





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 npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk	
Author and Contributors:	
Force/Organisation:	NPCC
Date Created:	27 September 2024
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 npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk	
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/security-policy-framework/hmg-security-policy-framework#risk-management	

Chief Constables' Council Minutes

25-26 September 2024

Attendees

AC Gavin Stephens	NPCC Chair
CC Sara Crew	Avon and Somerset
CC Trevor Rodenhurst	Bedfordshire
CC Nick Dean	Cambridgeshire
CC Mark Roberts	Cheshire
Cmsr Pete O'Doherty	City of London
CC Mark Webster	Cleveland
CC Rob Carden	Cumbria
CC Rachel Swann	Derbyshire Constabulary
DCC Jim Colwill	Devon and Cornwall
CC Amanda Pearson	Dorset
CC Rachel Bacon	Durham
CC Dr Richard Lewis	Dyfed-Powys
CC Ben-Julian Harrington	Essex

CC Rod Hansen	Gloucestershire
CC Stephen Watson	Greater Manchester
CC Mark Hobrough	Gwent
CC Scott Chilton	Hampshire
CC Charlie Hall	Hertfordshire
DCC Judi Heaton	Humberside
CC Tim Smith	Kent
CC Sacha Hatchett	Lancashire
CC Rob Nixon	Leicestershire
CC Paul Gibson	Lincolnshire
CC Serena Kennedy	Merseyside
Dep Cmsr Dame Lynne Owens	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Matt Jukes	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Laurence Taylor	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Matt Twist	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Pippa Mills	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Louisa Rolfe	Metropolitan Police Service
Cmsr Mark Rowley	Metropolitan Police Service
CC Amanda Blakeman	North Wales
CC Paul Sanford	Norfolk Constabulary
CC Ivan Balhatchet	Northamptonshire
CC Kate Meynell	Nottinghamshire
CC Vanessa Jardine	Northumbria
DCC Tim Forber	North Yorkshire
ACC Emma Bond	Police Scotland
T/DCC Chris Todd	Police Service for Northern Ireland
CC James Vaughan	South Wales
CC Lauren Poultney	South Yorkshire
CC Chris Noble	Staffordshire
DCC Rob Jones	Suffolk
CC Tim De Meyer	Surrey
CC Jo Shiner	Sussex
CC Jason Hogg	Thames Valley
CC Alex Franklin-Smith	Warwickshire
T/CC Richard Cooper	West Mercia
CC Craig Guildford	West Midlands
CC John Robins	West Yorkshire
CC Catherine Roper	Wiltshire
DCC Rachael Etebar	British Transport Police
CC Simon Chesterman	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
CEO Andy Marsh	College of Policing
Tom Harding	College of Policing
	
	
CC Melanie Dales	Ministry of Defence Police
James Ratcliffe	Royal Military Police

Gp Capt Russ Foster-Jones
Col Kristian Rotchell
Col Mark Shapland
CO Ruari Hardy
CO Robin Smith
CO Russell Foster
CC Chris Eyre
Cmsr Ian McGrail

Royal Airforce Police
Royal Navy Police
Royal Army Police
Guernsey Police
States of Jersey Police
Isle of Man Police
Sovereign bases of Royal Cyprus Police
Royal Gibraltar Police

In attendance

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Aimee Reed
DCC Ian Critchley
[Redacted]
T/DAC Alison Heydari
Abimbola Johnson
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Professor Paul Taylor
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
ACC Mark Williams
Gemma Stannard
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

No 10
Home Office
Home Office
Metropolitan Police Service
NPCC Lead for Tackling Organised Exploitation
NPCC Serious and Organised Crime Lead
NPCC Police Race Action Plan (PRAP) Lead
Police Race Action Plan
Digital, Data and Technology Coordination Committee
Police Review into Productivity
NPCC Finance Committee Coordinator
NPCC Chief Scientific Officer Policing
CEO BlueLight Commercial
College of Policing
NPoCC
NPCC Strategic Hub Lead
NPCC Head of Organisational Development and Change
NPCC Business and Chiefs' Council Manager
NPCC Staff Officer to NPCC Chair
NPCC National Crime Coordination Committee
NPCC Freedom of Information Act Officer
NPCC Business Support Assistant
NPCC Business Support Officer
NPCC Business Support Officer
NPCC Business Support Assistant
NPCC Executive Assistant to NPCC Chair

SESSION 1:**MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes for the previous meetings held were agreed:

Decision: July 2024 Minutes – Agreed

Action Log

All actions completed.

Parish Notices

The chair welcomed visitors to Chief Constables' Council (CCC). The following new appointments were mentioned at the meeting:

- A warm welcome was expressed to the following newly appointed Chief Officers attending CCC for the first time:
- Mark Hobrough as T/CC for Gwent Police.
- Richard Cooper T/CC for West Mercia Police.
- Pete O'Doherty as the new Commissioner of the City of London Police.
- The Chair also announced CC Charlie Hall's retirement and thanked him for all his hard work both as a CC but also on the national stage and his last CCC meeting will be in December.
- Tony Eastaugh is the Interim Chief Executive of PDS.
- The Ops Committee Chair role is out for expressions of interest.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update on the Operations Coordination Committee Chair role and the NPCC Chair encouraged all to apply.

Chair's Update**Police Staff Awards:**

The Strategic Hub Lead provided an update on the Police Staff Awards. The Senior Police Staff network has been running for 3 years with over 1700 members. The National Week of Police Staff celebration was launched in March which every force and organisation backed. 3rd March 2025 will be the National Week of Police Staff Celebration of recognition. The NPCC Coms team will be working on a Comms plan to Heads of Communications. They are writing to ministers to get their backing. They are launching a national police staff award process and there will be 5 categories of awards. They are asking for forces backing to help promote the event and will be seeking nominations from forces. Communications will be sent out via Chiefs Net, Heads of Comms and the Senior Police Staff network.

Decision: Chiefs noted the next Police Staff week of action taking place 3 March 25 and agreed to support the launch of the Police Staff Awards planned. Chiefs agreed to encourage promotion with forces once comms are circulated on ChiefsNet.

Police Summit:

The 19 and 20 November are the dates for the NPCC/APCC Summit. There is an interesting line up of speakers with the focus looking at global risk, local response and how we positively police for the future. There will be sessions on Science and Technology, Finance, Workforce and Prevention. Most forces have registered but there are some who haven't who are strongly encouraged to attend. A thank you was expressed to those who have been asked to attend as part of a panel and as speakers.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

CCC Venues and Costs:

The dates and venues have been confirmed for CCC for the next two years to give forces time to secure good deals with travel and hotels and to help plan ahead. The dates are as follows:

- On the 4th and 5th December, CCC will be in **CLOSED**.
- The 19th and 20th March 2025 will be **CLOSED** which coincides with the joint session with the PCCs and with the Sports Awards.
- On the 9 and 10 July 2025, CCC will be in **CLOSED** with the bravery awards.
- On the 17th and 18th September 2025, CCC will be online.
- The 3rd and 4th December 2025 will be in **CLOSED**.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update on plans for future locations for CCC meetings.

Action: Copy of slide showing all future meeting locations to be circulated to allow for chiefs to book travel early will be circulated with the timeline for submissions of all papers.

Operational Updates:

The stalking super complaint - Suzy Lamplugh Trust will be published on 27/09 and the key focus will be on the current legislation and what needs to be subject to review. The work identified that there are pockets of good practice amongst forces but not always consistent by geography. There will be 10 recommendations with a 56-day response plan. The national lead will be picking up the central response. Key headlines of the recommendations are – strategic assessment of this crime type and making sure it is included, effective risk assessments and training of staff and effective use of the protection orders. A stalking conference is being held in conjunction with the CPS on 8 October which all forces have been invited to. Forces are encouraged to push their teams to attend to make sure there is good representation at this event.

Decision: Chiefs noted the report will be published on the 27 September. Specifically, in response to the recommendations for Chief Constables, forces are required by 22 November 2024, to publish on their website an action plan which explains what their force will do locally to respond to each of the recommendations made and the comms team will share on 26 September additional information to support.

Undercover Policing Enquiry:

This is still ongoing and on track to be the longest ever running public enquiry. The Chair has been given some strong direction to get this enquiry to a conclusion which may put more pressure on the central team.

A positive update was provided by members of the National Governance group. The Chair was going to convene a large panel to determine the recommendations, but this is no longer going to happen as the recommendations will be implicit in the report. A comprehensive statement may provide assurance that all the recommendations have been met by the current governance, arrangements and accreditation which are now in place. It was commented on that some support may be required for the central team. It was also reported that the end of the next session which runs until Christmas, will bring the investigation up to 1992 in the chronology which will change the focus of the investigation from something which has been MET focused to national focused. In the next few weeks, there will be a distinct and difficult feature of the evidence which will be related to the intrusion into family justice campaigns with black victims of crime in London who were perceived as being anti police at the time and were subject to collateral intrusion from the SDS. They are engaging with the head of PRAP and other national leaders and it was reported that the investigation is likely to be more high profile in the weeks ahead.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Impartiality Review:

This has been published and the recommendations are being assessed looking at strategic matters such as definitions of operation independence and links to national staff networks and getting more structure around those.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Post Olympic Deployment:

It was reported that this was a very successful deployment which reflected well on the police officers, staff and animals deployed. Some good contacts were made, with good engagement with UK citizens and others. Officers were also deployed as athlete liaison contacts who were bilingual and carried out an important role. Thanks were expressed to the NPoCC Team ensuring that the officers deployed were safe and well looked after. The feedback in from the Ambassador was very positive to all officers deployed.

The Chair commented that he had received a letter from the Ambassador wanting to greater develop the work and collaboration on two fronts. Firstly, the Violence, Disorder, Community Tensions, dealing with far-right extremism and the lessons to be learnt from the deployment of UK personnel on French soil which may become part of strengthening relationships on borders.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update

Operation Drakeful:

Operation Drakeful was gold response with 4 key elements within it. Safeguard is now starting to be scaled down with 80 cells currently being made available. It was reported that 99,547 cells were made available over the two-year period in response to the prison crisis across 30 forces of which only 4,005 cells were used which generated £62 million in revenue. Safeguard will be closed down, but there may be additional pressures again in terms of the general prison crisis next Summer. It was commented on that there was a great response by forces to Operation Early Dawn with only 81 people having to be transported by policing themselves. There is lots of learning coming out from this Operation with a debrief, looking at the resourcing framework needed if Operation Early Dawn is activated and looking at the critical infrastructure. Operation Early Dawn has now been stood down. Fortunately, it was not necessary to go to Operation Brinker. A thanks was expressed to all the forces who stood up their command structure, pulled together members of their LRF and local Criminal Justice Boards and did tabletop exercises at a national and local level.

The fourth element was SDS40 which was the early release of prisoners. 1750 came out under tranche 1 and there was the data wash which went well, and local forces received their information. A thank you was expressed for the national support. It was reported that 37 prisoners had been released incorrectly and there are 7 outstanding. This was due to a technical issue with some people being charged under the 97 act and an amendment coming out in 2020 which superseded it. There is a desperate need for the Prison Service to become more modernised in terms of their technology. Some learning has come out to do with the victim notification scheme, how it works and the transparency in terms of compliance. There are some concerns around electronic tagging with a change in supplier which is being raised at a meeting to ensure there is transparency and progress made on this.

There are some debriefs going on between tranche 1 and tranche 2. Tranche 2 is the second wave of people being released and are people which are serving more than five years, and they want to ensure that they capture all the learning from tranche 1 ready for tranche 2.

It was reported that the broader Criminal Justice and the pressures across the system, demand is still outstripping capacity with the backlogs which will likely result in an accelerated system of reform. There

is likely to be that critical point reached again in the prison establishment in the Summer next year. Some of the reform discussions need to be taking place between now and Christmas and quarter 4. The Chair commented that there is appreciation from the Home Office on the work UK Policing has been doing in this space.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update on Op Early dawn and SDS40 operational impact reporting to be published on ChiefsNet.

Op Tarlac

An update was provided on Op Tarlac.

A thank you was expressed to other portfolios as with Op Tarlac there is often some co-production required in terms of working with key portfolios.

It was reported that whilst some operations are now moving into shadow form, Op Tarlac in the next few weeks in terms of increased sensitivity and awareness remains one to keep an eye on both national and locally.

A thanks was expressed to the tactical lead providing a lynch pin between Op Tarlac and Op Navette to join up some of the overlapping areas. Some of the key challenges were looked at with the importance of early engagement particularly in respect of local policing in terms of achieving a consistent policing approach. It was reported that hate crime is still being felt sharply across Jewish and Muslim communities with challenges around universities with university liaison officers currently playing a key role.

There are key community dates and briefing documents have been circulated to gold teams and Chiefs are encouraged to check that they have been received.

There is a video explaining about the High Holy days, what they are and what they look like. The 7th of October is the traditional key anniversary date in terms of marking the attacks on Israel but when looking at the religious calendar, the 24 and 25th are also recognised as key anniversary dates. Forces, if they haven't already done so, are encouraged to adopt Op Vineyard. There will be some pieces of work in Op Tarlac which may fit better within specific NPCC portfolios. Most of the work is likely to fit in the protest space.

There was also the mention that when engaging with both Jewish communities from a staff and police officer point of view and Muslim networks, there is a bit of concern about how we engage differently. The support provided for Ukraine verses the dynamics in the Middle East. The need to be sensitive and not generate a hierarchy of conflict on what is supported and what isn't. These issues play into the Race Action Plan with those on the African conflict with equally severe losses of life and impact not getting the same level of support.

CLOSED

The key issues for forces are to know where your vulnerable communities are, have those relationships built now and to understand what effective response looks like if communities come for help and support.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and supported the adoption Op Vineyard for consistent local engagement and response.

CLOSED

Accountability Review:

A recap was provided on past events when almost a year ago NX121. the MPS Firearms Officer was charged with the murder of Chris Kaba. This resulted in the laying down of weapons in London in particular, and there was real difficulty in being able to provide any mutual aid into London.

The Accountability Review was the key to getting Firearm officers back to work but nearly 12 months on the review has, not made any meaningful changes for officers which presents significant risks given the impending trial. The urgent work going forward is around Op Virtue. A letter has been received from the Home Secretary setting out what the Home Office intend to do to move things forward.

CLOSED

CLOSED

Disappointment has been expressed that the review has not moved on and since the new government, there hasn't been any clear expression on what is going to be done. There is cynicism amongst firearm officers and colleagues that it is not going to progress. However, there is reassurance from the HS that this will be moved forward It is now very close to the trial. The letter seemed to underline the commitment which was seen at the meeting. There were measures due to be in the Crime and Policing bill and the three measures will be resurrected and taken forward into legislation.

CLOSED

There was a request for the letter to be shared for government voice.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and the Operations coordination committee chair would speak with the Home Office to see whether the details of the letter could be shared to help with comms into their respective operational force areas.

Policing Productivity Review:

An update was provided on the Policing Productivity Review and the programme officially ends on 30/09. The report will be put in on time to the Home Secretary. A lot of police hours were found which are genuinely available hours if the work is carried through. There has been some good work done on the mental health piece. There has been a lack of progress with CPS and Criminal Justice. The previous government put forward 234 million pounds of investment and a centre for policing productivity in the College.

There was phase 2 which looked at AI, custody, workforce deployment and missing persons with more

free police time up to about 61 million hours over five years which could be freed up for other policing issues. The report will be circulated to all forces and PCCs. There has been a huge amount of good work carried out in Neighbourhoods and the review team have visited all forces with good cooperation from all forces. Neighbourhood Policing is a loosely defined term with a lack of consistency about what it means and a lack of shared performance objectives. On investigations the review team worked with the HMIC, and culture, training and supervision were areas which were looked at, working with the College.

Accreditation was looked at and the review team have found ways of making it easier on forces and less onerous. The final report will be submitted, and the team will dissolve. The Centre for Police and Productivity is there to implement and monitor the recommendations. It is not certain where this is going to be. It was going to be the College, and the new government has been talking about a new headquarters for policing, but it is currently not known where the work will be carried forward and whether the money will be available. The work needs to be continued in some form, but it is not clear as to how this is going to happen. A thank you was expressed to the team and to all the forces who assisted with the review.

The College reported that there have been some interim agreements to build a transitional team and centre for police productivity but that so far, there has only been a limited amount of money to build the foundations. The College is ready to progress this work but unless there is funding, none of the work will be able to take place.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and following supported the next steps as follows: (1) the final report will be submitted to the Home Secretary and Policing Minister by 30 September 2024. (2) The team will be disbanded, and the work will transition over to the Centre for Police Productivity, (3) the Centre for Police Productivity will implement and monitor the recommendations put forwards in our reports. It will also be responsible for rolling out the Model Process tool and (4) The update on the third phase report will be presented to chiefs at the CCC meeting in December.

Finance Update:

Some headlines were provided on Spending Review (SR) which will be a 2 phase SR.

The language with regards to the 1st Phase which is one year is rollover and tread water which has been used by Home Office officials which is indicative of what the Service may or may not be getting. The Finance Committee has been planning for SR. They have worked hard to get a submission in for the first phase. The Home Office were clear that they only wanted a submission under three hearings – Pay/Non-Pay and Funding Omissions.

To fund the 24/25, pay award into next year would require £650 million additional grant. To fund the incremental growth from the pay increases from the officers who joined via Uplift would require an extra £70 million. Submission on pay alone was £720 million.

There are a number of new burdens coming into Policing and they have sought to cost them. Their strong suggestion is that there needs to be an increase in the special grant budget. They seem to be getting percentage awards of the ask rather than the full ask. As a result of the finance survey, which is done annually, there is some good data on inflationary figures facing the Service and seeing significant increase in the MTA. All those burdens together and adding the funding required for pensions there is another £500 million required. They are starting to raise the cost of sustainability with a growing risk as a sector being the electrification of their fleet. The Finance Committee working group suggest that the full electrification of fleet would come to £800 million alone once you include infrastructure such as charging stations. They have not put in a bid for that but have suggested a contribution towards the quantum.

Costs have been submitted for the 13,000 increase. There needs to be a 3-1 ratio for new joiners of police staff which is based on what they might realistically get back. The Neighbourhood Policing guarantee for a year could cost up to 275 million pounds but this depends on what order recruitment is completed which is just for next year.

They have put in a sizeable submission. One of the Finance Committee meetings which was attended by all the forces CROs, and the feedback was as concerned as ever before They have put the best case in given the time limits.

In respect of pre-set permissions, MHCLG is the arbitrator on this who determine the maximum pre-set amounts and then it is determined how much goes to Council and how much goes to Policing. Last year it was 13 pounds which should be at the top end of their expectations.

Phase 2 is being worked on with a submission by mid to early Spring. They are just finalising with the Home Office what an engagement plan would look like. There will be engagement with coordination committee chairs, regions and partners. There was a plea that if anyone in their lead areas is in discussions with the Home Office about new capabilities which may incur cost, it would be helpful for those working on the submission to be informed about this at the earliest opportunity particularly around tech and training costs.

To sum up, it is very tricky, but they have put the strongest case in that they can, and Phase 2 will be equally as crucial.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Regional Papers

Decision: All decisions and actions from the regional papers are listed in the circulated slides contained within the CCC pack:

Action for all submission authors - Authors to liaise to regions on their respective feedback from chiefs gathered as per the regional process on the papers.

Pensions Update

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and all feedback will be reviewed and fed into future sessions and updates at CCC.

NPCC Strategic Hub and Risk Overview

Decisions: Chiefs noted the paper and provided feedback which the author will respond on. This would be a standing agenda item at CCC in session 1 for chiefs to raise any risks required.

National Staff Networks Structure and Governance

Decisions: Overall chiefs agreed to introduce the proposed governance structure, which will include the introduction of a new NPCC chief officer portfolio lead for national staff networks and the development of operating principles.

Proposal for New Definition of Police Corruption

Decisions: Following further discussion with clarity on the feedback chiefs agreed i) the definition of police corruption set out at para. 3.1.2 of the report, in addition to (ii) the 3 tests as at para. 3.1.3 that have to be met before the definition can be said to be engaged, alongside (iii) all the interpretations

referenced at para. 3.1.5.

AI Strategy

Decisions: Decision on paper taken in session 6 in the log.

NPCC Aviation

Decisions: Decision on paper taken in session 7 in the log.

HeForShe – Funding of Programme Manager Role

Decisions: The paper is not supported and remitted back to the NPCC Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Coordination Committee. The author to take feedback and work up alternative options to come back to CCC.

Session 2 – Increasing Gallantry Nominations

The Chair introduced the session identifying the following points:

- Recognised policing could be getting more recognition for colleague's and need to understand the process.
- Session at all Chief Officer Day to outline the process and how to maximise the best chance of success.
- Extended the offer of advice to colleagues to assist with nominations.
- Highlighted the opportunity to use already established award ceremony's to put forward into the honours system if they are successful.

The Chair handed the floor to the Home Office Police Honours, Medals, Awards, Memorials and Covenant lead. It was outlined this particular session would specifically focus on the Gallantry Award with the aim to increase the number of Gallantry nominations received from forces. During the session the following points were discussed:

- Gallantry awards are earned by people who have demonstrated bravery in the face of a high risk to their own life in order to save the life of another.
- Four levels of formal gallantry awarded, these are; Level 1 - The George Cross, heroism or of the most conspicuous courage in circumstances of extreme danger, Level 2 - The George Medal - granted for gallantry of a high order, Level 3 - The King's Gallantry Medal - granted for gallantry of a high order, Level 4 - The King's Commendation for Bravery - granted for gallantry not up to the foregoing standards but entailing risk to life and meriting national recognition.
- The Home Office, Cabinet Office and George Cross Committee believe that too few officers and staff are being nominated for gallantry awards.
- Asked for Chief Officers to proactively drive up the number of contacts with the Home Office, disseminate the message within their forces that leaders should be considering gallantry and for Chiefs to personally support cases when they are formally submitted.
- The Home Office agreed to provide feedback on nominations and also contact forces when they become aware of cases warranting consideration.

The Home Office lead provided illustrative examples and highlighted the following key points:

- Individual variables play a role in awarding this includes a person's knowledge, skills abilities, training and the requirement of their role.
- Their specific role in the incident needs to be described and include what active steps they took and what they had no control over.
- The relative risk to life needs to be included, for example, how much danger they were in and how aware they were of the danger.
- Detail in the nomination is very important.
- Above all the George Cross Committee have to uphold the prestige of the gallantry system by ensuring only the most deserving are awarded at every level based on precedent where they exist.

Decision: Chiefs supported the following: (1) to take steps within their force to proactively drive up the number of contacts with the Home Office regarding potential gallantry awards, (2) to disseminate the message within their forces that leaders should be considering gallantry when they believe members of their team have exhibited bravery; and (3) personally support cases when they are formally submitted. Chiefs noted that the Home Office will (1) provide feedback and steers on contact from forces; and (2) Contact forces when we become aware of cases warranting consideration.

Action: Illustrative examples and contact points will be shared with all chiefs to use.

Session 3 – Op Navette

CC BJ Harrington introduced the session and the update with a thanks for all involved with the policing of Op Navette for their hard work and support – it had been a real team effort across the policing landscape. CC Harrington stressed that Op Navette had been a success and had seen policing, and its response move from ‘peace keeping to war fighting’ within a very short space of time - officers and staff had risen to this challenge and this message would be reiterated during conversations with HMG and HMICFRS.

CC Harrington provided an overview of Op Navette and the following areas were covered during the update:

- Overview of how the violent disorder commenced and the timeline of the response
- Summary of the scale of the disorder seen in 72 towns and cities across the UK with 1280 arrested (as at 30 August) and 796 charged
- Overview of the policing response – responding to spontaneous disorder at speed with limited notice, the role of national coordinating Gold supported by NPoCC and regional mobilisation leads, over 40,000 shifts worked with significant deployments of public order and specialist resources
- Engagement with and quick support from CPS allowing rapid placement of offenders before the courts
- A breakdown of the resources that were deployed including strategic reserve and mobilisation over the 18 days of deployment
- Summary of the structure and coordination of the mobilisation plan and support from across a variety of areas including intelligence, corporate support including finance, Oscar Kilo and staff association support
- How the offenders involved were identified
- Summary of some of the challenges and successes; NPoCC, mobilisation plans and preparation were successful, forces and regions working together, clear reporting to COBR, no uniform or kit issues, public order tactics worked with a range of experience, national coordination role was devised and clear, robust media reporting
- Next steps – how does this shape the future policing of disorder; ongoing HMICRS review, internal debrief commenced with the College of Policing, NPoCC revised mobilisation plan drafted (introduction of tier 4) and for discussion scheduled at Council in Spring 2025

CC Harrington concluded that this operation had been an exceptional response by exceptional people across policing and CC Bacon was now leading on progression of community cohesion work. The disorder had been neutralised within a week with good mobilisation by criminal justice and investigators and whilst there will be learning to identify and share, this was an overall success and CC Harrington reiterated his thanks to all those involved.

Chief Constables thanked CC Harrington and others for the leadership and support provided and commented on the following:

- A key issue had been the tipping point where police can use the required level support and this is supported by the public, CPS charge offenders quickly and the courts dispense robust sentences
- Need to be able to brigade resources in regions ready to deploy quickly
- **CLOSED**
- Great effort by both central and force communication teams and work is ongoing within the Communications Advisory Group to address dis-information and its impact in this space

- **CLOSED**

- Financial benefits resulting from the letter of comfort and the need to see 100% level of recovery – the importance of this must be stressed to HMG

CC Rachel Bacon provided an overview of recovery and cohesion activity to address the long lasting impact resulting from the disorder. CC Bacon advised there was work ongoing to look at sustainable recovery for communities and the following areas were highlighted:

- **CLOSED**

- Will ensure there is complete transparency to feedback into HMICFRS rapid review and identify areas of learning including some slippage of recommendations which arose from the 2011 riots which included a lack of cohesive structures within partner organisations

- **CLOSED**

- Communications and stakeholder engagement is still very active
- Anticipation of the development of a national community cohesion strategy led by the Deputy Prime Ministers' office
- Best practice arising from a neighbourhood level has been shared – need to continue community engagement
- Forces need to continue to record all costs incurred related to Op Navatte – update provided on the recovery fund for a set number of local authorities
- Ongoing work with Police Federation and Superintendents Association to ensure appropriate levels of support are provided to staff
- Update on the updated arrests, offence and charge figures and also a summary of facial recognition data used during Op Navatte
- Update on the next steps including identifying gap areas, continuing to improve the assessment of community tensions, supporting force ongoing investigations and finance reporting for force cost recovery

CC Bacon summarised that the intention was to continue with Op Navatte Recovery and Cohesion Gold Groups meetings with a decreased regularity of gold meetings with the long term aim of moving into business as usual and to consider the outcome of the reviews and debrief processes. CC Bacon advised that quarterly updates would be brought to future Council meetings.

- **CLOSED**

- **CLOSED**

Gavin Stephens referenced the statement made to parliament following the disorder and some of the

commentary made since. CC Stephens advised that HMG were very impressed and grateful for the policing response to the disorder and conversations were ongoing around ensuring the appropriate reward and recognition for forces and officers. It had been recognised there were some capabilities that would have made the response easier and improvement was needed to strengthen those capabilities as well as the need to improve data gathering and reporting.

Decisions:

- Chiefs noted the following next steps: (1) HMIC commissioned by Home Secretary to provide a report (awaiting initial findings letter) Deeper dive inspection to follow. (2) Internal debrief process has commenced with College of Policing – Lessons learnt – discussions from CCC will form part of this, (3) NPoCC revised mobilisation plan drafted – will come to CCC in spring 25, (4) clarification around Tier 4 and the role of National Coordination Gold terms of reference, (5) government backed National Violent Disorder Programme – How will this look and future updates to come back to CCC.
- Chiefs supported the recommendations as follows: (1) keep continuation of Op Navette Recovery and Cohesion Gold under review, (2) Community Insight, Cohesion, Investigation, Finance and Debrief strands to pass into business as usual (BAU), (3) be co-ordinated through NPCC Local Policing Coordination Committee (LPCC) via existing NPCC Committee structures and (4) LPCC report into CCC on a quarterly basis.

No actions recorded.

Session 4 – New Government Reflections and Police Reform

Chief Constable Chair discussed the long term goals, despite the immediate short term financial pressures. The focus is what sort of policing model is needed for the future safety and security of the UK over the coming years? Chief Constable Chair gave an overview of the timeline of police reform discussions over the last year, a summary of government discussions amongst the operational pressures and an international case study which entered into a programme of reform and what the model system looks like 20 years on.

The current UK fundamental underpinning infrastructure is from the Royal Commission of 1960 to 1962. Policing is finding it increasingly difficult to keep the system afloat financially and develop the sort of capabilities needed, consistency to keep pace both with the criminal and socioeconomic changes, and the fast moving pace of technology, such as facial recognition. There is a pipeline of available technology in track which policing needs to assess how to adopt for the benefit of local communities or not and examine a more effective way in doing that.

Section 22 collaboration agreements have not been successful in getting the sort of cooperation and collaboration across the policing system that is needed. The intentions of the reforms more than 20 years old, have not fully been realised. There's intense pressure to try and keep the system afloat, and many Chiefs, staff and officers are effectively doing two or three jobs at the same time with chairing, coordinating and running large national portfolios with limited support and funding.

The Chair highlighted that the missions that the government have set out are hugely ambitious and stretching. Some of these missions will be very difficult without significant reform to how policing works across government with other departments and the buy in from other sectors. Additional care and attention could be given to local communities if policing could free up some of the new capabilities required.

Areas for discussion at the round table with government included the following five components:

1. There needs to be a stronger national centre to enable policing to succeed and has the durability to make the UK a safer place as a consequence of the reforms.
2. Refresh the work produced on capabilities to more clearly understand what is best delivered nationally and at a regional level and what needs to be protected at the local level.
3. Local policing needs; how it is changing and increasingly becoming interconnected with global threats. What specialisms need to be kept at a very local level and the governance.
4. A reform of police funding. It's not working for policing in England and Wales, the challenges in Northern Ireland and Scotland. There needs to be a fresh look at how the funding works and a cost to create some of the capabilities that everyone can all benefit from.
5. The current governance and decision making model needs to be reviewed as there is government appetite to enter into a programme of reform.

Chief Constable Chair sets out what is possible using Norway as an example. Norway's drivers were similar with the same set of challenges UK policing faces. Norway were not able to keep pace with the new sort of threats and challenges and thought the system was disparate in terms of development of capabilities. Norway set out some clear objectives and benefits in 2001 and 2016 reforms. Their training, kit and equipment is the same. Job roles, pay structures, departmental names and organisations are all the same in each of the districts, so policing is smooth and seamless compared to prior because they're operating on consistent systems. Due to system reforms and changes to the governance and decision making, Norway now have a higher level of performance as their policing protocol changed completely.

The state of policing reports set out the shortfall in performance challenges and expectations that everyone is struggling with resource and finance allocation. There is a huge ambition set over the next 10 years that's going to make significant inroads and UK policing has been set to be the most trusted and engaged service in the world by 2030.

Chiefs agreed many positives about the existing system, but it doesn't serve as well in other ways.

Questions were posed about what within the existing system should not be lost? What elements should remain separate? Answers included operational independence, local delivery, neighbourhood policing, local accountability, creativity and innovation, connection to local services, communities and partnerships, quality.

The financial allocation formula under the existing governance Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC) model is to distribute everything out locally and then negotiate it back to the centre. The second is from a Home Office grant agreement negotiated centrally. When local forces give back money to the centre, it is given to the Metropolitan Police because the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) is not under any legal status and the Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) continue to inherit risk on behalf of UK policing because there isn't a central repository for these activities.

The next question examined the risks and/or tensions in this work. The chair set the scene about standard setting if policing is going to create a stronger national centre. Who gets to decide on what the standards are rather than whether they're developed? Another tension included local force size, resilience and capability. In the current model, some forces are struggling financially because of their physical size which matches the size of the budget. There are bigger forces that maybe have more resilience than smaller forces. Chiefs want to make sure the development reform covers something for every force fairly and all forces gain in terms of capability and development.

Answers included Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), local needs, funding, politics, consistency, police staff retention, loss of victim focus, how long change will take, loss of local voice, mayoral devolution, focus only on cities, force restructures, who defines best practice, flexibility across the

system, worsening performance.

The last question posed the conditions for success. Answers included fair funding, consultation, collaboration, clear measures of success, cohesion of coordination, regional representation, right governance, all having a voice, transparency, root cause analysis of the problem, involving communities, local engagement, no bias against bigger forces, political consensus, evidence based, clear vision and trust.

Chiefs agreed to focus on regional forums to keep forces engaged because of the quick pace of change. The regional groups offer more time for debate and will allow for a stronger voice with input from Superintendent and Assistant Chief Constable (ACC) ranks who will inherit the system.

Chiefs are supportive of progress. It is suggested that decisions will be taken by system leaders, but this has not been defined and Chiefs would rather avoid a two-tier decision-making system. Chiefs agreed there will always be disagreements, so it will be difficult to produce a consistent system of agreement everyone will commit to. But accepted there is an element of personal risk for the lead of this work. Chiefs recommended external non-policing support and a range of voices, not just corporates but a challenge panel including international perspective as many nations have already been through this change. A history lessons learned panel would also be useful to assess why certain things did not work in the past. Reform will need to be supported by all partners to ensure success.

Chiefs discussed the need to reform the PCC model structure, devolution process which need to take into consideration the funding. Chiefs were clear about no reform on a shoestring for this huge piece of work which cannot be rushed and needs to consider the local element and all views. It needs proper parliamentary commitment, and a successful Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) bid with a clear mission. Chiefs were keen on not tackling everything and designing clear protocol for what policing does. Funding needs to be considered for now as well as the needs of the future.

Chiefs discussed being bold and much has been excluded already from government which constrains progress and thinking. Genuine proposals for change and reform affecting future generations go further than basic improvements and must be radical. Chiefs agreed to generate something that will genuinely work regardless of existing constraints to make progress for reform despite the difficulty of implementing them from a political perspective. The consultation will assist with a clear goal of what is important. Anything designed on a flawed contemporary structure will not withstand suboptimal proposals and will not work. Chiefs agreed the governance must be reformed and a new national body should not be created just to brigade the existing services. Chiefs discussed national examples of Scotland and Northern Ireland. There has been a loss of 900 officers from local policing, so protections are needed. Some forces are trying to survive and recover.

Chiefs agreed the struggle for further funding, threat of survivability, managing massive portfolios and complexity of policing needs urgent reform. Chiefs agreed forces should be focused on what can only and best be delivered locally to improve public confidence. The national should focus on what should more efficiently and effectively be able to be provided nationally. Chiefs agreed it would be helpful to have some guiding principles to shape the conversation and achieve a stronger coordination centre with consistency around capabilities.

Actions and Decisions:

Decisions: Chiefs supported the development of the programme team and will form part of a joint team which will bring together the policing system, Home Office external advisers to design and deliver phases of work based on the discussions from the meeting. Next steps will include (1) looking for an existing chief officer (officer or staff) to lead and an expression of interest will be issued on ChiefsNet

imminently. (2) 2-3 individuals to provide immediate support to the chief officer (communications, government affairs and staff officer).

Session 5 – Digital, Data and Technology Coordination Committee (DDaTCC)

The DDaT session provided updates across three sectors of its presentation, covering the Delivery Landscape Reform Programme (DLRP) and the Centre for Data and Analytics in Policing (CDAP), respectively. The DDaT Coordination Committee (DDaTCC) Chair introduced the session and speakers before moving onto a (DDaTCC) overview and refresh of points made earlier this year during March's Chief Constables' Council (CCC) regarding the importance and purpose of DDaT.

DDaTCC

The Chair updated Chiefs on progress in DDaT with sub boards being reviewed, exemplifying how the National Technology Board review has saved over 300 Chief Information Officer days as well as other governance structures and efficiencies. There is further development of the Portfolio Assurance Group which provides oversight and assurance of the entire public safety portfolio. Chiefs were guaranteed that challenges were being raised on their behalf in this area. The need, commitment and reassurance for progress of DDaTCC was highlighted.

The Chair spoke on the challenges faced due to funding recently having been agreed with Police Digital Service (PDS) for further 6 months. Moreover, challenges with delivery issues show there is a need for Monthly Per Consumption and Capacity Expenditure (MPCE) (PDS) to deliver and the Law Enforcement Community Network (LECN) (Home Office) to be running at the same time. It is hoped the commission will then give the information for DDaT to make an informed judgement for cloud hosting within policing, it is agreed that haste is required to ensure the cloud platform is running to its fullest state. The importance of secure by design was emphasised as it cannot be challenged, there is assurance in terms of live services that become national systems. Concerns regarding inflexibility and capacity were noted. It was raised there is an increase in National Senior Information Risk Owner (NSIRO) work as NSIRO now signs off on all medium risk work for critical national infrastructure.

Looking forward, it was presented there is a need for review of Emergency Service Mobile Communication Programme (ESMCP) and Specific Investigatory Measures (MLA) approaches, at current, they are unaffordable and unsustainable. This was raised with the commission board wherein it was recognised and agreed, there is scope for reviewing the arrangements. It will be beneficial to establish NPCC DDaT with support from the Home Office for DDaT sustainability; Home Office colleagues have provided positive feedback regarding discussions for the possibility of DDaT sustainability. This is in addition to the demand for engagement in police reform discussions for DDaT; to ensure DDaT's active contribution on behalf of Chiefs and their wants.

The Chair summarised by promising Chiefs that DDaT will continue to move forward with the points outlined and assured the important and requirement for reforming this area of policing.

Decision: (DDaTCC) - Chiefs noted and supported the next steps of work as follows: (1) Finalise DDaTCC Review – OCIP / CDAP, (2) build PAG portfolio governance and establish Live Services Board, (3) implementation of National Prioritisation Model for DDaT, (4) review MTA / MLE approaches with Home Office, (5) establish NPCC DDaT Office with Home Office support and (6) engage in policing reform for DDaT for future updates to chiefs at CCC.

DLRP

The lead gave Chiefs overview on how the DLRP strategy with the MLA review has outlined the need to bring all police IT back under the control and ownership of the sector, which lead to DLRP being set up. It was stressed how important the lack of control, as well as other areas such as performance directions and development of the systems, is. With calls for change moving forward; noting full support for

DDaTCC previously outlined reform vision.

Setting out the aims of DLRP, phase one would be to enact due diligence work on all live IT systems to transitioning them to the sector. Once completed, DLRP would be in a position to have current programmes under development to go live, resulting in all IT being under sector control through PDS by 2027. Phase one is due to end in December this year, allowing to start transitions in Q1 of 2025.

The lead continued to inform Chiefs that due diligence discovered several systems were not fit to transition. These systems have been removed from DLRP and placed into business-as-usual process for replacement. Chiefs were assured that there is continuous liaison with PDS, commission board, and DLRP. Where transition was suitable, DLRP has been paused to align with the new target outlined within the police reform discussion. It is anticipated systems will transition in bigger quantity instead of the drip feed that was in the DLRP plan; reassuring the same overall timeline will be kept. The DLRP scope will be incorporated into the new programme, discovery is due to take place across police programmes and national capabilities to establish risk and opportunities before transitioning systems to a new national body. The DLRP update was finalised with confidence that, although DLRP is paused, work will continue under police reform with a similar timeframe; further updates will continue to be provided to Chiefs during this programme.

Finding some technical assessments have been taking place, Chiefs questioned whether these systems presently run by the Home Office are fit to be returned back to policing. Chiefs also raised queries on if there is funding available that could be redirected if control and ownership is regained. In response, it was confirmed efforts are underway to look into finances in an attempt to improve within this process, noting current issues with unsighted work, isolation and lack of transparency. Calls for better access and control over funds was agreeable by Chiefs.

Decision: (DLRP) - Chiefs noted the update on phase 1 due diligence work and DLRP transition activity has been officially paused. Future communications regarding the work will be circulated on ChiefsNet.

CDAP

The CDAP presentation began by stating the need for cultural change within the sector and the change required from Chiefs in terms of investment. A collective agreement on what is desired and how Chiefs wish to receive access to information. The lead mentioned the problem of unsustainable funding for long term capabilities. The current way of operating the data and analytics service is limited, for some ineffective, as there is disagreement around what is wanted at local and national level. Chiefs were warned that national data is starting to present a risk to forces who rely on national datasets to make statements on performance and deliver national enterprise. Recommendations were made to build on learning through CDAP for a national system, to create an enterprise capability that can deliver service and products coherently and consistently to this sector; not having this capability creates risk. The lead underlined the need for a national capability with sustainability and professionalism.

CDAP's aim was outlined for a central capability that assists operational policing, improving productivity and efficiency. There is strong encouragement for innovation at a local level and skill development within data maturity and literacy (developed alongside the College of Policing). CDAP aim to reconfirm Chiefs' commitment to further development and sustainment of this capability as technology and innovation for national policing serve the central mission. The need for long term budgeting and prioritisation was reemphasised. It was put to Chiefs' that CDAP intends to come back to them with a business plan, however, CDAP must know if Chiefs will support the concept that has been presented to them for a central capability. In addition, the lead queried if Chiefs are going to accept an Artificial Intelligence (AI) strategy, they must be prepared to invest in a capability which can get the sector's data to where it needs to be for this strategy. It was recognised that there is support amongst Chiefs for what has been outlined above.

Chiefs questioned using the Home Office's need for a national performance framework to procure funding to accelerate the CDAP proposal. In response, the lead confirmed there is ability to service the national performance framework from a data service in a national capability environment, and there could be an opportunity to raise within the Home Office for funding a 'once and well' capability model. A further point agreed by Chiefs was that when a business case is progressed, they want to understand if money is being spent wisely on future ambition. They are looking to realign and reorganise to an effective process with increased transparency.

It was observed by Chiefs that it would be a disadvantage if forces did not work in unison on this capability to invest in development. There were calls to identify the point where we can stop investment and focus locally or rebalance, so proportions are greater than what is being done locally. DDaTCC and CDAP agreed to take a question to the board regarding sending out advice and guidance to forces to support in their development.

Decision: (CDAP) - Chiefs supported the following in principle: (1) Use CDAP as the gateway, and framework for the procurement of future funding, to drive tech, data and analytical capabilities across key areas of national policing focus. (2) to engage with the trialling of tools, locally. (3) to adopt a 'once and well' mindset and (4) supported the development of the Business Case back to a future CCC meeting based on the discussions from the meeting and direction of travel.

Action: (CDAP) Advice and guidance for principles to forces to be sent out.

Session 6 – AI Strategy

Chief started the section by discussing about AI's broad spectrum, from advanced technology to robotic process automation and emphasized the need for processing power, data, algorithms, and human interpretation for effective AI.

Chief outlined the NPCC's approach to AI, categorizing initiatives into productivity, effectiveness, and countering criminal threats. In productivity, the focus is on innovation and providing guidance for AI use in policing. For effectiveness, there's consideration of a centralized AI laboratory and national capabilities. In countering criminal threats, efforts include deepfake detection and collaboration with tech companies, highlighting challenges in legally testing AI models and the need for guidance from the AI Safety Institute. Chief also mentioned about ongoing work on criminal legislation and ethical AI use, including a checklist for Chief Constables.

Next, Chief emphasized the importance of transparency in AI data and model training, the provenance and use of synthetic data, and measures of accuracy. Chief also highlighted the work of the West Midlands Ethics Committee and the need for evaluation in the effectiveness space, particularly in forecasting. Chief cautioned against models claiming 100% accuracy and stressed the importance of understanding false positives and negatives, using an example of predicting criminal behaviour. Chief explained that high false positives can waste resources, and precision is crucial.

Next, Chief highlighted the need for a comprehensive evaluation process, similar to clinical science, involving model testing, assessment, and real-world trials. Chief mentioned ongoing efforts to produce guidance for engaging with tech companies and stressed the value of data. Chief also showcased innovative AI applications in various police forces, such as RPA, call handling, and crime detection.

Chief emphasized the need to build a system that identifies problems and integrates innovation across the committee portfolio. Highlight the importance of prioritizing and rolling out initiatives collectively to maximize benefits, the potential role of the centre for productivity in supporting these efforts.

Next, Chief acknowledged that top-down IT projects were not always successful, but also emphasized the

importance of transparent, and well-evaluated initiatives. Chief expressed the need for rapid and authentic implementation of innovations, such as AI-generated crime reports, the importance of the centre for police productivity in supporting these efforts as well as the important of alignment with policing threats and productivity improvements.

Chief suggested a framework to avoid duplicating efforts across forces and to address key problem statements rather than reacting passively to market approaches. Chief emphasized the importance of balancing innovation with effectiveness, particularly in offender management and AI use cases, highlighting the need for local data training and a blueprint set by the college.

Furthermore, the National Science Innovation Board's audits were discussed, including one on violence against women and girls, and the challenge of deciding which innovations to implement nationally. Chief stressed the importance of aligning innovations with strategic priorities and ensuring they are tested, evaluated, and kitemarked. Chief also highlighted the complexity of delivering national projects and suggested that not all projects are complex as some require procurement and understanding of skills gaps.

Lastly, Chiefs discussed instances where lower-ranking officers independently purchased AI applications to ease their tasks, emphasizing the critical need to know where data is stored to avoid "black box" issues and data protection concerns. Chief stressed involving the Chief Information Officer and digital services in procurement processes to ensure data security.

Decisions: Chiefs noted and provided feedback on the outlined strategy and key updates for consultation. Chiefs provided feedback on the approach we would take to AI, areas for focus, how the portfolio is governed and key deliverables.

Action: Actions of future circulations to all chiefs as follows (1) engagement with AI tech companies via Bluelight commercial will be circulated and placed on ChiefsNet. (2) Responsible AI checklist to be circulated and how to use this. (3) Documentation on the use from the ethics committee to be circulated.

Session 7 – Aviation Portfolio

The session was led by Assistant Commissioner Laurence Taylor and focused on the future of NPCC Aviation support, what it could look like and gave his rationale for the requesting of a small team to help coordinate the activity, align with suitable partners and build better collaboration across the state aircraft system and beyond.

He highlighted that there are real challenges, not least the age of the fleet, which will require flexible and agile thinking to respond to the local and operating context in a cost efficient and effective way, including the capabilities that future technologies will bring to aerial support. Furthermore, he wanted to offer choices on how best to service local need based on risk appetite, budgetary constraints and other factors.

Slides were shown and the following points are in addition to those discussed in the slides:

He showed a slide on the current situation and mentioned that although the West Yorkshire Combined Authority wished to surrender the lead force status, as the idea to set up a Public Limited Body to run NPAS was voted against at the National Strategic Board, they will still continue to hold it but review what it looks like going forward beyond the idea of like for like replacement. Currently, 75% of support is delivered by traditional aircraft and 25% by drone. In 5 to 10 years time this will reverse and 75% will be by drone and 25% by aircraft but the demand and capability could be increased to far more that will enhance issues like officer safety, more efficient deployments and increase operational capability on

the ground.

The next slide shown was about the current challenges and risks and emphasised the need to engage with other bodies including the emergency services, military and government agencies to ensure that development is not duplicated by working in isolation.

Slide five of the presentation showed the work currently being done on NPAS Transformation and Transition. It detailed that it was currently at Stage 4 with the Transformation Business Case having been submitted to the National Strategic Board in September 2024, with the agreement being that work needs to be done to look at the future size, scale and capabilities of NPAS across 'traditional' aviation and aligning that with the other work to inform the transition model going forward.

Slide six detailed the trial near the River Severn of the large platform, rotary winged, unmanned aircraft, identified to replace helicopters. These are particularly useful in rural areas.

The following slide detailed the work done so far on drones and it was pointed out that NPAS drones fly as state aircraft and, therefore, are not subject to CAA regulations. As a result, we will be working closely with the CAA to ensure that they are satisfied with our safety capabilities, training records and other systems around drones so we do not pose a risk to other people and airspace users. This is because the 'State Aircraft' status can be removed quite easily, which would ground the fleet.

The suggested future governance model was detailed in the next slide with the suggestion to site everything under a single Aviation Board with particular emphasis on the Future Technologies Board where the building of a full data platform could present real cost benefits.

A slide on the future NPCC Aviation Roadmap was shown but there were no additional points and that tied into the next slide on the possible future milestones. Again, there were no additional points.

The last five slides of the presentation contained information over the possible achievements both in the service and the capability of drones, had an example of what better drone deployment could offer and a look to the ambition of offering 24/7 coverage by using a blended mix comprising drones, airships, satellite technology etc.

He concluded the presentation by stating that a strategy was needed and that the first draught papers for this will be prepared in the next two months that will then be shared for consultation. This will not contain a request for money to fund the strategy, which has been covered elsewhere. It will, however, highlight that, in order to collaborate, coordinate and bring about the best outcomes for policing to maximise our ability, a small team will be required with the capability to analyse the effect that we're delivering.

The session was then opened for questions and comments.

A Chief Officer asked whether the £1.7 million set aside for innovation work has been confirmed? AC Taylor answered that it hadn't been with only the funding approved for 25/26 but it's not clear if will continue beyond that. Conversations have been had with the Home Office and are continuing on whether drones will continue to be a priority or if they want to look at broader AI automation. This prompted a comment from the Chief Officer that this will need to be considered as a high priority in the spending review.

CLOSED

A Chief Officer detailed that the Transformation Board had voted in favour of the move to the future Aviation Board model that will reduce the influence of the PCCs, which has not been helpful at times, but which will still involve them. They also raised the point of fleet replacement and the associated

costs. AC Taylor gave further information about the vote and then stated, with reference to fleet replacement, that we are at a point where we can go out to tender for between 7 to 12 new aircraft as, at present, drones are not the answer, although they may be in the future.

Another Chief Officer stated their opinion that the money needs to be transferred to future development rather than fleet replacement and that they would be prepared to lose short-term capability to develop more quickly in the medium term. This would mean, therefore, accepting less money from the Home Office now to allow for the development. They then wondered whether this was a help or a hindrance. AC Taylor replied that it is a fine balance in that it helps NPAS think about what capability and level of service is required if we invested in the future but presents a risk to the infrastructure required to fly the aircraft and its sustainability if funding were decreased in the present. This was supported by a number of Chief Officers, however, as an opposing view, a Deputy Chief Officer stated that fleet replacement is still very important.

Blue Light Commercial's representative then explained the framework for tenders. A decision could be made to order a number of aircraft now at a guaranteed price for six months or batch it depending on the requirements that come out of the strategy with the knowledge that the second or third batches could be more expensive. The various options will be worked through and then go back to the Board for decision. They then highlighted that, as foreign technology is very involved in drones, who we get drones from and how needs to be placed on the Risk Register.

A Chief Officer then asked that, as their force is more rural, meaning they are less involved in items like pursuit and more into missing person, whether we could work together with the Coast Guard, for example, to increase efficiency in terms of capability and fleet. AC Taylor agreed with this.

A Chief Officer made the point that, as big government contracts come up for renewal for aviation, the NPCC should look to potentially try to partner with involved agencies to try and release efficiencies, cost reductions and improve efficiency. They further agreed with the plan to go big on strategy and look at things like satellite technology and keeping the UK safe from the air, which may also bring in other partners through necessity.

A Chief Officer asked for clarity on the outcomes for the future investment they are being asked to make in drones, particularly as it doesn't align with emerging crimes like fraud, online crime, VAWG etc., and how this is balanced with Value for Money. However, there were broadly in favour of the investment but needed its proportionality measured against other necessary investments across the service. AC Taylor replied that what he is asking for is to develop and build the business case that shows investment against capability/efficiency. He stated that he believed that this is a real opportunity to improve the efficiency of what is delivered on the ground through proper aerial support and the benefit it will bring to policing by covering things like:

- keeping officers safe
- firearms operations for containment
- building searches
- searching at height
- covert capabilities

Following the discussions, a Chief Officer asked what information they are allowed to share with PCCs to which AC Taylor stated he was happy to share any of the information given today or other

information if it was felt that it would help conversations, and all they need do is to contact him.

AC Taylor concluded the session by stating that this is a real opportunity to take stock and then think about the longer term and be really open minded about future capability. He stressed it would not be straightforward as it is a complex area that involves a lot of partners, particularly the CAA, so it would need to be done properly and professionally with the outcome that stresses the belief that we can deliver this safely, competently and with full operational ability in the future.

AC Taylor then asked the Chair to confirm the next steps. He confirmed that he has secured funding for the consultancy piece but does not have the team to support strategy and implementation over the next two years. The Chair addressed the Chief Officer in charge of the Finance Committee, CC Paul Sanford, to refresh the financial papers with this through Finance Committee. CC Sanford asked how much this would be for 25/26 and beyond and the figure was given as £346,501 but there was some flexibility. CC Sanford stated that there is no room in the operating budget for this, so asked forces to provide an NRE share of this. He stated that this would need to be decided now as he did not believe it would happen in CSR Phase One. It can absolutely form part of the Phase Two submission but this can be worked on in future. The Chair agreed with this and stated that, unless any dissent is made to this approach, this figure would be incorporated into the final budget conversations to be held later.

The session was then ended.

Action: Information from briefing to help engagement with Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) to be sent to chiefs following discussion.

Action: Update following tenders due next week will be shared with all chiefs.

Decision: Funding decision taken in session 11 under national operating budget for Oct 24 to March 25 period.

Decision: Chiefs noted the development of the strategy which will be shared for future consultation.

Decision: Draft Authorised Professional Practice (APP) Aviation will be released for consultation in December for feedback from Chiefs.

Session 8 – Crime Coordination Committee

AC Louisa Rolfe introduced the session and provided an overview of the key areas that would be covered during the National Crime Coordination session. AC Rolfe advised that an update had been sent out via Chiefs Net following recent government announcements around violence against women and girls; AC Rolfe advised that there was not much movement on the 'whats' as these were manifesto commitments but there was room for discussion on the 'how' and engagement was ongoing with HMG around the detail of the VAWG manifesto commitments and areas of feasibility etc.

Violence against Women and Girls - (VAWG) - Workshops planned with forces in October to engage on key deliverables with key reps.

Action: (VAWG) - Workshops planned with forces in October to engage on key deliverables with key reps.

TOEX

Ian Critchley advised that he would provide a short update on TOEX, Hydrant and the national centre. Ian Critchley referenced the supporting paper that had been shared which provided an update on the issues of hosting, governance and funding of TOEX. Ian provided an overview of issues around hosting and provided a summary of some of the considerations that had been considered with the

recommendation that TOEX moves across from Norfolk into the NPCC Hub subject to the initial move of Op Hydrant. Governance had been considered and the national intelligence portfolio was the preferred option as TOEX is predominately an intelligence function. The bulk of funding for TOEX comes from the Home Office and a comfort letter had been provided in relation to the Home Office Grant for 2025/26 which covers the majority of the central team and some of the staff that sit within the regions. Ian provided a summary of the risks, opportunities and next steps.

Ian Critchley provided an update on Op Hydrant (which impacts on TOEX) which is fully funded by the Home Office and has morphed from originally coming in to tackle the response to 'Saville' and helps provide support through ICSA and is now a CSE taskforce to support forces particularly with some high-profile group-based offences. Norfolk continues to host HR and Finance support, and South Yorkshire enable the data requirements of the programme. There is a recommendation to move Op Hydrant into the NPCC Hub. A comfort letter was anticipated in the coming weeks in relation to Op Hydrant.

Ian Critchley provided an update on the national centre for VAWG and Public Protection (NC4VPP) and advised a more detailed update was due to at December's council. This work built on the work of Op Soteria and the VAWG Taskforce and the VKPP. Work was currently at the high-level stage in terms of deliverables and business cases were being developed for submission to the Home Office around funding. Workshops were planned to engage forces, partners and staff within the programmes to develop the key deliverables and build.

Chief Constables commented on funding, the professionalisation of staff and the choices that will have to be made in these areas. It was recognised the scale of work was vast and policing needs one coherent voice that sets out the challenge, the ask of stakeholders and how to corral funding into one central place. The grant landscape was recognised to be very fragmented but if this work is brought together consistently it will provide a stronger strategic voice and will show the overlap between capabilities, bring together learning of op soteria and provide a strategic centre that is helpful to forces. The need for commissioning services to be held to account was raised so as to provide value for money and doing an activity once and not repeating this across forces and reducing fragmentation. AC Rolfe provided an update on the related super complaint and how a consistent voice across policing would be beneficial. The benefits of bringing in the CPS was raised to focus on perpetrators as well as engagement with HMICFRS on what an appropriate response looks like that considers the complexity of VAWG.

Decisions:

(TOEX) - Chiefs accepted the recommendations in the paper as follows: (1) The NPCC is recommended as the most suitable host for TOEX National Resources, given its existing infrastructure and strategic alignment. (2) Governance should be consolidated under the Intelligence Portfolio to ensure coherent oversight and strategic direction of both the intelligence and data analytics function and (3) there will be a close alignment to the developing capability of the National Centre for Public Protection as intelligence developments around Tackling VAWG are considered. Following this the 3-month project on the development proposal for scope of transition.

(Op Hydrant) - Chiefs accepted the next steps as follows: (1) supported the progression at Crime Committee and NPCC Change Board subject to Home Office funding & data requirements. (2) Following discussion at the meeting the team will commence key actions as noted and (3) chiefs noted the ambition will be to complete transition by the end of March 2025.

Inquiries of National Significance

AC Rolfe advised that phase two of this work was underway with a mapping process of the actual resourcing impact on forces of significant inquiries including the financial impact. A coherent assessment of all large scale inquiries would be brought to Decembers' Council so that policing can provide the Home Office with a better understanding when special grant requests are submitted and come up with an assessment process prior to the launch of a criminal investigation in the case of public inquiries whereby

large scale inquiries are affecting multiple force areas helping policing to identify key stakeholders, ownership, funding and methods of scaling up. AC Rolfe commented that forces were seeing an increased amount of specialist resources investigating events of history as opposed to dealing with criminal offences of today.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update on phase 2 work underway mapping the financial and capacity impact on forces for coherent assessment of all large scale assessment processes for inquiries affecting multiple force areas. This will be presented for a large session to all chiefs at the December CCC meeting.

Dynamic Decision Case Management System

CC Tim Smith introduced the item and provided an update on queries that were raised at the last Council meeting and updated on work to deconflict concerns raised by Chiefs around the potential for duplication with work that is ongoing within the DDaT space. Following work that had been undertaken to review the systems; this had provided assurance that the systems were complimentary and not conflicting. CC Smith provided an update on the current position with DDaCs and the following areas were highlighted:

- The procurement process was complete and the project was on schedule
- Over 700 subject matter experts were in place across policing and the plan is that the system will enable high risk investigations to move between local, regional, **CLOSED** and the CT network
- An update on costs was provided and it was noted that costs had been reduced in comparison with the costs associated with running legacy systems. DDaCs will provide greater efficiency and effectiveness and a request was made to continue with project costs for the rest of the financial year
- Positive engagement continues across policing with the predominant focus on SOC and linking in with the DDaT landscape
- An overview of affordability and costs including requests for supporting data from forces to understand spend on legacy systems so as to show force savings more accurately
- Overview of next 6 months activity including inclusion in the SOC technological roadmap and wider SME capability demonstrations planned with force teams

CC Smith summarised the key asks of Chief Constables which were:

- Continue to support the project funding (as agreed at March CCC) for the rest of this financial year
- Provision to the project team of financial analysis of costs that are spent on legacy systems
- Some providers of legacy systems are seeking securing of their products – request for Chiefs to be cautious and not to agree any long term future provision of systems

Chief Constables noted the update and raised the following issues:

- Would be helpful to understand what the legacy systems are and what the best approach going forward for forces/regions
- DDaT Committee is supportive of proposals and Rob Carden updated on areas that PDS will be able to support regions on stakeholder confidence and development of a platform for delivery. The DDaT Committee can assist with identification of benefits

Actions:

- Project team to work with regions and forces to link in with their respective legacy systems assessments.
- Funding decision recorded under session 11 under the national operating budget.
- Wider SME capability demonstrations W/C 18 November feedback will come to CCC in December.
- Chiefs capability demo to come to CCC December meeting.
- **Decision:** (Dynamic Decision Case Management System - DDaCCs) Funding decision recorded under session 11 under the national operating budget.

- **Decision:** (Dynamic Decision Case Management System - DDaCCs) Wider SME capability demonstrations W/C 18 November feedback will come to CCC in December.
- **Decision:** (Dynamic Decision Case Management System - DDaCCs) Chiefs capability demo to come to CCC December meeting.

Drugs Strategy update

CC Richard Lewis provided a verbal update on the following issues:

Independent review of Drugs and HMG 10 Year Drug Strategy (Harm to Hope)

CC Lewis advised that a decision was awaited to understand if the Harm to Hope Drug Strategy would be maintained by the current government as this strategy had been developed the Conservative government. As yet a decision was awaited from Government on this and CC Lewis updated that he had written to the Minister to advise where the NPCC drugs portfolio could assist with meeting manifesto pledges including on drug crime, ASB and violence against women and girls. CC Lewis will provide a position paper on how policing can assist with drug related crime and what a strategy of the future may look like - engagement was ongoing with force drug leads to assist with the development of this paper.

Naloxone

CC Lewis advised that this was an issue the Minister was very interested in and CC Lewis has stressed that the deployment of this was an operational decision and one for Chief Constables to make in their individual forces. CC Lewis updated on research funding that had been obtained to look at the efficacy of the use of naloxone, how many lives had been saved and how can policing standardise the responses that are provided by officers when they use the drug to report on how effective this has been. CC Lewis also raised the issue around ensuring the safety of our staff when dealing with naloxone and instances of accidental ingestion etc.

Fast parcels and post

CLOSED

CLOSED

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Session 9 – Police Race Action Plan (PRAP)

The Chair gave an update on Senior responsible officer (SRO) perspective of PRAP and where National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) is currently with the action plan. The Programme Director of PRAP gave an overview of the progress made and the future work with choices on options for moving forward and the importance for continued investment in the national programme. The Independent Scrutiny Oversight Board (ISOB) lead gave an assessment of where progress still needs to be made.

The SRO position is that there is still a lot more to do and deliver and the PRAP plan needs lots of

attention which despite the united commitment in the aftermath of the murder George Floyd, there hasn't been enough momentum. There has been attrition of staff involved in the programme, the programme has not had the support and commitment to properly drive it forward. The last year has been a very intensive exercise to refresh the plan with a whole host of external and community consultation to make sure it properly reflects what black communities need. The chair's assessment is that the programme is not yet mature enough to move into business as usual (BAU) and the central resource should not be disbanded yet.

The Chair stressed that policing wants black victims of domestic abuse and exploitation to be confident in coming forward. Forces want black communities to look at policing and feel representation of their community, that UK policing understand their concerns which is not the case at the moment.

Some forces are making excellent progress but it's not replicated everywhere. The context forces are operating on is changing. There's a lack of consistency and a lack of insight and data. If policing is not able to close that gap in trust and confidence between white communities and black communities, then this will this strongly feature in the Safer Streets mission. The government gave a commitment to legislate on race equalities. There's been some early dialogue about what the benefits of that might be for policing and the communities. The blatant racism and violence over the summer will feature in government's work and there is interest from the current government on PRAP where there previously wasn't. Policing has never been held accountable but there may be more interest to do so now with the new makeup of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). The Chair proposed continued investment in the central capability to maintain momentum and is optimistic about progress and the commitment to become an anti-racist service.

The programme director gave an assessment that progress has been too slow, encountered key structural problems, lack of a clear plan around the delivery and what the priorities were. Although there had been some external engagement, this needed to be improved and was a key issue picked up by ISOB. The lacking engagement strategy led to very challenging relationships with both internal and external stakeholders. But in the last year, there has been a lot of development and a progress report has been published, and all vacancies in the core team have been filled excluding one. Forces have provided some excellent support and new skills in the short term attachments which have worked really well. Another piece of good work is the benchmarking process, noting the good work forces are doing and also work with the National Civil Society groups. There have been frank and positive discussions and the relationships with these groups are very fragile, but has been a benchmark for the programme director to identify exactly the direction of thinking and governance going forwards.

The programme director provided a high level summary of the key actions and activity that the plan has delivered to build trust and confidence at a national level. There have been visits to different forces to find out what local delivery looks like and has noted some key challenges. A significant amount of actions will need further work. The central team are keen to continue to support forces with their capacity to deliver on those actions, internal plans and delivery and the long term aspiration is an anti-racism commitment.

It was assessed that some forces are very embryonic in their plans and other forces have different strengths and areas for improvement which links with sharing best practices. The programme director and lead for ISOB gave some examples of forces that were not implementing local race action plans, didn't have the right governance structure in place, no resourcing, and were not producing any external communications or working constructively with staff associations to assist with this work, including little engagement with stakeholders. PRAP is keen to introduce different pilots into forces and provide the support with the College of Policing (COP) as well as embedding anti-racist practices. Areas of consideration are future governance and monitoring progress against the maturity matrix.

The huge risks around disbanding the central core team, include a loss of expertise and knowledge,

inconsistent delivery across different forces and different rates of maturity that could worsen without a central team. The programme director set out a three year funding plan to maintain the core team and there will be a gradual reduction in resource over the years. There are good opportunities to take forward with government especially with the Race equality bill, other partners and civil groups and an opportunity to make things better for black communities and build trust and confidence. There is a huge cost to the loss of trust which can be estimated in terms of decreased effectiveness in crime prevention. For example, intelligence from communities, reduced community safety. There is also a cost in terms of public protests and unrest. Events triggered by police racism can lead to significant policing costs and legal costs on lawsuits relating to racial discrimination.

The Chair of ISOB provided their assessment that the race action plan has finally started to hit its stride over the past year which is felt in terms of the dynamic of effective working relationships with the central team. Anti-racism work is really difficult because it's very attritional and is often about scoping, but the work is moving in the right direction and having a positive impact, so it would be a shame to lose the work and momentum if the central team is lost.

ISOB annual report highlighted three main recommendations around introducing tangible, measurable performance metrics, identifying really clear areas of focus and increasing engagement with external stakeholders. These three areas have been prioritised by PRAP in this short period of time. There have been a number of positive discussions with civil society organisations. ISOB recognised a much more strategic approach by PRAP so that recommendation around needing clear areas of focus, needing metrics is coming to fruition. There is progress in terms of an outcomes framework, an anti-racism charter, a dashboard and a maturity matrix. The work is being delivered and there is a much wider cohort of people now invested in PRAP.

The HMRCFRS report around activism highlighted some of the positive work and the potential in PRAP, but the action plan needs to be made inspectable. The legacy of the race action programme and long term strategy was raised and needs to be embedded in institutions and structures which are wider than policing. It needs responsibility and government recognition that if the PRAP is delivered, then it's a real positive for society.

ISOB stressed the need for Chiefs to have more consistent communication internally and externally with community engagement and outreach which is key for race action programmes to deliver both on national and local levels. There has been slow progress because there hasn't been a strong quality engagement until this point and there needs to be a more concerted effort within policing to drive this forward. ISOB is keen to continue with contributions to keep PRAP on track.

Chiefs supported good practice and having a strong central team co-ordinating and influencing the system even beyond policing and having local and national support for the challenging work. But chiefs discussed the focus on a long term strategy and embedding practices to deal with deep rooted change policing is trying to make. Chiefs acknowledged both the service and system has these inbuilt biases. But chiefs agreed the force visits from the central team were useful. One visit resulted in a big investment of resources for the size of the force and now has dedicated leadership in this space. Chiefs agreed having a national voice is helpful, and the ability to link into the civil society organisations and academics which is very hard to do locally. There was understanding that great progress has made after a slow start and it is a tough programme to deliver.

All chiefs agreed the programme director's leadership has moved things on and the benefits of the approach, but discussed the disadvantages of approving a three year plan for the following reasons:

- Funding is difficult at the moment, with many budgetary cuts and competing priorities. Therefore, funding needs to be proportionate to the forces financial position as policing is losing staff which is impactful on the front line.

- There needs to be a balance between central support and direction versus local freedoms to make impactful progress.
- There is not enough penetration at all levels in the organisation. Making improvements would inform local force response to PRAP if ever challenged or inspected.
- The commitment previously from last December was to fund the programme for another year and then to be able to exit the programme towards a mainstream strategy in a pragmatic and positive way that lay the foundations to deliver it locally.
- Chiefs accepted the advice that the programme is not ready to be withdrawn due to the maturity of the work and significant risk of sending a damaging message to black communities and losing trust. But that there needs to be other available options and a compromise, to see if the work can be done quicker.
- Chiefs were open to support an extension but shorter than three years and would consider a one year extension.
- Chiefs considered there being an opportunity for the Race, Religion and Belief portfolio to work a lot more closely with the PRAP team. There is an opportunity to start bridging the gap and examine the longer term plan of moving this work forwards into local force spaces.
- Some forces have strong local teams delivering a lot of work and question the benefit from the national team.
- There needs to be clear timescales, and clear parameters of delivery as well as a clear exit plan and how to move BAU to a local level. The challenge is also making a difference at street level locally.
- There was agreement that trust and confidence is rebuilt at a local level and not necessarily a national level.
- Forces should spend locally to deliver for the communities. It is helpful to have a standard and guidance from a national perspective.

Some chiefs strongly supported the continued funding for the central team and increased level of engagement and oversight by chiefs to support delivery of PRAP. Without this, PRAP will struggle with little achievement of delivery for the long term.

The COP lead supports the programme and expressed understanding of budgets but emphasised good progress around the role of COP in the outcomes framework, the anti-race commitment, training and updating the national curriculum to teach about the history and difficult relationship between black communities and policing, tackling racism. The lead agreed it was not the time to exit the programme, but there is a need for clarity around what can only and best be delivered locally. The government should hold chiefs accountable for delivery and also define what must efficiently and effectively be delivered centrally. Nationally there should be a central performance framework.

Actions and Decisions

- The Chair's final plea was for more support and encouragement at board level for the programme.
- Final budget setting takes place in December so the programme will provide a range of proportionate costing options for final sign off in December.
- Provide forces an option and understanding of quicker integration to local work, clear expectations locally. There isn't an inspection framework at the moment. There will be no visibility nationally as a system if some forces are choosing to deliver the local PRAP programme or not. So there needs to be a guarantee and commitment to local delivery.
- Provide an option for those forces who wish to contribute to central support of the programme. Services will only be available and provided to those who contribute and will provide advice and regional support.
- The Chair will seek individual force positions on the programme to develop a range of options.

- The Chair will re-examine the three year transition plan and explore the option of a shorter transition plan, an option around those that want to support the national team and how this would look.

Decision: (1) Programme to provide a range of costing options for December CCC. To include current 3 year plan and other shorter transition plans. (2) Provide option for those forces who wish to contribute to programme against those who don't - services will only be provided to those who contribute. (3) Provide option for quicker integration to forces locally. (4) NPCC Chair to seek individual force positions on the programme.

Session 10 – Right Care, Right Person

The lead started the RCRP session by updating Chiefs on the progress of RCRP, outlining that the majority of forces have now implemented some phases of RCRP, with a few forces having fully implemented, and a minority not having implemented at all. The RCRP project team continue to work and support forces who are struggling to set up RCRP due to issues such as local partnerships and funding. It was clarified there is a lot of work to be done to fully implement and imbed RCRP as business as usual, and highlighted the importance of ensuring RCRP is not undermined.

RCRP developed a national toolkit which is available for any force or partner to access and demonstrates the most suitable way to implement RCRP. Chiefs were reassured that the RCRP team have taken legal advice throughout this process and will continue to raise any further issues, saving time within force and maintaining the national approach. Local traction with partners was accredited to tactical delivery boards and frequent meetings with partners and stakeholders at a national level.

Further national engagement with governmental boards allows RCRP to address high priority issues at this level to prevent RCRP implementation being disrupted. The lead gave details of touchpoint meeting benefits which allow forces to discuss progress, challenges, and problem solve; providing insight to additional support required or issues to address nationally. Further support includes peer review and strategic briefings with Chief Officers.

Chiefs were provided updates from the recent landscape review and touchpoint meetings on the national picture of RCRP.

It was noted there is still significant work to be done and advised forces to take advantage of the national RCRP team whilst it is available. The lead shared that forces who have implemented the RCRP approach successfully have shown considerable impact on reducing the demand on resources and ensuring the right people are helping the most vulnerable. This session gave understanding on peer review which involves time spent with force leads, local partner leads, and staff visiting force control room. Peer review learning is added to the knowledge hub. Chiefs were briefed on RCRP and children with joint principles disseminated to forces and partners. It was clarified that the position remains that RCRP does apply to children, there is key focus on safeguarding, if forces are excluding children from RCRP they may not be applying the same level of risk assessment and consideration.

It was presented that the RCRP team are now working on the mental health Authorised Professional Practice (APP) ensuring approved practice reflects RCRP and is able to support decision making. Work is ongoing with the Independent Office for Police Conduct and His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services regarding inspection. The lead recognised there are considerations on how this may impact Chiefs/forces with adverse effect from policy. The RCRP evaluation report found significant improved partnership working using RCRP, this also applies further in other areas of working outside of RCRP. Additionally, Annual Data Requirement (ADR) statistics show a national reduction in section 136, this is expected to further decrease next year.

Data was presented on case studies from the Metropolitan Police Service and Norfolk Constabulary. Both forces showed a positive impact with fewer deployments and an increase in officer hours saved. Norfolk Constabulary highlighted frontline officers recognised the change, noting they felt valued, and were doing the job they were brought in to do.

Chiefs heard the challenges facing RCRP regarding the change in government, highlighting the positive support from the previous government, there is not yet steer on the new government approach; if there is lack of support for RCRP it could have an adverse effect on partner renewals. Moreover, there are challenges with the finalisation of APP. Key focuses for the RCRP team reported providing a continual support network and monitoring impact and effectiveness. The lead called for a permanent NPCC RCRP lead.

The costs required to continue RCRP work until March 2025 were presented to Chiefs. The current plan is to transition to review centre at the end of the year, the lead shared view that if there is no further funding it is difficult to see how it will continue with strategic oversight and the delivery we are getting at the moment. In addition, Chiefs heard there is ability to transition into a business-as-usual model, but the RCRP team need more time and funding to achieve this.

Chiefs voiced APP is key, as this is what officers are held accountable for, and stressed the importance of imbedding APP into training. Calls for decisions on what is in policing mission and for push back if the responsibility does not sit within the mission. Chiefs were assured APP is being worked on and it has been prioritised by the College of Policing. The importance of ensuring strategic and tactical leads understand nuances for RCRP applying to adults and duty to safeguard with specific difference with RCRP children was raised by Chiefs in relation to developing the children missing from care framework.

RCRP learning can be taken to help forces understand and roll out the missing children in care framework nationally.

Chiefs recognised the help and support from RCRP and the benefits for police service and looked forward to when RCRP can be continued in forces on their own, adding comment, it is imperative this is done quickly. In response, the lead iterated the need to continue the work until the end of the financial year for implementation support but expressed concerns for the future of RCRP if the centre for policing productivity review is withdrawn, furthering, that investment will be required to maximise RCRP. Hope for the centre for policing productivity to be the home for RCRP was voiced by Chiefs.

The lead concluded by informing Chiefs financial support is required for current staff within RCRP but assured them the work will not be shelved.

Decision: Funding decision taken in session 11 under national operating budget for Oct 24 to March 25 period.

Decision: RCRP Authorised Professional Practice (APP) draft will be released for consultation and feedback to chiefs when ready.

No actions recorded.

Session 11 – Finance Coordination Committee

The session was opened by the NPCC Finance Lead who firstly handed to the CEO of the College of Policing to discuss fees and charging at the College of Policing.

The CEO of the College of Policing discussed the following points:

- Highlighted a 35% real reduction in grant received.
- Discussed other streams of income coming into the College but do not generate profit.
- Highlighted in the drive to make efficiency they have moved into more economic accommodation and reduced the number of delivery centres.
- Highlighted the following 10% charges requested to forces for Fast Track Leadership Courses and Executive Leadership Programme.
- Maintained colleagues will be full sighted on any future requests for funding and financing.

Chiefs highlighted the following points:

- The importance to highlight new burdens on finance, new potential training and impact on abstractions.
- The importance of understanding the potential pipeline prior to the Spending Review to enable costs to be implemented.
- To guard against inequality across forces on how much they are able to afford in relation to leadership training.

The NPCC Finance Lead then progressed with the full update, which included:

- The NPCC Operating Budget for 2024 - 25 was agreed at 0.132% NRE.
- This year the committee has asked for a 3 year projected requirement and a 2.5% efficiency saving.
- 27 funding requests were received.
- Two areas asked for further funding - DDaCCs funding request of 286K and RCRP 79K for a total 365K in year cost pressure. The cost per force was shown and all chiefs approved increase per force with finance committee to write to all forces to ask for funding.
- Funding submission for 2025 - 26 were shown in more detail. The Committee Chair committed to write to all Chiefs providing a more detailed breakdown with decisions to be made at the December CCC. Chiefs agreed with this approach.
- The Finance Committee Chair outlined the decision will be made one details of the Spending Review have been received.
- All underspend needs to be flagged to the committee.

The NPCC Chair outlined the importance of working collaborative to ensure a joined up approach to finance and ensuring areas of work are funded appropriately.

The NPCC Finance lead then provided a general finance overview and highlighted the following points:

- Request for forces to provide detailed data for the NPCC Finance Survey for the coming year as this helps to build a broader picture of police finances and assists with the Spending Review submission.
- Most forces are assuming a vacancy rate of 4000 staff posts in policing. The majority of these roles are operational roles.
- £250 million of police officer salaries over the next 3 years will be uplift officers moving through pay scales.
- £3.1 billion gap in policing budgets over the next 3 years.
- There are increasing amounts of borrowing being seen across policing.
- Phase two CSR planning is underway.
- Drive for a common pay assumption of no more than 2%.

Chief Constables raised the following points and questions:

- Commended the Finance Committee for the comprehensive work undertaken.

- The importance of identifying income generation polices within policing and ensuring full cost recover in some instances and ensure admin fees etc are set at appropriate standards.

Decision: (Budget Settings) - RCRP and Aviation funding requests and commitment to expenditure in this financial year supported via NRE contributions per force.

Decision: (Budget Settings) - DDaCCs funding request and RCRP totals to be collected by NPCC Finance Coordination Committee from forces during 24-March 25 period.

Decision: (Budget Settings) - 25-26 National Operating Budget will be submitted to December CCC for decisions and this will allow phase 1 of the spending review decisions to be factored in. No decision on expenditure for 25-26 budget was agreed in Sept CCC.

Decision: (Finance Survey Update) - Forces to provide data for next year finance survey once published to contribute to phase 2 of the spending review. Chiefs agreed to support the January 25 finance survey.

Decision: (Finance Survey update) - Chiefs noted the finance coordination committee activity and promotion of messages as outlined in the presentation.

Action: (Budget Setting) - Finance Coordination Committee Chair will write out to forces on detail of phase 1 of spending review once completed in October.

Action: (Budget Setting) - Chiefs to send any confirmations they might have for underspend to the NPCC finance coordination committee as per the condition of the grant agreement.

Action: (Finance Survey Update) - Forces to provide data for next year finance survey once published to contribute to phase 2 of the spending review.

Action: (Finance Survey Update) - BlueLight Commercial to circulate an overview of what they are working on to the NPCC finance coordination committee to factor into phase 2 of spending review.

Action: (Finance Survey Update) - NPCC CSA team to link in with forces to have some ready figures and stats across volume crime - the rol of policing in economic growth.

Action: (Finance Survey Update) - National Retail Crime lead to join up in any retail crime considerations.

Session 12 – Pay and Conditions

Just before the 31st of August information became available concerning Pensions and the position that officers may owe or be owed contributions. Ther has been quite a lot of organisational noise in this area with a lack of understanding about what is been going and our response to it. When the 2015 scheme was introduced some officers were protected. Those officers stayed on the '87 scheme, some were tapered, and some not protected at all. This situation was found to be discriminatory. There was no leave of appeal for that finding so the responsibility for this discrimination is the scheme managers (i.e. Chief Constables in charge of forces).

Following no leave of appeal, the remedy was required and that has affected over 100,000 people. From the 1st April 2022, all officers were effectively put into the 2015 scheme, so the effect of the discrimination is that people were taken out of the 2015 scheme, and were put on to the '22 scheme. If officers were in the '87 scheme when they were taken out, they owe contributions. If they were in the '06 scheme when they were taken out, they are owed contributions. Effectively, if you want to go back

into your old scheme, you have got to pay the subscriptions for the old scheme to get the benefits out of it. The application of interest to pay that service is just so that public money is not devalued. Request that wherever we can achieve consistency in the way we organise recognising that Chief Constables are individual scheme managers with all contractual relationships with administrators. XPS have got 33 of the forces, some forces do it in house or with other organisations. A peculiarity of the system is that there are very few software suppliers in the market, therefore software suppliers are holding a lot of power.

Presented slides addressing some of the main common queries with regards to remedy. With the issue of statements provided member questions concern the position for active members and then the position of remedy for retired members. Active members are a priority under the remedy called Deferred Choice.

There is also some technical issues with regards to processing the data in large volumes in an annual benefit statement.

Presentation highlighted some additional issues that have happened since those statements were issued. In terms of the national grip.

One of those identified has been about the forecast date for the actual benefit statement itself and the use of 60. Sixty is the normal pension age for the police scheme recognising and prioritising the need for proper modelling tools to be able to allow people to forecast retirement with the sector over the next 12 months to deliver those technological forecasts.

Significant concern around interest payments has generated the most of discussion so far. After the Home Office published consultation back in January last year, legal advice was sought regarding to interest and force's ability around interest.

One of the challenges of a locally administered scheme, is while MPCC can offer advice, they cannot always do things centrally on behalf of all forces, so options are being considered with regards to a more wrap around support right across policing but we will be providing a list of publishing a list of providers that people could go to with additional information so that scheme managers can direct members to those providers and they can also in the statement again it links to the compensation element.

Locally Chief Constables have individual contractual relationships with administrators. Advised he has been getting XPS together nationally and trying best to grip hold of them. Each force needs a local policy and achieve consistency in the area. Regional representation at a regional group is the best place to get contemporary up to date policy discussions.

Question raised around the issue of interest payments, the potential tax bill, and enquiries by Federation regarding same.

Advised information provided by last scheme manager Steering Group they are looking to waive the interest for a 12-week period from the receipt of the statement. Suggested it is within our discretion, partly because of the work involved to calculate it for everyone who might make individual decisions. Contrary confirmation received they are not looking at waving interest beyond that period. Advice is that it would be unlawful to do so.

Some misreporting identified as to what is happening. All people are doing is waving the recalculation of interest within three months. If somebody says, OK, I now want to make that contribution payment. They are not calculating that the interest to the date of payment, they are keeping it at the date of the statement.

Question asked if that is a funded scheme or is that the pension pot that has to pay for that? Or is it the force that must pay for that?

Confirmed funding through the Home Office with funding guidance issued to each force.

Mentioned XPS are dealing with significant challenges in dealing with local enquiries.

This is all about financial planning, security for them and their families, both now and into the future. Welcomed guidance/advice, in terms of the interest on the 12-week period and in terms of compensation, the risk of doing these 43 different ways? Formal letter sent to XPS on behalf of officers who have not received statements since the 1st of August, and they have failed to give that information.

Query on presentation about default to age 60 retirement with mutterings from current administration about potential tax thresholds changing in terms of lump sum payments. The sooner some kind of accurate calculators are provided then individuals can access and produce their own individual projections, which will take heat out the scenario. Request to encourage those kinds of calculators coming online at the earliest opportunity in terms of that financial planning.

CCC advised of meeting with XPS for a few months. The first meeting provided a description of why XPS found it hard for succession planning to the right post to get strategically prepared for it. Addressed his concerns and advised them they had let members down on comms. Robust grip initiated. Nationally, policing are probably the most noisy and vocal and vociferous challenging client.

To reassure CCC, for a pension savings statement, the statutory date is the 6th of October. So that is not the statutory date of a remediable service statement, which is an RSS which is the 31st of March but in some cases, if somebody does not receive a pension savings statement for the same reasons they could not receive an annual benefit statement they have three months to use the digital service from when they do receive a statement.

Query regarding the potential to guess the wrong pension savings statement. This is being raised with HMT. Administrators must issue knowingly wrong statements that has been raised at the highest level on HMT and HMRC to understand what that means. Work is continuing this. It would mean, people do still need to self-assess. They might be at risk of either self-assessing on an estimate or knowingly incorrect information. There are communications and pension chat sessions with the remedy leads. To ensure that information then flows through, and in the process of providing a pensions aid statement fact sheet that will draw that out in a clearer to understand way.

Query about the issue is about officers who have transferred and whether there is anything collectively, that can be done across the service. If members who have transferred from one force to another, the extent of detail needed to obtain about a pension, any part time working, the contributions, the salary and all of that, all of that was signed over to different forces at various times. Unclear on what is missing in that information affecting transferees?

The issue is one of the biggest projects for remedy was always going to be finding seven years' worth of remedial data that has not already been shared. When people move forces, the normal information shared is around the dates of service, but what is not shared is, and particularly with regards to the legacy scheme, was hours and how that affect how to calculate a pensionable service pay on both the final salary and the reform. There was a financial data spreadsheet and that was provided back in 2021. Information for all the employees and their contribution data will need to be found. Focus has been on finding that data for their active members, not for people who have left them. So, the ask was put a policy into place that said, 'if I am asked to provide this data to another force, how am I going to do that? How is my payroll team going to find the right resources to do that?' Data protection advisors are advising we cannot transfer such data. We've issued some guidance previously about the transfer of data that it can be done, but there does seem to be in some cases in payrolls and blockages, we've been able to do that and some of that might be resourced and of course resources are very difficult issue to solve because.

Clarity sought on transferees within his scheme. Issues has been raised with XPS advising some difficulty in this space. XPS did originally agree to be a data clearing house and have since reneged due to resourcing. We have provided the contact details for every force payroll and advised if Members cannot get the information from XPS go straight to the payroll.

Lead will write to the federation on a national basis. The Federation are raising the same issues, so we will respond to them on a national basis. So, there is some things we are still waiting for advice on specifically. The Federation, for example, have raised the technical issue about the application of interest in reverse. Concerns highlighted over a heavily litigious environment.

Decision: (Pension Savings Statement and Tax) - Self Assessment is only to be used for 2023/24 and the normal timescales apply for this year. For years the remediable years 2015/16 to 2022/23 members should not amend a self-assessment, but instead must use the HMRC digital service, Members have until 31 January to use this service.

Decision: Chiefs noted the NPCC Pension team are aware of the issue affecting officers who had periods of part time working during the remedy period, having received inflated contributions adjustments. Team is working with forces and administrators together to identify and recalculate the affected cases.

Action: (Pension Savings Statement and Tax) - Issuing PSS and ASB -RSS in advance of letters being released - a list of providers will be made available to all forces w/c 30th Sept.

Action: Chiefs to check that each region is represented at the scheme managers steering group at the monthly meeting to engage with counterparts regionally.

Action: NPCC Pensions team to re-circulate in next monthly bulletin on ChiefsNet options for escalation routes.

Action: NPCC Pensions lead to write to Police Federation on application of interest point.

Any other Business

No other business recorded.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next full CCC meeting will be held on **4-5 December 2024**.