paper based on the results from the task and finish group will be submitted to a future Chiefs’ Council meeting. (Action 3): Chiefs to send suggestions to the NPCC CSA on any subjects chiefs would like research on that would be available through the Police Science Council.

Response – **(Action 1):** Complete. The first meeting is w/c 26 September, and an update will be circulated to all chiefs. **(Action 2):** Ongoing. Will come from the conclusion of Action 1. **(Action 3):** Very little responses received from Chiefs, but the majority will be processed to go through the coordination model, which the CSA team are setting up.

1.5 : Session 12 (July 2022) – Operation Hampshire (Action Owner: POLFED Chair): Polfed agreed to share short surveys on how Polfed will operate including key priorities going forward for chiefs to feedback on.

Response – This action relates to the PFEW 2025 project, which is taking a fresh look at the Police Federation’s organisational aims and objectives for the coming years. The team have scheduled meetings with the 43 Branch chairs on 13/14 October at which it will be discussed and to reach a consensus of the best way to engage with chief officers – whether directly, or through the Chairs. Action is ongoing, but the expectation is that the engagement with chief officers will take place late October.

Chair's Update

The chair welcomed visitors to Council. The following new appointments and honours were welcomed at the meeting:

Appointments

- Sir Steve House will lead from the 12 September a review of operational productivity in policing overseen by NPCC and Nick Ephgrave has come over to the NPCC as full time Chair for CJCC.
- Dame Lynne Owens will become interim Deputy Commissioner – Metropolitan Police.
- CC Steve Jupp joining the NPCC as SOC national lead end of September.
- Amanda Blakeman will become Chief Constable North Wales Police – covered by Richard Debicki as T/CC for the moment.
- Craig Guildford will become Chief Constable for the West Midlands Police
- Kate Meynell will become Chief Constable for Nottinghamshire Police
- Will Kerr will become Chief Constable of Devon and Cornwall Constabulary
- Rachel Kearton will become T/Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary
- Trevor Rodenhurst has become A/Chief Constable of Bedfordshire Police
- NPCC Crime Coordination Committee - Appointed AC Louisa Rolfe as Chair.

Retirements

- CC Sir Dave Thompson – West Midlands Police last meeting of Council.
- Steve Jupp last meeting as Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary
- Garry Forsyth last meeting as Chief Constable for Bedfordshire Police
- Helen Ball (Met Police) last meeting of Council.
- Last meeting for CC Carl Foulkes
- Last meeting for CC Alan Pughsley

CHAIRS UPDATE

London Bridge and Leicester Incident

Thanks were expressed for all the work from forces on London Bridge which was a success. 47 forces contributed to mutual aid effort and forces were praised on their ability to divert resources to support Leicester which created an exceptional impression of the Service.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update on both and thanked all forces for their hard work and contributions.

APCC and NPCC Joint Summit

The dates of the Summit were provided with forces being encouraged to register. The Home Secretary and the Policing Minister will be attending as well as the shadow government. All Chief Officers were also encouraged to attend the event too not just Chief Constables.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and all were invited to attend the next joint summit in 9-10 November.

Government Changes

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and would be discussed in session 10.

Policing Protocol/SPR

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and would be discussed in session 10.

Sustainability

It was reported that some workshops have been arranged to look at segmentation with regards to rural, urban and metropolitan to try and get the learning because of the different levels of maturity across the forces. This will help inform where things are in terms of moving towards net zero carbon. One of the difficulties has been trying to apply for grants as often the emergency services are not included within the main criteria and when they get money, they are struggling to spend it within the procurement rules in the time periods. There is the impact of the CAP and the Delta in terms of energy costs for the forces. With Delta, there is £175 million pounds to be found and the caps that the government have put in place mean that these will not trigger to give any benefits. They are looking at supplier intervention with people from the finance and procurement communities so they can do more with the suppliers directly.

It was commented that progress is being made on operational involvement.

Action: Impacts of funding cap in place by Government and energy increases impacts on forces will be worked up and shared.

Police Race Action Plan – Improving Policing for Black People

Although it has not been the easiest piece of work, it has reached the point where there is now quite a lot of work to happen on the ground. Colleagues are stepping up to help deliver some tangible

change on the ground. A new SRO will need to be found to take over this work. The plan has had a huge amount of feedback via the consultation process and the College will get external support to help with the analysis, so they are well placed to make the tweaks to the plan. They are about to get the feedback from the first survey they have done with black officers across the country which will help inform the plan and there will be a debrief on this in the next couple of days. A thank you was expressed for all the input into the survey and the engagement on the ice breaker forces.

At the last CCC meeting there was a sense of unease as to where is the evidence as to what is being achieved and the paper summarises the tangible activity taking place. Thirty plus forces have signed up to be ice breakers – either because good practise has been identified or some forces want to get even better.

There is honesty and clarity from Chief Constables but some forces are louder than others. Chief Constables need to relay to their staff that this is all about core policing and staying focused on the plan which helps reduce crime, increase confidence and target criminals.

They have met with the ice breaker forces and started to hear about the plans and actions to be rolled out across the forces.

There was a discussion about the national and the local accountability. It was emphasised that elements of the plan are national to drive consistency but that it is not a one size fits all – different forces have different levels of maturity on this, they are using best practice, challenging and supporting and demonstrating evidence and consistency. They are happy to visit and support forces locally where required.

There is the need to be clear in the communication and in the narrative with partners, internal and external stakeholders about what is being delivered at a national level and what the expectation is of forces as there may be some confusion between internal and external stakeholders. It needs to be aligned with what they are tracking in terms of what success looks like within the force with what the performance dashboard is looking like at a national level to make sure they is alignment.

The need for a replacement SRO was again emphasised.

Action: First survey of black police officers and survey results for the action plan will be shared with all chiefs to look at learnings from these.

Action: SRO role will be advertised – all chiefs are invited to apply and share the role internally.

Action: Supt and Ch Supt roles to be advertised to forces for local champions.

NPCC and NPoCC Estates Move

Decision: An extraordinary Chiefs' Council meeting is planned to go through final proposal with all chiefs in November.

DCC Contracts

Decision: Item will be covered in session 2.

HM Prisons Telephone Proposal

The paper involves a change to give better control around phones in prisons. There is no significant implication for forces. It is on the agenda because with the change of ministerial appointments there is a concern that the person now in charge may want to do a big announcement. There were no objections raised for the Prisons lead to take this forward on behalf of forces.

Decision: Chiefs agreed now that the pilot has ended, both police and HMPPS are coordinating national roll out to ensure that all feedback has been addressed, all stakeholders are engaged and all steps have been taken to prepare both HMPPS and police for a smooth integration. Forces would support the roll out aiming for the launch date of 1 November 2022.

Plan for Continued Funding from Government

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Review of Productivity in Policing Update

This is a review commissioned by the Home Secretary. The review will be hosted by the NPCC and will link directly into Council. The Home Office have put a lump of money for this financial year and the next to take it through to September 2023 so this is not a review which will be asking for funding at Council. There will be an advisory board.

The TOR are still being finalised and the Interim TOR have been circulated to all Chiefs. There will be meetings with the Home Secretary and the policing minister to finalise this and this will then be re-circulated. The report is due next September. There will be a small core team who will be working on this full time, and it will comprise a mix of police officers and police staff with a little consultancy and some help from the Home Office. The NPCC Science Team have offered up someone to assist just after Christmas to work on technology issues. The forces will be reporting on what they are doing, what they are proud of and what they would like to be able to do. There will not be a big consultancy running the review as they will be project managing it themselves.

One of the things they will be looking at is what is meant by productivity and produce a definition which all can agree on. The Police have looked at productivity over a number of years – there was the Operational Policing review which looked at police productivity back in the 90s. Why don't we do what the NHS does? They are being pushed by the Home Office to look at what the NHS does. The NHS budget dwarfs the policing budget. They have invested heavily on this in the NHS and know the cost of everything. The Policing environment is completely different to the NHS. A hip replacement is easier to cost than a burglary which has many variables to factor in. They will be looking at modelling policing processes. Is there a tool to see if processes are cost effective, are there better steps that can be taken?

They will also be looking at barriers to productivity, recent impositions on policing -DG6 etc. There are the counting rules which are overcomplex for crime recording and Code G on PACE for example. Is there more we can do with technology? How do you measure what you get from Police Officers?

There is also the need to be more prepared for future spending reviews to get a greater budget or to keep an existing one.

The review can be seen as an opportunity to redefine the core role of policing. There will be the setting up of an advisory stakeholder board – there will be a national one but also another board made up of regional Chiefs and maybe even one for Business Area leads. The College have been supportive. More work still needs to be done with the Home Office to get more definition.

There will be a section set aside at each of the monthly regional Chiefs meeting to discuss this work going forward and a slot will be put on each CCC going forward.

There were comments from forces indicating their support for the review.

Decision: Extraordinary Chiefs' Council meeting planned for October.

Action: Terms of Reference will be circulated once approved via Home Office in advance of extraordinary Chiefs' Council meeting.

Action: Team will write out to force to encourage them to get involved with the review by sharing examples of work that could help inform the review and supporting attachments to the review team.

Action: Any forces who are already doing productivity work to contact lead to help inform the review centrally.

Decision: Chiefs agreed as part of the review it would be valuable to look at what greater impacts/cost saving forces could have from greater investment in different areas – baselining data important to gather.

Decision: Chiefs agreed the review will be a standing agenda item at every Chiefs' Council meeting.

Finance Pressures

The Finance Committee commented on the financial pressures survey – 43 responses were received. Cumulative reoccurring funding gap is 200 million per year and the cap on officer numbers has taken its toll on police staff numbers. There are some estimates of likely police staff number reductions but there are gaps in the data. Reserves are getting hammered with a cumulative reduction of almost a billion pounds in collective reserves. Borrowing is the most worrying issue. This will bring pressure on revenue benefits.

They are looking at the issue of what could police finances look like post uplift.

REGIONAL PAPERS

NPCC Data Protection – Joint Controllership Agreement Update

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and supported the full paper for agreement being submitted to the December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Workforce – Bursaries and Scholarships Guidance to Forces

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and were broadly supportive as it is a chief's decision to use (force choice). Further discussion in session 2.

NPCC Strategy and Planning Update with Business Plan

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and provided feedback to the NPCC team through the regional process (see feedback)

NPCC Criminal Justice Coordination Committee Briefing and Strategies for Implementation

Decision: Chiefs expressed their concerns in certain CJ areas through the regional feedback and noted the briefing with the revision of the strategies for implementation.

Action: Longer session will be held at the December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Proposal to Establish a National Internal Stakeholder Engagement Group

Decision: Chiefs supported the recommendations in the paper as follows:

- Chiefs noted the content of the paper and longevity of the Uplift Internal Stakeholder Group.
- Chiefs agreed the proposals for a national Internal Stakeholder Engagement Group to engage across staff networks.
- Approved the governance, taking a decision on the Chair based on the options outlined, with central funding for 2023 / 24 and for this to be considered as part of the wider NPCC business planning and budget setting process going forward.
- Chiefs agreed the MoU in relation to staff network facilities as presented to Council (January 2020) to be reviewed in 12 months.

Action: CC Swann and CC Kelly to discuss who should chair and own the national stakeholder group with details being published on ChiefsNet.

Identifying and Supporting forces to improve performance against the National Crime and Policing Measures

Decision: Based on the feedback – chiefs did not support the paper in it's current form and would await a revision for re-submission.

Session 2 – Workforce

There is a large amount of Workforce Coordination Committee work going on currently in between the Uplift work linked to attrition, PEQF, the work on leadership in the College, competencies and

values, the fitness test review, Strategic Assessment of work, Oscar Kilo etc. The importance of Chief Constables keeping an eye out for all this work on Chiefs Net was emphasised.

It was commented that huge progress has been made within Wellbeing. There have been huge changes with PTSD.

The role of the CMO was explained which is a medical position and more specifically looks at occupational medicine which focus on the relationship between health and work. The CMO will be a Senior leader within the wellbeing field, responsible for the clinical aspects of wellbeing with the emphasis on occupational health practise. The CMO will chair the new clinical governance group within the national police wellbeing service, addressing some of the urgent issues within police occupational health such as the lack of national standards for practice, improving the ill health retirement process and supporting police in the Uplift programme.

Two documents were referred to. The document from the Police Foundation looks at how policing is changing and needs to change to fulfil its functions. It recognises the importance of wellbeing. And identified wellbeing as a core strategic capability. It challenged the College to revolutionise its training. There is the Fundamental review at the College with a new strategy coming out which will incorporate wellbeing. It is about boosting professionalism, improving leadership and driving consistency which relates to the wellbeing agenda.

Wellbeing has to be seen as important in terms of how forces operationalise things and needs to be incorporated into leadership, training and standards. The role will be about encouraging systems change, achieving a consistence approach and reducing silo working and restoring professional pride in occupational health practitioners.

Police Covenant

11 priorities have been identified.

There will be the appointment of a CMO for the Police

The creation of a Clinical Governance Group which will be chaired by the CMO.

A Programme Manager will be appointed but the challenge will be to identify gaps and bid for future resourcing.

The National Police Wellbeing Service Capability Model is being adopted.

The Police Covenant Clinical Governance group will operate through work streams – there is a piece around engagement with the NHS, suicide prevention. Occupational health observatory will be set up to identify what the issues are. There will be an oversight function. Working with NPoCC on lessons from Covid. Reporting direct to Workforce Coordination Committee, through the Covenant Delivery Group to the oversight board chaired by the Policing Minister and there will be a dotted line relationship to the National Police Wellbeing Service and to the NPCC Operational Wellbeing Group.

Introduction by Interim Chief Medical Officer – Overview of Clinical Governance Group

Action: Link in with national NPCC health and safety working group lead.

Decision: Stakeholder map and more information will be circulated on ChiefsNet.

Bursaries and Scholarships

Decision: Guidance has been developed and shared with all Forces and with Workforce Co-ordination Committee.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and were broadly supportive as it is a chief's decision to use (force choice).

Decision: Team offered to all chiefs to visit forces to help implement guidance should they take this up.

Code of Ethics Review

Action: Appointment of new ethics lead will be published on ChiefsNet.

Decision: Chiefs supported the direction of travel for the structured approach.

Decision: Draft code of practice will come back to Chiefs' Council before implementation for review and to secure buy in from forces and chiefs.

Action: NPCC Lead to ask College of Policing to contact forces who have not provided ethic leads contact details.

Decision: Comms plan to be shared with all chiefs to see how they can support this going forwards.

Pay and Conditions

Action: Review possible funding options for helping to set up team to review pay reform work.

Decision: Chiefs reconfirmed the principle that DCC base pay should be set at 82.5% of their Chief Constable.

Decision: Chiefs endorsed that recommendations on changes to chief officer pay and conditions for 2023 onwards should return to the Senior Salaries' Review Body (SSRB) rather than the Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB).

Decision: DCCs Fixed Term Appointments (FTAs) will be retained at present but a paper will come back showing the benefits of removal of FTAs to employers to allow a more informed decision to be made. (Please note that the DCCs present on the session, including Sam De Reya, Jim Colwill, Richard Debicki, Paul Betts and Alex Franklin-Smith, all declared a conflict of interest for this discussion as substantive DCCs and therefore played no part in the discussion or decision making around this session).

Attrition Modelling and Framework

From April 2023, there is the requirement to maintain the 20,000 additional police officers and to do that the service needs to think about the impact of attrition and where we see our vulnerability within the work force which is the young in service. There are significant financial impacts to the attrition. Retention is about an outcome and is the product of good attraction, training and development of the workforce.

A hub is being built to drive home the message about retention -recruiting people well, developing and supporting people.

Action: Uplift – Research into leavers to be circulated to all chiefs and heads of people on ChiefsNet.

Action: Chair of Workforce Coordination Committee to arrange for leaver / attrition data back to a future Chiefs’ Council meeting.

Action: Onboarding survey results to be circulated to all forces.

Session 3 - Future Delivery of FCIN

The Chair introduced the item and welcomed A/CC Richard Debicki who was joined by Chief Superintendent Jason Davenport. A/CC Debicki thanked forces who were members of the FCI network for their support and highlighted the importance of the network to deliver forensic collision policing outcomes. A/CC Debicki advised that North Wales is the host force and legal entity for the FCIN and outlined the framework that helped to deliver a consistent approach for ISO accreditation. DCC Debicki provided a high level summary of the independent review which had recommended a change in the operating model; approval of which was sought from Chiefs Council (as detailed in option 2 in the supporting business case that had been circulated). A/CC Debicki advised that a decision was required in order to avoid unnecessary delays and to deliver a pathway through to ISO accreditation which was recognised as a challenging and complex area. There was also a legal requirement made via the forensic regulator - who was supportive and had provided some latitude around the appearance of forensic collision investigation in the forensic regulatory codes - however this would feature in 3 years' time. It was also noted that the Section 22 agreement noted that decision making forum was the management board who were in support of Option 2.

Ch Supt Davenport provided an overview of the three options outlined in the business case and the rationale for the recommendation of option 2 to Chiefs Council to approve which included a summary of the associated costs for each of the options. Ch Supt Davenport provided an overview of the views that had been provided by the Forensic Science Regulator which included:

- Need to ensure a consistent national approach with continuous improvement
- Systemic quality management approach
- A robust competency framework for practitioners

All of the above aimed to reduce risk to the criminal justice system and one of the significant aims of option 2 was to reduce the national risk of admissibility of evidence and to keep a consistent and supportive network approach around quality management and competency. Ch Supt Davenport provided an overview of the timeline to move through the delivery plan and advised that if a decision was reached today, a briefing would be provided to the APCC in early October with amendments to

the Section 22A for completion by January 2023 after which transition to the new delivery model could commence.

The Chair stressed the need for a decision on this matter and to consider that the independent review and the management board had supported option 2 as the way forward and asked for any views/comments that did not support the recommended option.

Chief Constables sought clarification on issues around

- Does this bring in line with the governance for other accredited forensic activity
- Are the option 2 costs part of business as usual
- Need to understand what the host force arrangements would look like under option 2 model
- Recognise the importance of local costs and the need for individual forces to have clear oversight of costs
- Is there scope for policing to have a negotiation as to what is considered 'good enough' in view of the standards being set not by policing but by the justice system

The Chair summarised that option 2 was supported however there were questions on an individual force basis along with the broader question that policing are attempting to meet standards that are out of our control.

CC Nick Dean provided a summary of recent correspondence from Chris Porter (NPCC lead for Forensic Quality) to Chief Constables sent in August seeking feedback on the forensics regulators codes of practice. CC Dean asked Chief Constables to put in their responses to the six high level questions that were raised so that a comprehensive NPCC response could be submitted.

Decision: Chiefs supported option 2 as the recommended option for the future delivery model of the Forensic Collision Investigation Network (FCIN), as outlined in the enclosed business case.

Decision: Chiefs supported the recommendation to present this business case to the Association of Police & Crime Commissioners (APCC) for consideration and support as the Legal Body.

Action: NPCC Lead to work with the NPCC Finance Coordination Committee on identifying local costs and link in on the productivity review for possible future funding bids.

Action: Forces to respond on forensic regulator questions to the NPCC lead to enable NPCC response back on consultation.

Session 4 - CT Policing Update

Decision: Chiefs noted the update

Decision: Chiefs agreed to help promote more National CBRN vacancies in all forces to help with the recruitment challenge in this area.

Decision: Longer session planned at the December Chiefs' Council meeting on MP Security and Manchester Arena Inquiry vol 2 and 3 reports.

Session 5 - PEEL Proposals

The NPCC Chair summarised from the last meeting the issue of PCCs and PCs involvements with both strategic briefings and hot debriefs from PEEL process. It was agreed that PCCs don't go, but subsequently on every occasion where there was a strategic briefing or a debriefing PPC's were invited to go along. Other legal advice was sought and the position recorded is there is no right for a PCC to attend either a strategic briefing as part of an HMICFRS or a hot debrief.

They have no right legally to do so and is entirely within the gift of the Chief Constable whether he or she chooses to invite their PCC to one or both of those meetings.

Other related issue to HMI was that Andy Cooke had the opportunity to conduct a number of the P-POG process meetings. The NPCC Chair has attended two out of the three, it's important because more forces formally engaged than previously. The chair expressed its importance and for everyone to be familiar with how that process is being undertaken.

Forces are presenting and discussing individually is much better than the previous scenario. The approach that's being taken from an NPCC perspective in terms of the support but also from the college point of view and from the Home Office is much more action oriented. More is getting done and a matter for the individual Chiefs to have their own view. The process will continue to refine in a way that is it is a supportive process, getting forces into a status or removed from a particular status.

Andrew Cooke thanked the NPCC chair for the summary. It's not designed to be a castigation process, that the most important aspect is that people are held to account. Regardless of whether that's the Home Office, the NPCC, the APCC or others, all have agreed to be held to account and for actions to be issued. It's a smarter system approach to dealing with forces find themselves in Engage, which doesn't mean force is failing but part of the business isn't going as well as it should be. That's the approach taken and hope that it is better than it was.

Andrew Cooke presented the slides for the next iteration of PEEL. Previous feedback was that Chiefs were never consulted on these issues and the intention is to consult regularly with Chiefs. The presentation has been circulated however on the basis that not everyone has read it asks Suzette Allcorn to go through the slides with Chiefs.

Suzette Allcorn introduced herself and informed Chiefs she will bring in **S40(2)** to present alongside her part of the presentation. Suzette provides an overview of where the current round is at, updates briefly on some of the work ongoing for the next round before moving into the specifics on the PEEL assessment framework.

In the current cycle, 25 false reports published, but evidence collected for around 33. Due to complete current round and publish all by the end of March 2023.

Pie chart looked at the grade allocation of the reports and inspections completed. Previous presented at this group, mentioned previous round of PEEL around 70% of grades were Good, and

discussed introducing fifth tier to see if could kind of separate those that are really Good from the barely Good. The current picture is 34% of grades so far are Good and second awarded grades are the new Adequate grade at 30%. Lowest number of grades as expected is inadequate and 8% of Outstanding. A Good mix of grade across the piece and probably where we anticipated all thought we might get to.

A brief snapshot provided with some of the cross cutting themes. Themes are tracked with an individual question area. Seeing things appear in multiple questions and tend to see the theme having both a negative and positive aspect. So might see really good investment in technology and both are Offender Management and Digital Investigations, which is positive. But then on the flip side, lack of onward planning for that investment in terms of the right volume of resources with the right training to use that technology. Or a lack of obvious resource planning for the increase in offences that investment might generate.

Cross cutting tracking of themes and happy to provide more on that in future but looking at holistic point of view as well.

Mentioned last time that embedded right from the start process and impact evaluation for new version of PEEL and what has worked well is that this model has given a much more comprehensive understanding of force performance. Much better use of all the inspection evidence that is held and more opportunities for earlier and continual improvement.

Definite positives, but biggest area of feedback is need to look at recognizing it's been demanding and intense, both for staff but for forces as well. A number of factors spoken about last time, the pause of the pandemic meant baseline knowledge took a lot longer to get there, zero to taking time to embed continuous assessment model.

Feedback is just simply the breadth and depth of evidence needed across the PEEL assessment framework, focusing now on how we can learn from all of the evaluation we've got to make improvements for round 2. Going to talk specifically about the peer assessment framework, but it's really important that it's understood that it doesn't sit in isolation. Other bits of work around the intensity of inspection is a much clearer sequencing of activity, which should help in terms of when evidence collected and doing it in a sensible order to help with planning.

Making better use of COUNT principle (collect once use numerous times) approach to evidence gathering. Done even more mapping with things like child protection and custody inspections and will do the same with thematics to make sure that if evidence is needed, it is used as much as we can across both inspections. A lot of work has gone into what data is needed for next round to try and make sure only what is needed is collected. Equally important to make sure data used from elsewhere if it exists and prevent asking for data that is already available elsewhere. Links into refined document requests and making much better use of FMS so that requests aren't made for things that already provided and more will be coming out about the document requests once get to the point of writing to all with details.

Information around the context of the PEEL PAF review, always review methodology after every round because need to update with a changing landscape. Real focus on what was learned from cycle one that can help with efficiency in cycle two. The scope was to keep the breadth of it because the feedback has been that the value comes from PEEL at the breadth of what is looked at but trying to be more efficient in how it's done.

Feedback through the PMCC and regional groups, most of it is focused on some sort of wording clarifications around measures of Good, so changes made based on that which will show as red.

One of the overarching changes relates to well-being in demand. So operational evidence for demand well-being and leadership will naturally be gathered within the course of evidence gathering activities for all areas of our inspection framework. But will now solely be reported within the workforce and leadership questions only.

Victim service assessment and crime data integrity slide: Victim experience from call handling to outcome including detailed consideration of the use of outcomes will continue to remain the focus of the victim service assessment. VSA finders will provide direct evidence for linked areas within the assessment framework, so in particular responding to the public and investigations. The VSA narrative will remain ungraded and areas for improvement established within the crime file review will be considered within the linked areas and not listed within the VSA itself, that's how its approached this cycle that is finishing up.

CDI will continue to be graded and delivered at the current frequency, but some things will be removed from cycle T so that's screening out of crimes, that won't be reviewed. Investigations and outcome policy, governance for investigations and outcomes will be considered within the investigations question alone. Removing the safeguarding example which was introduced this year. Purely because there's been difficulty maintaining the cases needed for review and also the reviews not providing the information expected.

What will be included and which is currently under development, is a resolution process for the crime file review, and that's akin to what currently exists for crime data integrity, the scheduling of the VSA crime file review will also take place closer to the field work inspection window in the current cycle.

Brief point made that its increasingly not callers, but contacts and the shift between callers and contacts is becoming increasingly important as well. There is a lot of work going on in digital public contact on that. It's increasingly digital now, a lot of people are making the shift from 101 on the digital when they get to that point in the recorded message because it's convenient and it seems through digital public contact, the satisfaction levels for digital contact are quite a bit higher than 101 as well.

Query around the VSA aspect of things, and certainly in terms of those standards required within control rooms around assessment of vulnerability, etc. Whether or not HMIC have ever considered or would consider quantifying the time taken or the reasonable time taken a call handler to achieve those standards because obviously that then impacts on 101 times etc and it would be Good to have

a sense of what that is a standard expected. How they note that impact on call handling times because they can be counterintuitive sometimes, unfortunately.

Same point, that's there's beginning to be so much stuff in the front end and there are also usually at the end of this CDI processes to navigate, that the call handling times are going up dramatically adding more in, and real kind of danger here. Crime prevention devices important and it's important it's given in somewhere in the cycle, but there's so much stuff being asked through this process and it feels while having a debate about the narrative on volume crime, driving up vulnerability a bit more again. Nervous in some ways about the degree to which would continue to drive up focus on vulnerability.

Andrew Cooke noted it was a fair point and there's always a balance with these things, wouldn't expect any call handler to give 10 minutes on crime prevention. It is a balance, fully accept that, and oversimplifying it, but aware of it and will take cognisance of it.

The police powers and procedural justice slide, the community engagement element, which exists in cycle one, is moving to an app prevention and deterrence question where it more closely aligned. This question will then solely focus on procedural justice, examining the quality of police, public interactions and the use of powers. The title of this question has been changed from public treatment to reflect that focus.

Topic one focused on the face to face interaction between the police and the public, and the decision making that leads up to the use of a police power. Will also look at how the force trains officers to recognize and deal with biases. And finally look at force policy on body worn video and where this can and should be used to improve encounters, including compliant handcuffing, where deviation from NPCC guidelines on recording will be noted, including the force rationale for doing so.

Topics two and three will focus on the use of stop and search and the use of force respectively. Will look at whether these powers are used fairly, lawfully and respectfully, but just as importantly, whether they are seen to be so. Look again at training provided the entire governance process around the use of these powers, and then how the force invites and responds to external challenge. In relation to stop and search will also include a review of outlier data with particular focus on the force understanding if they are an outlier and why. Another point to note following circulation of the presentation, an update to the wording of the first characteristic of Good within the stop and search topic, which is highlighted in red and the wording reflects the aim, which is to consider the overall use of stop and search as well as how the power is used.

Comment made that think it's actually really helpful, the direction this is going, and really useful. Question around which particular use of forces are record, given that the NPCC guidance was guidance and wasn't required. Given move to body worn video screening and oversight, whether or not we need to be, concentrate quite the same amount on the discretion issues that exist about what we choose to record or not, because there's rationale that graded to a standard that some didn't sign up to, but the principle of this is fine. That's just a minor detail and think it's a Good step forward of striking the balance for using the power and assessing active engagement with its disproportionality. Think this is much better than last time.

Andrew Cooke noted point and didn't disagree with the point made either.

Prevention and deterrence question. This question has been restructured to recognize that prevention and deterrence should be a whole force approach with problem solving, not purely considered a neighbourhood function. The wording has been developed to mirror that used within the neighbourhood policing guidelines and the national prevention strategy. Topic one focuses on how well the force embeds a preventative policing approach, including working with partners. For example, the force knows who and where its problems are, how to deal with them through primary, secondary and tertiary approaches, decides who will undertake the action and considers the consistency of neighbourhood capability and capacity to achieve sustainable results. Recognize challenges with shared data which may exist and the impact that they may have on preventative work, and this will be considered alongside the forces proactive attempts to improve access to partner data, considering that context.

Topic two will focus on problem solving and takes the journey of this question to the next stage. The focus is on the presence of a long term commitment to problem solving, so both culture and drive, the correct capacity and capability to deliver, evaluate and learn from what works well and a partnership approach that achieves sustainable outcomes.

Topic three, which previously focused predominantly on neighbourhood policing, which is now a single characteristic of Good within the first topic, is going to focus on effective community engagement. The content focuses on the forces knowing who their communities are, demonstrating that they provide different ways to engage with them alongside processes to check the engagement is meaningful, so there's a clear outcome from the engagement and engagement enables the force to build trust and confidence.

One of the points that was raised within the PMCC feedback, was whether the NPCC Race Action Plan would be inspected as part of this and the response is that it won't be directly via a characteristic of Good, however, how forces engage accordingly with their communities is examined within topic three and how forces have incorporated the NPCC Race Action Plan into strategic, operational and tactical engagements will be referenced in our inspection guidance for inspection staff to be aware of and consider.

Question asked that presume from recent inspections, that the language is adapted for specialists in a way such as BTP where communities is viewed differently and just some of the other language wouldn't necessarily be transposable across. Presume it's clear with the inspection that it's adapted obviously because still do get inspected.

Andrew Cooke said it's not a one-size-fits-all. So will focus on the different communities, as there are with BTP.

Chief Constables commented:

- That it would be helpful to have the police powers piece under the Race Action plan just because that will come up at the at ISOP in terms of how this is being used to assess that. Don't know whether it's it's been considered in the mix of the overarching plan.

- Confirmation made that did have a discussion at the board last week about how the race plan would fit in. There will be feedback on areas that ought to feature. But there's an overlap here.
- Whether in the next round there's an opportunity to comment on the nature of problem solving activity that's going on. So a team that do high intensity partnership work predominantly on health and social care issues in order to just to give some headroom to the other teams, but would like their specialist skills used on crime problem solving. Might be an additional piece of evidence used towards the productivity review and just to make the point about the type of activity that engaged in from a problem solving perspective, perhaps should best sit elsewhere.

HMI suggested that this would get picked up when look at how working with partners and how it links to demand management, as an opportunity to comment on that, in terms of the context what's being done.

HMI suggested that taking into consideration partnership working you would expect to have and the impact on prevention and deterrence, but also those which are perhaps preventing you from being able to focus on areas that you would wish because you are working with partners to fill gap.

Comment made about the national level and what the cumulative effect of all that is?

Andrew Cooke will see if can work around that, but if can, will do.

Responding to the public, focus of this question remains largely the same as the current cycle with some amendments proposed for the existing characteristics of Good or the remaining characteristics of Good. The question will build upon evidence gathered within the VSA. Topic one has been expanded to include all relevant aspects from the victim service assessments and make sure that that assessment has a natural pain within the rest of the framework and it will also consider the leadership of the control room and how this links to the wider forced governance arrangements.

The inspection of the prompt answering of calls, thrive assessment and crime prevention have been separated as well, and this supports forces the ability to make improvements to those individual strands if needed, and any resulting areas for improvement can be more easily discharged than in their current grouping that we have from Union cycle one. The singular focus on crime prevention will also support us to assess the recommendation made in recent Spotlight report on serious acquisitive crime.

And the ability to contact the force through other appropriate, accessible and monitored channels will be considered and this seeks to make sure that the response to the public is no less or better dependent on the route into reporting. There are limited changes to topic two, which seeks to establish the use of internal and external experts in the support of strong decision making and the accuracy of risk assessments. Equally, the quality and timeliness of initial responses.

Investigations, the focus is similar to responding to the public will remain largely the same, but with an improved focus on outcomes. It will again build upon the evidence gathered within the VSA and consider all investigation types. Topic one, the governance characteristic Good has been expanded

to include a focus on the force allocating investigations to those with the right skills and capabilities to carry out effective investigations and that those investigations are effectively supervised. Would expect to see evidence of the forces internal process to assure itself of the quality of supervisory input.

Topic two is new and specifically focuses on securing justice for victims, and this is via achieving appropriate outcomes for them, which may include bringing offenders to justice, including through the appropriate use of evidence led prosecutions. This topic does consider the police element only of the wider justice process. Topic three focuses purely on the forces ability to support linked in access to rights in accordance with the Victims Code of Practice.

Comment made no issue at all with any of the bits on there, but regarding office County rules and outcomes and CDI more broadly. Need to link in.as there is a review at the moment for the Policing Minister and the Home Secretary in respect of the outcomes and how they will be broadened. A meeting in the coming weeks with VAWG. So it's for the team to be tapped into that around what is being looked at rather than just the old fashioned, but wait for old detection money. But equally the 14's, 22's and 23's that will come down the line, particularly around violence against women and girls.

HMI confirmed linked in with the Productivity Review and VSA CDI lead on the who has meeting the next day on this and is also aware of this.

Comment made on previous slide and links to contact, not just focus on 999 and 101. So where the force answers 999 calls within national standards and 101 calls have a low number of callers disengaging. It's just to make the point that at times actually might want to be encouraging people to disengage from the 101 and go on to single online home for instance. Had a massive increase in 999 calls, so trying to prioritize that and shift people onto other channels with effective sort of triage and risk assessment in place. Focusing not on how managing other demands of the single online home, other demands needs to be taken into the equation. Specifically to say for callers not disengage from 101 might be a success factor, and worth reflecting that back.

Andrew Cooke noted it was an interesting point made, let me think about it. Know that the government are still intent on measuring speed of response in relation to this.

Discussion continued that there are some mechanisms in place for that, but they're probably not mature enough at the moment. There would be some proxy measures used, could see at what point somebody leaves the 101 call, in terms of the IVR type system, are they routing away once they realized that they could actually go online, once they've had that on the IVR, there is also some functionality on single online home. Aware single online home isn't the only factor here, but can ask people if they tried other means already. About managing demand unless going to get lots more resource and putting people into appropriate channels ought to be the focus, appreciating that the government steer is all around the phones.

Andrew Cooke agreed. And acknowledged it's a big difference between someone coming off after two minutes and 20 minutes. Can see point made and will think around that.

Question regarding investigations, and whether the criteria is agnostic, in terms of crime type whereas the recent correspondence from new Home Secretary wasn't agnostic in terms of the type of crimes that policing should be focusing. Repeated references to things such as neighbourhood crime and explicit reference to RAZO and Op Soteria. Question whether that level of sensitivity and focus is going to play into the assessment of forces in terms of the investigations of different crime types, rather than broadly across the piece.

Andrew Cooke confirmed it's deliberately been left agnostic for a number of reasons, not just to inspect based on what the government thinks needs to be inspected, but where think forces need to improve. Will pay particular attention that's highlighted in the spotlight reports around neighbourhood crimes and rape etc but will also be looking right across the board, but some are going to get more visibility than others. In relation to Op Soteria points, looking at how to implement some of the learning from Op Soteria into PEEL. Met with Op Soteria team previous week so can incorporate that moving forward, but fully understand the point made, but deliberately keeping agnostic at the moment.

Comment made regarding Investigations slide, on the force secures justice for victims. It may seem a pedantry, point, but there is something more serious to think about it. It's not the police that secure justice, it's the system. Given that coming under increasing pressure and performance, that sort of language suggests and reinforces that it's all down to police. Which of course it's not, hugely important part to play, but it's as much down the CPS and the court system, all the rest to secure justice. So whether there's anything that can be done, not around what is measured but reminding those that look at these kinds of reports that it's not just the police that is involved in this that the other parts are just as important if victim is going to get justice. No suggestion for wording just wondered whether that's worth thinking about.

Noted it is a fair point, state of policing got a major on these issues this year, and where the demand has been taken away and know there's a numerous pronged attack on the new ministers and Home Secretary around these demand issues HMIC, from NPCC and from others who've spoken to ministers and the Home Secretary so far. It'll be very clear that this is the police part of the whole system and not the police's fault for the whole issue.

Vulnerability, this question considers the forces approach to the vulnerability that it identifies and the ongoing safeguarding it provides a single agency and as part of multi-agency arrangements. So the content has been developed including data request reviews to align to the Domestic Abuse Act and also the NPCC VAWG action plan. Topic one continues to look at the strength of the forces, vulnerability, strategy, governance and performance monitoring regarding improving the service that it provides to vulnerable people against all College of policing vulnerability strands and therefore aligned to the national Vulnerability action plan. Focus makes it explicit the need for victim

feedback to be evident as being captured and shaping that strategy. Topic two retains focus on safeguarding measures, so the use of DVPNS and those where applicable, domestic violence disclosures etc to reduce repeat victimization and prevent harm.

Concern about the first point about an effective strategy, feels like ticking a box that an organization has a strategy, but how do you know that they're delivering against it? Worried that forces could be delivering really well in this space, but not necessarily have a strategy. Worried looking for an artifact as opposed to Good practice. Also the domestic abuse act, very little of it has come into being yet, and there are certainly some things within it that that are still subject to a lot of evaluation before they will. Not sure ready to inspect against the domestic abuse act. The preventative order schemes, like previous points made, there are things that forces will apply for, but there are many things that are applied for outside of policing and not even in crime situations that forces are not yet notified of and a realism here with the broader justice system that it's common practice that even the most serious Protection Orders, like stalking, Protection Orders, CPS will commonly not charge until a second breach. So there's something about not wanting to drive lots of nugatory policing activity with very little outcome. Would rather look at how forces affectively protect victims with what's available to them, rather than counting how they monitor and use orders when actually orders might not be the solution.

Reassurance provided that won't be inspecting on the full breadth of the DA Act because it won't be right to do so. Aware of the commencement schedule and it's just making sure part of the DIEG that looking to make sure that any data had was as full and complete as possible to support to understand those elements that have come into play, to be able to see where forces are with progressing day. Very much not expecting forces to be doing everything perfectly but those bits that have come into play having a means to look at. Point around the tactics and borders and options that are available, it's not looking at kind of bean counting for use of a better word, looking at in an individual circumstance was the best approach available tactic for policing used there. So rather than expecting that there is a DPN in every single case where it's appropriate, was it considered? And if it wasn't considered is there a rational why?

Point also made that no extra marks will be given for pretty strategies either. It's actually what comes out the other end. It's just the whole sort of gamut from start through to conclusion being looked at.

Management of suspects and offenders, this question will continue to focus on effective and consistent risk management for the protection of the public. Topic one is largely unchanged other than the removal of focus on PNC circulation and ACRO checks, which were found to be positive in this current cycle and the focus of the remaining areas will be more explicit around the safeguarding rationale for their use opposed to purely just having a system in place. So that understanding of why they are being used or that impacts of using them.

Topics two and three are wearing cycle one. Had highest volume of areas for improvement allocated to forces. Evidence from force management statements also suggests that there is a poorer

understanding of current and future demand in relation to both of those areas, which is potentially negatively impacting on resource decisions and policy development which considers demand and not necessarily mitigate sufficiently against the risk. And as such topic two will retain a focus on the management of registered sex offenders and then given the current predicted increase in demand in referrals to pull it and the concerns that the current cycle have identified, proposed to place a greater emphasis on this inspection section, moving it from a single characteristic of Good as it is within cycle one to a topic area in its own right.

Both topics two and three will consider their proactive capability of forces and partnerships to target and manage offenders. Proposing to remove from this question, which exists in the current cycle, isn't a focus on integrated defender management, but considering the reintroduction of it for cycles three. Found that the embedding of the IOM approach across forces is inconsistent and still in progress, as is the use of the idiom system so therefore no data available to enable to provide a comparative performance across England and Wales, and won't be able to until those systems are embedded. Believe that there will be much more beneficial inspection if consider that in cycles three. There is scope for forces who are further ahead in their IOM arrangements or other offender related multi agency schemes to highlight those within the prevention and deterrence and vulnerability questions and existing recommendations that are linked to IOM will be reviewed in the ordinary course of FLL's engagement with forces and the forced providing evidence of their progression against them.

Comment made regarding the bail one, picking up language, always using an appropriate feels a bit of a contradiction. Worried because of the bail changes, need to be very well calibrated. It's absolutely right using them effectively to protect vulnerable people or prevent crime. But need to be careful about language used. Got to be conscious that if have breaches and people brought back in the extra 3 hours enables to try and focus to get these across the line as a red case to charge. Also need to be very clear when not going to apply restrictions in areas because could create huge problems for selves say with this. Not quite sure whether saying it's appropriate or whether it's always, always and appropriate don't quite seem clear at the moment.

No disagreements with that and no issue in taking that out.

Another comment made that worried could end up counting numbers here to reassure ourselves of activity and it probably goes back to some of earlier points in the conversation, forces could strive to apply restrictions in orders to everybody, but that would make us less efficient at their managing offenders overall. And there's just something about how to get this right. There's just something about not tying selves knots by making this about volume activity. There's lots of learning to come out of the Mick Creedon review, and was going to ask, about, the timing may not be right and that may be about a specific sort of cohort of offenders, but there's a lot in there that's applicable across the board that actually policing tends to tie itself in knots by applying criteria to a huge number of people. Then it's then it's almost impossible to manage which actually takes eye off those that really do want to manage.

Reassurance given it won't be about the volume, but about the appropriateness of the usage. And there's a big difference between the two, really. It's not checking the box for every everyone, it's whether the box was ticked in a particular case, when it was the right thing to do so. And equally articulating, when it hasn't been.

Comment made about the force routinely considered preventative ancillary orders breached, some monitored actions taken and then back to the previous vulnerability slide around the preventative orders scheme. Then the oxset elements it in the third box around the sort of the investment in online child sexual exploitation team. Going through budget setting like other forces, currently having to make some really difficult and in order to sufficiently meet all of these areas, which are all really important areas, but having to make decisions around investing in additional operational lawyers, putting additional resources into child sex rotation online team. The the cost of this is increasing in order to achieve adequate or goo, increasing against a sort of shrinking resource envelope and it's just the cumulative impact of all of these. Wondered whether there's any sort of costing to achieve these in in a medium size force.

Andrew Cooke confirmed there's no costing at all. Don't cost recommendations. This is where think the bench should be set. Forces role to proper resource and manage risks in force. If there's a reason why not doing it and rationale is there, that would be considered as part of the final judgment made by the HMI.

Workforce, and the focus of this question is on how Good the force is at building, developing and looking after its workforce and encouraging an ethical law for and inclusive workplace. Focus on drivers of well-being, the retention of new recruits including national diverse backgrounds, PDS and the strength of first line management. Priority themes for cycle two are very similar to those in cycle one, but taken to the next journey. For example, currently considering progress towards uplift and recruitment. This cycle looks at the experience of new recruits, both police officers and staff, and their attention. Topic one considers the forces understanding of the strategic drivers of Good and poor well-being and these increments on resourcing decisions. Topic two focuses on the development and support of new recruits and efforts to retain them. Those within their first five years of service and this considers creation of an inclusive environment and the support that underrepresented groups and this is in line with the College of policing stages and considers the data available regarding these within the first five years of employment.

Topic three considers the capacity and capability of first line managers link closed due to the College of Policing work program stages, the first focus being on promotion and progression and talent identification and management. Second line management onwards will be considered in future cycles of inspection as the development programs are creative and embedded. Overall there'll be a deeper focus on subject areas and stronger focus on leadership, ethics, audacity and inclusion will be threaded throughout.

Leadership and force management, the overriding priority for cycle two has been to include leadership as a topic. As such a rebranding of this question. Intend to report on leadership in the force in a separate ungraded narrative section and that's separate section will draw on evidence from across the assessment framework. It's still in the very early stages of development and conscious need to be specific around what is meant by leadership, which isn't focused solely on the Chief constable or the senior leaders. It is around leadership at every level and working on this, so ideas around what that might look like are useful for this question as well. The intention has been to make better use which these set touched on earlier on the information that's held within our force management statements and also data that exists elsewhere. Touched on SIP for data before and that will support a reduction in the volume of additional documents being requested.

Topic one is amended to include reference to the force management statements, but the principle of the questions unchanged is essentially about force having Good plans, Good governance and monitoring performance. Topic two is new and is the leadership question, so this is about ensuring staff and officers have the skills, training and support to be leaders and characteristic of Good too is about ethical leadership, so people feeling able to apply for promotion, they're being a culture of leadership and diversity. Topic three is unchanged, but this is where all operational and strategic demand evidence is recorded. In the future, won't be reporting it in individual questions. It will be created within either workforce or leadership, depending on whether it is wellbeing or demanding leadership focused. Topic four is the value for money question, which now includes collaboration and then topic 5 is unchanged and remains the finance question.

Question about all the focus around police culture, and quite rightly at the moment, surprised to not see it referenced in this section at all. Or to assume that that would be picked up in one of thematic inspections?

Response that an awful lot of work going on around various thematics at the moments, including counter corruption, misogyny and various parts of vetting. Plus there's a race thematic also due.

There's a lot of work going on around it without it focusing in specifically in relation to this question although would foresee as part of leadership, the cultural force being mentioned as part of that when do the write up around leadership itself.

Culture will absolutely come through in this question, but alongside this, still got counter corruption and vetting inspections happening. And we've got a number of thematics. The awful inspection around CCC and vetting are still ongoing as well, and that will roll through next year as well.

Comment that's really helpful, given the investment that probably a lot of forces are now making to understand organizational culture and strengthen it, it would be helpful if it was reflected in the broad PEEL assessment as well. But it sounds like it would be so that's reassuring.

Clarity sought around the ungraded narrative around leadership in, in terms of the question that in green, supportive of that question 12 obviously this time was graded. Concerns around if this section is graded, the point raised around this will be seen as a comment around the leadership of the Chief Constable and the Chief Officer team. So for if it is graded just some concerns around that.

Explanation given that leadership of force management question as a question in its own right, which has a leadership element will remain graded and there will draw upon evidence both within this question and other areas to produce ungraded narrative which is similar to the reducing crime one.

Discussion about narrative, whether it is perceived to be issues in the Chief officer team or not, or the wider leadership issue or the Chief officer team is working well and the key messages and the culture throughout the organization is right.

Comment about how to get that understanding across to the communities and it's the snapshots that are picked up on. That narrative is going to be absolutely critical and the media release that goes out with it.

Still got a lot of work to do on it and it will be coming to PEEL external Reference group and speaking to others around how we get that right but its early days.

Nervous about standards, question is if going to make comment upon the culture in the force, what is the standard model gathering evidence against on culture? Because it's a big, broad, sweeping statement, there are a great many different cultures in an organization in most forces. Quite hard thing to get hands on and count or measure. Can look at what's going in the discipline system and at other areas but quite a broad statement, so what's the standard inspecting against for culture?

It's a fair point. The point about the culture of the force, it's whether the values of the chief officers are reflected throughout the force itself. What they are doing to ensure that the right culture is there. Identifying what exactly that right culture is, I suppose, is down to what the chief themselves sets as the values for the force.

Couple of questions around the rationale around victim services in relation to why that remains an ungraded and what's the time scales for this second phase? Is part of the learning that actually make a break between inspecting the pilot forces before move on to the next, or really the first group?

Because they were just running into one another. A couple of points, code of the Victims Code was featured heavily last year. Almost ahead of being able to implement completely. That's not going to be the case this year, but think maybe there are a couple of other things mentioned like the Domestic Abuse Act where almost ahead of being able to understand, look at the guidance, do the implementation. Thoughts reflecting on last year.

The grading for VSA was removed because it was felt to be unfair that were replicating various cause, concern and areas for improvement twice when that was a graded area because could end up with two requires improvements for an enough. The same issues on occasions continue to do that.

There's a lot of representation from NPCC for VSA not to be graded. Was taken to ministers who came back that they thought that it should be. Convinced them it's one of the most important parts of the field report. It will always be #1 reflect that number one. But grade and it was unfair for forces that's why stopped doing it. The VSA was getting a bit of a double hit and it was impossible to unpick victim service.

There are no pilot forces, this is just round two. Will give notification hopefully by the end of October what the kick off around round 2 looks like. There will be a small pause, if late on the schedule, so have a two year cycle basically to get through 43 forces. So will know within the next sort of month or so where in that two year schedule from 2324 onwards. Will have Good notice where sit in that. So it will be a consistent peer assessment framework for all 43 forces in the second round.

Being ahead of the game, DEA Act, will only be looking at the bits implemented and known and understood, and just monitoring as things roll through.

Comment made, but reflecting on the cultural bit, think the leadership bit and the culture of the force is already very well contained within the workforce question. Don't actually think that's

particularly new, but think it's less explicit because it's not as a heading. So if it's sort of as it is now, and described, less of an issue, but there is some skill and danger around the summary of the force that most people will read and the press will latch on to and the press release to make sure that it's not simply focused on that question. Now it's explicitly under a question, I think that's where the sort of concerns lie.

Doing this to make it more effective for ourselves and for yourselves. That's why consulting so much in relation to it. Hope it's hitting the mark better with the improvements that are being highlighted. Any of the issues that have been raised, will be taken away and looked at and make sure get it right before it comes through. Just a snapshot or preview really of what looking at next and still working on this and it's some time off. Looking at contextual analysis in relation to each force so that can better place why the force has received the grades it's got and what the reasons are behind it, whether that's disparities on funding formulas, whether that's demand, whether that specific issues in particular forces, trying to achieve is to get a PO report that is far more bespoke and explains better to people why that force is doing particularly well or not doing as well as it should be, which should be a Good reassurance to there's a lot of work that sits around that. Hopefully bringing it back in a few months for views.

Thanks given for feedback through the different consultation processes.

Decision: Chiefs agreed the position that Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) have no legal right to attend strategic or hot debriefs with HMICFRS but that attendance is at the discretion of CCs.

Decision: After review of each slide – chiefs supported the draft proposals for the consultation.

Session 6 - Crime Coordination Committee Session

Overall Update

NPCC Crime Lead confirmed that Firearms Licensing paper has been circulated and update will be brought to next council in December and International Portfolio update would be brought to council next year.

Homicide Prevention leads gave an outline of framework which was developed in collaboration with CoP and HMICFRS. The initial set of force visits have been completed along with the document submission review. The architectural build of the framework is underway and is being developed for hosting on the college website, and collation of existing best practice methodology is being progressed with input from College of Policing What Works library, the Vulnerability Knowledge and Practice Platform, the Domestic Homicide Project and the Youth Endowment Fund. The practice initiatives are being drafted following feedback from forces and these will be added to the framework when it is published – it is important to note that this will also be public facing so best practice is available for all to read. The academic research is being collated and there will be work with CoP and HMICFRS in the new year to plan how to progress this. Alongside this work there are further reviews of promising practice to support those already being put on the framework.

The framework will be tested over the next week in the CoP with a planned launch for policing on 17 October. A more public launch will follow after further testing and feedback from users has ensured it is stable and working correctly. Work is continuing on the National Problem Profile Template being undertaken by CoP which will support understanding of what is driving the increases in homicide. Best practice such as the Initial Homicide Debriefs will also be included

A number of issues were identified while building the framework. Data Sharing between forces was seen as a challenge with a need to develop further governance, and possibly give more consideration to what information is missing and required rather than trying to gather everything – this is something for NPCC to consider. There is evidence that the 18 forces with Violence Reduction Units were seeing a much greater reduction in serious violence with a widening gap so should look at a plan for those forces without VRUs. Early Sharing of Initiatives could possibly be better managed to avoid duplication – for example there are seven pieces of work with independent funding streams regarding DA risk matrices and homicide – so how can these be coordinated and linked together to identify the best way forward. There are opportunities with better use of technology, academic research and engagement with third sector but there does not seem to be a clear way to share learning and experience across forces rather than each force reinventing the wheel. The next phase includes examining initiatives that have been identified as good practice. Each force has been contacted and drafts for these pieces of work are under review and will be included in the framework when signed off.

The Prevention Coordination Committee have been involved with this work and are reviewing whether the Public Health portfolio, which contains VRU, require separate support.

The CoP have been working with HMICFRS on a protocol across a range of issues, including homicide prevention, and will identify good practice and publish on website. Smarter practice will help build a stronger framework, supporting CoP ambition to be relevant, dynamic and connected. CoP recognise that there is frustration that they do good work but that it is shared fast enough. The force visits have been supported by the college and good practice is being extracted in a much more dynamic way and shared more quickly.

Although there was a finding from the domestic homicide research project that were a number of suicides of domestic abuse victims, particularly women, this is not covered in the framework. The National Lead for Suicide has been working with the third sector, particularly domestic abuse charities and those that support victims after domestic homicide around this. There does not appear to be a volume of homicide cases that were incorrectly identified as suicide. However there have been some cases where forces have already pursued successful post death prosecutions for long term coercive controlling behaviour. This has great potential for identifying where the prevention opportunities are for public health responsibilities around reducing suicide. New guidance for dealing with sudden and unexpected death has also been well received by the by the sector as well.

It was confirmed that the SOC portfolio will be involved with prevention framework guidance as they become aware of threats to life and interventions going on at regional level.

Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking lead provided update on Crown and Courts Act s.5(1) Tasking for Organised Immigration Crime. This has been in force since September 2021 and now is a good time to remind all about requirements, the progress to date and raise a request for the future.

Human trafficking and associated exploitation is one of the fastest growing and most profitable criminal enterprises that OCGT get involved in worldwide. There are several definitions but put simply it is the facilitation of illegal migration into the UK. It is seen as a crime against the state as opposed to the individual but vulnerability and exploitation grows significantly.

There are a number of nuances around definitions, and it depends on which agency you're from. But basically foreign nationals, usually complicit, being trafficked into the UK by clandestine means, most likely at significant cost to themselves, both financially and often, physically being exploited by criminal network processes. Those individuals aim to remain within the UK with a view to regularize themselves through either asylum, through ownership of forged documents or moving into the shadow economy. Whichever way though leads to the vulnerabilities being exposed and further exploitation from those organized crime gangs. This creates significant demand on policing including cannabis farms, county lines, sex works etc and create significant money for organized criminality.

A term now being used is poly criminality. The same people that are trafficking in people are dealing with drugs and guns, and create risk for individuals and communities. The methods for clandestine transport vary, there are highly visible aspects around small boats at the moment, but also lorry container drops and possibly use of private airfields. This doesn't just affect coastal areas but the whole country. Operations to counter this require significant resources from time and finance. If this can be prevented at an early stage then that saves us the work and of course, protects victims. This is not a problem for policing alone - agencies such as immigration enforcement, border Force and **S23** have just as much responsibility.

The Crime and Courts Tasking act creates a formal requirement for forty three police forces and nine ROCUs and while the full action list is lengthy, for brevity they can be under four points - gather intelligence and improve recording, operational response to clandestine events (inland), focus on investigation standards and disruptions and enhance the partnership. There is now an agreement with **S23** for a framework which will test the success of the task over the next twelve months, which are focused under headings of engaged, efficient and effective. To support this there are a number of task and finish groups that are in the process of being set up that will tackle some of the most obvious blockers which should be in place by the end of the year. Most of these are around Intel flow but as well as creating task and finish groups there is a responsibility to engage forces, to support change and improvement. There will be a review, not an inspection, to create an enhancement plan. The team will also pick up on feedback trends and common blockers which can be pushed back into the Home Office and through **S23** governance. The team will come back in to help the forces achieve those enhancement plans.

Bedfordshire, Essex, Sussex have completed reviews and they will get reports and plans in the shortly. Cheshire is currently going through a standardisation process and West Yorkshire is being reviewed. Thirteen forces have made initial contact and their executive teams are agreeing terms of reference and review. Effectively eighteen forces have engaged and there are twenty five to go, so those forces need to contact lead to agree the terms of reference so that we can work with the next year. A letter was sent by previous lead and this will be recirculated.

The summary is that the actions a review will give our staff the understanding and tools to demonstrate that policing response is clearly improved which will assist targeting criminals and protect communities and the victims.

VAWG lead outlined three main elements in update - the progress of the work over the last year and the recently released report, feedback on upcoming items due before the end of the year and next steps from April 2023 and funding options.

HMICFRS feedback is that progress has been made but there is still a lot of work to do which is recognised.

VAWG will have an event in October at CoP to share frontline practice and progress across our forty three forces. The review of VAWG misconduct is due out in November, this has been prepared in conjunction with Professional Standards and Ethics Portfolio. The first benchmarking report around VAWG performance is expected to be released to the public at the end of November. This will build on the data that's been collected over a year now to give a clear baseline in terms of crime and internal trust and confidence.

The APPC summit in November will see the launch of work to outline how other areas in wider criminal justice sector, such as education, prevention and safer spaces can impact VAWG as well as policing. Over the second year of the program it is hoped the VAWG debate will shift to include other areas in the solution as well as policing.

The initial expectation of the VAWG programme was to increase trust and confidence and to look at national coordination and consistency across the forty three forces. Any observations from forces on this would be welcomed. There is work on the national management of orders and VAWG learning from Op Soteria for repeat perpetrators et cetera covering everything from night time economy through to online harms bill and digital aspects. Demand from spiking has stabilised over the last year and new campaign material has gone to universities around that. A business plan has been completed and will be discussed with the Home Office for future funding.

Attendees raised the issue of needing additional input and need for discussions to take place with local authorities, educations, academies and how community safety partnerships and would appreciate evidence to support that. It was felt helpful is a national process was in place with Home Office to liaise with Department of Education and other stakeholders. Could VAWG content be added to year six PSE, especially as there is evidence sexualised behaviour is occurring at a much younger age. There is also an issue of how schools have procedures for reporting inappropriate behaviours on premises, but there seems to be a gap for how to report behaviour occurring at home or other sites. There also could be more education for boys who are accessing material on the internet which is giving a warped perspective on consent and behaviour.

ROCU lead provided update on uplift process which is a year behind the police uplift program for forces. Based on current projections there is a good level of confidence that all regions, bar one, look on track to hit targets but there is not room for slippage on this so support would be

appreciated.

S31 Law Enforcement

The demand on SOCU policing is growing all the time, along with the expectations of ministers in terms of what will be delivered by that component of the PUP. As capability increases more demand is also being identified. ROCU are building a consistent capability across the country - the details vary places depending on the size of the region and the requirement against the threat – but the consistent capability is one of the biggest differences to what's been built before. That work within regions can reduce demand for forces and increase operational effectiveness.

Uplift success is reliant on the agreement that was made last June to smooth the 850 for this year over two years. In December ROCU will be looking to get formal agreement that to progress towards the 23/24 plan.

S31 Law Enforcement

S31 Law Enforcement

S31 Law Enforcement

S31 Law Enforcement

Action: All new appointments for the coordination committee including portfolio changes would be circulated on ChiefsNet.

Intelligence – PND Update

Decision:

S31 Law Enforcement

Action: Forces to look at PND licenses to ensure redistributed to use effectively – if more licenses are needed contact the PND steering group.

SOC PUP

Decision:

Decision: Chiefs supported the direction of travel towards the 23/24 plan and a paper based on slide 5 would come back through the regional Council process with a substantive item on the agenda in December to discuss. This paper would include what's being delivered by the capability.

Decision: A number of forces asked for support from ROCU uplift recruitment which the team will liaise on.

International – JICC

Action: Update will come back to the December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG)

Action: Timeline to be circulated with update to all forces.

Action: Invitation to the VAWG conference on the 17 October would be shared with all to attend.

Decision: Partnership plan will be launched at the joint APCC and NPCC summit in November.

Action: Tackling VAWG priorities 23-24 will be circulated to all chiefs for response.

MSHT (Modern Slavery)

Action: S23

Action: Team to re-circulate a copy of Shaun Sawyer engagement letter on assistance available to help tackle this crime type (Organised Immigration Crime – OIC) with all forces seeking responses.

Investigations – Homicide Prevention

Decision: Chiefs supported the direction of travel with a focus on establishing the policing framework further by:

- Creating guidance for every force to factor into local homicide prevention strategy / arrangements.
- Developing further considerations for addressing homicide prevention activity across NPCC Portfolios

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and were informed of the second round of publishing initiatives within the framework and welcomed soon the publication of lessons learnt regarding the systems leaders approach.

Firearms Licensing

Action: Paper to come back to the December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Session 7 - Prevention Coordination Committee Update

The Chair introduced the item and welcomed CC Serena Kennedy. CC Kennedy provided an overview of the formation of the Prevention Committee and work that had been undertaken to review the Prevention Structure and Strategy including incorporating learning arising from the Excellence in Policing conference which had helped to provide clarity on both purpose and priorities. CC Kennedy had met with each of the Coordination Committee Chairs to agree what areas of work should come across to the Prevention Committee and to help enable cross committee work, reduce areas of duplication and identify any gaps etc.

CC Kennedy provided an overview of the national policing strategy that was signed off by Chiefs Council in December 2022 and highlighted some additions that have been included as part of the consultation process which related to enabling factors and the importance of AI and data analytics. CC Kennedy provided a summary of the objectives and aims of the strategy and this included areas of cultural change, reducing harm and offending and reducing demand through evidence based problem solving.

CC Kennedy highlighted work ongoing to develop the structure of the Prevention Committee, the portfolios that sit under it and the supporting governance/meeting structure – including the regional lead structure. All portfolio vacancies had been filled except for the restorative justice portfolio and CC Kennedy asked Chiefs to consider suitable colleagues for this lead. CC Kennedy provided an overview of the Prevention Committees strategic objectives and their alignment with the NPCC Strategy and other cross portfolio working/engagement opportunities. CC Kennedy advised that a prevention committee newsletter which provided an overview of the key areas covered would be shared with chief officers and force prevention leads.

Chief Constables commented on the following:

- Consider the opportunities of the collaborative arrangement with the APCC to avoid duplication and ensure appropriate contribution

- Need to consider the area of demand reduction - i.e greater self-reporting of crime and how to promote and maximise the impact of the police preventative activity to the public
- Consider links into Government via the Prime Ministers Delivery Unit
- Consider the opportunities for industry to change and contribute to reducing demand
- Make the case to forthcoming spending reviews to show the cost benefit analysis

Action: First Prevention committee newsletter to be circulated on ChiefsNet.

Action: South West regional chair to send prevention committee chair South West lead contact details for prevention.

Action: Review links into Prime Minister's unit on prevention review.

Action: Review comms strategy to widen out for review as the committee develops preventative activity to publish.

Decision: Chiefs' Council in December to host larger session with chiefs to discuss work going forwards.

Action: Review stakeholder engagement with industry and private sector organisations to help increase industry's understanding of policing needs for prevention.

Session 8 - College of Policing – Chief Officer Progression and Appointments Recommendations

The Chair introduced the session and advised that this item was brought back to Chiefs Council following previous debate and the task set to the College to undertake a review of Chief Officer progression and development including a review of the current Strategic Command Course. The Chair highlighted the need for Council to have a robust debate regarding a number of challenging issues, and to decide on a way forward to ensure that activity can be progressed as swiftly as possible.

CC Andy Marsh highlighted the work that had been undertaken and was ongoing within the College to review and address the issue of developing and delivering world class and outstanding leadership at all levels in the police service. CC Marsh summarised the issues raised at the July Chief Constables Council meeting which included issues around candidate quality and diversity, candidate preparation, Senior PNAC process and its content and the appointment process for chief officers. CC Marsh stressed the tight timescales involved in progressing next steps and reiterated that decisions were required now in order to be able to implement and communicate these changes.

Jo Noakes provided an overview of the high level of stakeholder engagement that had taken place and fed into the review. Six key issues were identified as a result of the engagement which were:

- Developing a pipeline
- Perception that minority groups are less likely to self-identify as being ready for SPNAC
- Role attractiveness
- Concerns around SPNAC outcomes
- SPNAC and SCC accessibility
- Reliance on temporary promotion

Jo Noakes provided a detailed summary of recommendations each of which were developed following a set of principles for what each recommendation should achieve. The resulting 6 recommendations were:

- Chief officer assessment and development will be delivered through a new police executive leadership programme (PELP) that replaces senior PNAC and the strategic command course (SCC)
- The Chief officer appointments process should be nationally defined and standardised, and locally delivered
- Forces will identify, develop, and support a pipeline of officers with the potential to become senior or chief officers, starting early in their careers
- Specific effort will be undertaken to identify, develop and support a pipeline of officers with the potential to become chief officers from minority and underrepresented groups, at force-level and nationally
- Development offerings and expectations for senior police staff should be defined and standardised nationally
- Issues that make the role of chief officer unattractive should be addressed by the Home Office

Jo Noakes advised that the recommendations had been shared with the SCC professional reference group and police superintendent association who were both supportive. Subject to endorsement from Council, next steps were to establish a review delivery group with representation from across delivery enablers, communicate the changes to potential candidates and identification of any regulatory changes required and by the end of the year, share guidance regarding how the new leadership process will run. March 2023 was anticipated as the submission date for candidates' portfolios and the new cohort would commence in May/June 2023.

The Chair opened for debate and views. Following a detailed discussion, a summary of views raised were:

- Recognition that there had been some loss of confidence in the process by future leaders and therefore the timing was now to progress, develop and change the process
- Significant concerns around challenging timescales for the implication of a major transformation to policing leadership selection and the impact of such fast time changes to potential applicants
- How to ensure consistency of assessment and removal of any local/unconscious bias
- Must address and own feelings of mistrust in the process
- What is the role of the HMICFRS to ensure that forces are using the standards and mechanisms set by the College to select and build senior leadership teams and should the College perform a stronger role in the standard of development etc of potential chief officers
- Consider and address risks around the module approach – including forces allowing candidates sufficient time/space to complete
- Important to acknowledge importance of the ASPIRE programme and continued professional development beyond selection
- Must recognise the challenges of being a chief officer and therefore the selection process is hard and a pass or fail element should be considered – as is the case at more junior levels
- Concerns proposed changes will not address the diversity aspect and the risk of bias on occasions
- The creation of a portfolio approach will assist in the provision of evidence across the breadth and depth of individual applicants – recognising that portfolios must be objectively assessed
- Need an evaluation process of the new process
- Concerns to removal of a process with standard and rigour for a process that isn't yet defined

- Concern the revised process is weighted towards increasing quantity and diversity over the application of a national standard
- Consider any impact and messaging to those on the current course
- Need clarification that the revised process was inclusive of police staff and that appointments would remain locally applied

CC Marsh commented that he heard the concerns and comments raised which were valid and highlighted the following:

- Responsibility on Chief Constables to identify people earlier and engage them with both the college of policing and local mechanisms to develop talent
- Portfolios will be developed, and the working group will give guidance to ensure they are as limited in bureaucracy as possible and provide Chief Constables with assurance around candidates' competency levels and consistency
- The college will run a simultaneous process run by the College which will provide a joint review and avenue for appeal
- The content of the programme will be a modular programme and fit more with those with busy life/personal/family commitments
- Timelines for delivery was accepted as challenging however it was felt that swift and immediate action was needed however there was confidence on the timelines and the robustness of proposals
- Must be clear on what problems we trying to solve
- Must consider the criteria for Chief Superintendents

The Chair highlighted the question of whether proposals would reduce the movement of senior staff and the potential impact on certain forces. It was accepted this was a concern and the new appointment guidance would have to reflect this to ensure there was an appropriate balance around individual need and the benefits to policing. Conversations were being held around the number of ranks performed within one role/force and other possible areas of mitigation including making the best use of secondment opportunities.

CC Marsh commented that the recommendations aimed to address the previous feedback and consensus from Chief Constables that the current process did not meet current day requirements and Jo Noakes provided reassurance around the criteria for superintendents and senior police staff and the future ability to undertake more workforce planning at a senior level.

Chiefs commented that the proposal should be viewed and framed as an improvement to the process which was an evolving process. CC Pinkney stressed the need to advertise roles this year.

The Chair felt the need for change was accepted although recognised that proposals could not answer all the issues and concerns raised by a wide forum on a complex issue. There was a need to consider the capacity within the College to manage the required change at speed considering the amount of work and capability required to deliver it effectively, whether the system would be able to cope with the increased demand and what is the review and assessment process going to be. CC Marsh advised that considerable consideration had been given on the issue of capability to deliver and the planning assumption was for two intakes per year and numbers would need to be balanced between those two intakes. It was also accepted that a rigorous review process would be required after year 1.

The Chair felt the majority supported the progression of recommendations as outlined whilst it was accepted that there were strong views raised on timelines, the inclusion of a pass or fail element and how the recommendations would impact on diversity. It was highlighted by a couple of Chief Constables that there were some voices that did not support all/some of the recommendations and this should be recognised.

In a final summary the Chair advised that it was the responsibility of the College of Policing to deliver on both the assessment process and the development process for Chief Officers and Assistant Chief officers. Chief Constables Council had put the challenge to the College that there were issues with the current PNNAC and SCC in terms of delivery for forces and had asked them to review and make recommendations for radical change. This the College had done and there had been a wide-ranging consultation process. Today's session had provided an opportunity to review those proposals. The majority view was that the proposals were supported with a number of caveats and questions – with three specific areas of particular concern highlighted as:

- Issue of standards – does moving to the revised process reduce the element of pass and fail/a national standard
- Will this have a negative impact on diversity
- The timeline is very ambitious and there are concerns that this will impact on the effectiveness of the process

The College should progress the recommendations as outlined with the recognition that the chief officer reference/oversight group was critical and there would be future updates to Chiefs Constables Council.

Decision: Chiefs' Council had previously raised concerns regarding the current processes for chief officer progression and selection (SPNAC and SCC) and asked the College to review and make recommendations for change. This was the outcome of that work and it was acknowledged that the College have consulted widely to inform the work. There was consensus support, although not unanimous, for the proposals outlined but with some concerns raised around the following areas for which clarity is sought:

- the timeline for implementation and whether it is too ambitious and could impact on effectiveness of delivery
- that standards will not be reduced and a national standard will be maintained, with clarity around the pass/fail element
- the impact of the new programme on diversity – need to ensure it won't negatively impact on diversity

Chiefs agreed that the responsibility to deliver this work rests with the College of Policing. There was majority agreement that the decisions as outlined below should be supported/endorsed for the College to commence work immediately on implementation of this reform:

- Immediately: set up a review steering group with representation from forces
- Immediately: notify potential candidates of the changes, and ensure current SCC candidates are informed
- Immediately: identify any regulatory changes that may be required

- End of 2022: develop and publish detailed guidance on how the new Police Executive Leadership Programme will run
- March 2023: Candidates submit portfolios
- May/June 2023: Commence first cohort of new Police Executive Leadership Programme

Decision: The development of this work will need regular review and monitoring and it will agreed regular updates will be provided to Chiefs' Council, with extraordinary meetings called if issues or areas emerge that need timely discussion and decisions.

Action: College to set out to chiefs the concerns and issues raised and detail how these will be addressed, by whom and when.

Action: College will set up chief officer review delivery group which will operate as a high-level strategic forum to oversee implementation of agreed reforms to the chief officer progression pipeline. The group will include one chief officer per region, one chief officer level member of police staff and one chief officer from a non-Home Office form. NPCC to write out to all chiefs.

Action: College to invite all chiefs to a workshop planned for the 18 October.

Session 9 - Research on Staff Welfare (Op Talla Sickness and Absence Learning)

The impact of Covid 19 on the police workforce on England and Wales was discussed.

Op Talla did a good job of assimilating every force's sickness data and this required a large amount of effort for each force to put this information together.

There was a good opportunity to look back at death in service data and replicate some of the other excess mortality data which have been collated with other professions. Officers were reporting on isolation. A survey was conducted with about 1800 responses from a cross section of forces which was split about 50/50 between officers and staff.

There was a substantial impact on the workforce from Covid. Unsurprisingly, there was a higher prevalence of exposure to Covid around officers. The rate of Covid was around 10 % higher in officers than the general population and in terms of absences it was not unusual for them to go above 10 days. Data was collected from the start of the Pandemic to October 2021. 4 % is the general level of workforce sickness but this is a flat line level which would be expected to go up seasonally. Sickness levels throughout Covid didn't peak much beyond that 4%. Absence rates were sometimes triple what they normally were.

An update was provided on the Op Talla Recovery, Reform and Learning programme and a summary was provided on the short update paper that was circulated. There were key themes which came out and the programme worked in partnership with forces. There were a number of regional networks as well as the Programme Board which was used to share and gather information which was well supported by forces. PPE transitioned to the health and safety committee, there are still contingencies in place but further work around location and how that contingency is going to be held is being undertaken. In terms of mental health work and managing trauma – working closely

with National Wellbeing Service who are trialling a new trauma process at the moment. Impacts of Long Covid is still being felt by staff. They have undertaken knowledge sharing events on this and some funding to do some research on that. Good practice into and for policing. Agile – a paper was shared with forces. Generally positive but some challenges so sent around a paper for best practice and with case studies. In terms of partnerships, adaptability proved to be key. Joint communications and helplines worked well. The 4E's have been used successfully – some groups difficult to engage for example elderly groups. Op Talla is to be used and scalable for use across other emergencies.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update in relation to Op Talla, Recovery Reform and Learning activity to date.

Action: Team to share NPCC/NPoCC commissioned piece of work and academic research undertaken by the University of Cambridge in relation to the impact of COVID-19 on the police workforce in England and Wales.

Decision: The team offered to all forces to present and highlight the learnings and themes.

Session 10 - Police Response to Residential Burglary

Session started with discussion around burglary response. There have been questions to NPCC around central guidance and it expected that individual forces will be contacted for their views.

National Burglary lead outlined that there had been growing interest in acquisitive crime from government and media in recent weeks, with a focus on outcomes / detections. There have been a range of reasons for a decline in outcome performance over the last 10 years, but during the same period there has also been a 51% reduction in volume which should also be emphasised. As the Police Uplift Programme investment has rolled out more forces have brought back dedicated burglary teams. All have burglary leads with CSI and initial attendance policies being reviewed and refined. This has gathered pace recently and there was a HMICFRS inspection into acquisitive crime which produced some recommendations around consistency of investigative standards and CSI deployment across the UK and there is work with CoP on this with guidance to come out shortly. The majority of forces currently have a THRIVE approach to attendance at burglaries with call handlers asking victims questions to inform deployment based on immediate risk to individuals and the opportunity to retrieve evidence. There is some inconsistency with CSI deployment as identified by HMIC and most forces provide crime prevention advice for residential burglaries, particularly to prevent repeat victimisation or where there are more vulnerable victims. Although a number of forces are moving toward attending every burglary and recognise benefits with victim satisfaction and community trust, this would not in itself increase detection rates and moving resources would have an impact on other areas.

CoP stated that evidence that visible attendance and house to house prevention activity does have a positive impact on crime figures, and will update APP if required to set national standards for HMICFRS to benchmark against. There was some wider discussion around this, reiterating that attendance and follow up visits were desirable but would impact other work. The 'counting rules' for burglary were discussed and it was felt should be raised with Home Office – there was a concern

that thefts from sheds and vacant properties should not be counted in the same way as burglary from homes. GMP have been running 12 month pilot attending all domestic burglaries and have expanded this leading to increase in victim satisfaction and detection rates.

It was felt it would be helpful to link the resourcing required for this to the larger piece of productivity work sponsored by the Home Office.

Overwhelming support from Chiefs for policy of all domestic burglaries to be visited by police (including options of PSO, DOCO, SOCO etc) although some concerns about resources and how current recording rules would show in stats (e.g. sheds and vacant properties). It needs to be clear what the guidance is and that performance can be objectively measured against this as it will be monitored by Home Office.

The new Home Secretary has written a letter setting out her position and ambition to cut crime by 20% although details of how this are measured are not yet clear. The uplift programme is still strongly supported, and it is expected there will be increased use score cards to measure performance of priority areas as in other areas of Criminal Justice system. There are no big changes expected to the Beating Crime plan and the score cards will provide figures around the delivery of this. There needs to be clarity around the different roles that NPPC leads and Chief Constables have with regards to performance and guidance. NPPC leads provide advice and guidance on specific areas and share knowledge across forces, but local performance is the responsibility of the Chief Constable for the force. Chief Constable and NPCC leads should respond to queries in a coordinated way with a focus on how initiatives support operational delivery and reduce crime.

Decision: Chiefs agreed a centrally developed narrative between the NPCC lead and College of Policing and adoption of national response for policing should be circulated. This should include the College's rapid review of evidence of the policing measures which can be effective in solving burglary crimes as well as reassuring victims. Update to be circulated on ChiefsNet.

Action: Chiefs agreed that the crime recording rules for burglaries need to be reviewed as they create a misleading picture for the public. A request would be made to the Home Secretary to ask that officials liaise with policing around a review of counting rules.

Decision: Agreement from all chiefs that there should be attendance at all home burglaries.

Action: Tie in with the National Productivity review for burglary resources to be balanced with other demands.

Action: College agreed to review new standard under Authorised Professional Practice (APP) from NPCC burglary lead to be used as a basis for HMICFRS inspections/national position for unified approach.

New Government

Action: NPCC team to invite the Policing Minister and Home Secretary to the December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Decision: Chiefs discussed the opportunities and challenges with the formation of the new Government and noted the discussions.

Session 11 - ESMCP Update and Future Approach

S43 Commercial Interests

S31 Law Enforcement

Airwave

S43 Commercial Interests

S31 Law Enforcement

Timeline for Chiefs

S43 Commercial Interests

S31 Law Enforcement

Financial Considerations between NPCC and APCC finance groups

S43 Commercial Interests

S31 Law Enforcement

Next steps and considerations

S43 Commercial Interests

S31 Law Enforcement

Session 12 – S23 Information Supplied by, or concerning certain Security Bodies

Session 13 - Special Commission on the Registration of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis

The Chair welcomed Sir Tom to the meeting. Sir Tom Winsor provided Chief Constables with an overview of work and outcomes involved in the special commission report that he led on at the request of the Home Secretary.

Decision: Chiefs thanked Sir Tom for discussing the reports and noted the update.

Action: National Operating Budget update will be circulated with the CCC Sept minutes to all chiefs.

NPCC Chair thanked everyone for the work achieved in the last two days

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next full Chiefs' Council meeting will be held on **7-8 December 2022**.