

Police Reform and Transformation Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2016 at 2, Marsham Street, London

Security classification: Not Protectively Marked
Disclosable under FOIA 2000: Yes
Author: Adrian Wight
Force/organisation: National Police Chiefs' Council and Association of Police and Crime Commissioners
Date created: 15 July 2016

ATTENDANCE

Present

Julia Mulligan (JM) (Chair)	Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire
Sara Thornton (ST) Paul Lincoln (PL)	Chair, National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) Director General, Crime, Policing and Fire Group, Home Office
Cllr Simon Duckworth (SD)	Member of the City of London Policing Committee (Representing other Police Governing Bodies)
Martin Surl (MS)	Interim Chair of the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) and Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire Interim Chair APCC, Gloucestershire
David Lloyd (DL) Charlie Radford (CR)	Police and Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire Chief Finance Officer, Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner
Nazir Afzal (NA) Lynne Owens (LO) Craig Mackey	Chief Executive, APCC Director General, National Crime Agency (NCA) Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)
Alex Marshall (AM) David Thompson (DT) Stephen Kavanagh (SK) Simon Cole (SC) Rebecca Lawrence (RL)	Chief Executive, College of Policing Chief Constable, West Midlands Police Chief Constable, Essex Police Chief Constable, Leicestershire Police Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime

IN ATTENDANCE

Supt. Tim Metcalfe (TM)	Chief of Staff, NPCC
Oliver Shaw (OS)	Policy Director, APCC
Cat McIntyre (CM)	APCC
Nicola Growcott (NG)	NPCC Communications
Richard Thwaite (RT)	Home Office IT
Adrian Wight (AW)	Home Office (Minutes)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and introductions were made around the table.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 29 JUNE 2016

- 2.1 At page 2, paragraph 2.8, the date for the Assurance Manager interviews should read 19 July. Six applicants had been shortlisted.
- 2.2 It was agreed that an action log as had been presented at previous meetings would be helpful.

3. MATTERS ARISING AND PCC ENGAGEMENT

- 3.1 Sara Thornton presented the paper about engagement by the Specialist Capabilities Programme Team with PCCs. The plan was to see all PCCs by September, if possible. In discussion, the importance of comprehensive engagement was emphasised together with the need to link into meetings of the Specialist Capabilities Board and the overall decision making process. There was also a responsibility on PCCs to feed back to wider groups. Ruth Lawrence said that early engagement with London had been good and that there was a benefit in a workshop approach to support alignment as the Policing and Crime Plan was developed locally.

ACTION: Sara Thornton to bring back to the PRTB a more detailed plan reflecting the discussion.

ACTION: Nazir Afzal to raise engagement between PCCs at the APCC AGM.

4. DIGITAL BID REVIEWS

- 4.1 Richard Thwaite presented the paper showing the relationship and dependencies between the digital bids and the landscape of six major programmes:
 - Digital Public Contact
 - Digital Investigation and Intelligence
 - Digital First
 - Emergency Service Mobile Communications (Home Office led)
 - Home Office Biometrics (Home Office led)
 - National Law Enforcement Database Programme (NLEDP) (Home Office led)
- 4.2 There was a need to ensure that the potential linkages and dependencies were managed. The bid to establish a National Register of Missing Persons had a conflicting overlap with the landscape. This is because the proposal was based on building capability for the Police National Database (PNC), which was being replaced through the National Law Enforcement Data Programme (NLEDP). The Board agreed that the bid set out a potentially important capability, but seeking to build this on the PND at this stage was not feasible or the right approach. A future bid that focused on the

requirement and demonstrated how this could be part of the new NDLEDP approach would be something the Board could consider.

- 4.3 The Board commented that the bids presented showed different areas trying to solve the same problems in different ways. There was a risk of consolidating the different elements without overall clarity of direction. For this reason, it was agreed that in future the PRTB should move to a more strategic approach with the Board able to set a clearer direction and commission work that would lead to a convergence to common standards. This did not, however, mean that the current bids could not be supported, as these could be complementary if the dependencies were carefully managed. , In the first year of the Police Transformation Fund (PTF), there was a need to replace systems and increase inter-operability and efficiency whilst a convergence approach would take some time to develop.
- 4.4 Grant conditions could be used to help ensure the projects maintained alignment with the national programmes. Those that were at the proof of concept stage should demonstrate alignment at full business case stage. This included the approach to the purchase of ERP systems to avoid fragmentation. There was also an ongoing role for the Board in measuring benefits delivery.
- 4.5 In future, the Board could say that it will not fund bids that do not meet specific standards, or are unclear on the local/regional/national fit. There was a balance to be struck in convergence on national standards to allow data inter-operability whilst allowing local flexibility on approach. The Home Office was not looking to mandate standards in policing, however it was open to the leadership of policing to write to Ministers with a proposed mandation and time-frame if there was consensus that this was the best approach.

5. TRANSFORMATION FUND BIDS

- 5.1 Declarations of interest were discussed. It was noted that PCCs and other members would have an interest in particular bids and should not seek to influence the Board's decisions on these.
- 5.2 Tim Metcalfe presented the paper, supported by further comments from the Gateway Group which had met on Monday 11 July 2016. 18 bids had been reviewed as part of the process and 15 had been recommended by the Gateway Group for onward recommendation to the Home Secretary. Further bids had been received and would be considered in September. The Gateway Group had also agreed on the merits of a commissioning approach, and the use of caveats and conditions in awarding bids. They noted that it was difficult for proof of concept bids to meet all the criteria in the same way as an implementation bid. Though a proof of concept could be important for exploring key areas for potential transformation. There were also challenges with funding certainty for future years.
- 5.3 It was noted that there should be a check on the realism of spend of the bids, given that successful bids would receive funding part way through 16/17. In some cases bidders might feel able to commence work at their own financial risk once the 'in-principle' decision was made and as the grants were being agreed. There should also be appropriate finance due diligence in each case before grants were awarded.

Ultimately each bidder and their Chief Finance Officers would need to provide assurance about costs and delivery to receive payment of grant from the Home Office.

- 5.4 The Board considered each of the bids made to the Fund taking account of the work done by the Gateway Group. It was agreed that following the meeting letters would be written to each of the lead bidders containing the recommendations of the Board which would be forwarded to the Home Secretary. These recommendations would form part of the Home Secretary's considerations as to whether to make a grant award from the Fund.

6. NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Nazir Afzal said that it was recognised that the Gateway Group had been convened at short notice to meet the tight timescales for the first funding round. The College and National Crime Agency had also provided input that would be built into the process in future. The need for the membership of the Gateway Group to evolve was discussed. Further work was needed to develop the process for future rounds including potentially using professional support to help develop the approach. A more detailed proposal would need to be developed for this to seek to secure funding based with 'in principle' support from PRTB for this use of the Transformation Fund. The papers called for up to £900K mainly to support the Board in commissioning IT work, as well as building capability for implementing digital programmes, and developing the portfolio approach as follows:

- A £540,000 fund for supporting forces to define and develop 'commissioned' projects to support national priorities,
- £180,000 fund to support the technical and digital policing talent hub to support recruitment and training.
- £180,000 for a Portfolio Management capability to provide oversight of the work.

- 6.2 It was noted that the Board could not fully play its role if proof of concept bids were not within the scope of the Fund. Seeing bids at this stage of a project would help support the development of a portfolio management approach.
- 6.3 It was agreed that the Board would support consultancy up to a maximum set out in the paper. The detail would be agreed outside the meeting.

7. REFORM STRANDS

- 7.1 Sara Thornton provided a brief update on National Police Chiefs' Council. The Joint Forensics and Biometrics Service was presented to all Chief Constable the previous day as an Outline Business Case. There is strong support to come back with a bid in September to the Fund. The approach being taken by digital policing and specialist capabilities had the support of the Council. The Home Office had also presented on the Infrastructure Policing work and further consultation was planned.

8. COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

- 8.1 It was agreed that it was important to publicise the work of the Board and a full communications strategy was important to do this. Minutes of the meetings would be published. Further thought was being given to briefing MPs and Lords in the autumn.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting was 14 September 2016. The feasibility of an August meeting was being explored.