

Minutes

APCC – General Meeting – 25 January 2018

Venue: Emmanuel Centre, 9-23 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 3DW

Item No.	Title
1.0	<p>Item Title: Welcome and Minutes</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Julia Mulligan (Acting Chair): Noted that she is Acting Chair in PCC David Lloyd's absence, and welcomed colleagues to the meeting. ▪ The Acting Chair asked if there were any comments on the draft Minutes from the previous meeting or the actions arising. It was noted that there were four actions, all completed, and the Minutes were approved. ▪ The Acting Chair introduced the new APCC Chief Executive Designate, Susannah Hancock, and noted that Susannah will start in her new role on 3 April 2018. The comprehensive recruitment process was noted. The Acting Chair congratulated Susannah and asked if she would like to say a few words. ▪ The Chief Executive Designate explained how delighted she was to have been appointed to the role, and that she was looking forward to starting. She noted her intention to do a tour of PCC offices, early in her new role, to meet with PCCs locally. ▪ She noted that she had been working in the CJS for 25 years now, starting her career as a probation officer, then as a practitioner, then working in Central Government for the Youth Justice Board, and then at Victim Support, before joining the Essex OPCC. She hoped she would bring CJS and local government knowledge to the role. ▪ The Acting Chair thanked Susannah, and she noted there were a number of issues that PCC colleagues would be raising with her imminently, and that PCCs would look forward to meeting her on her tour.
2.0	<p>Item Title: Chair Reports</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <p>PCC Julia Mulligan, Acting APCC Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Acting Chair raised the PCCs' salary review. She noted that the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) is working with the APCC to create a questionnaire to be distributed to PCCs. The deadline for returning this information to SSRB was confirmed to be 28 February 2018, and a proposed meeting on 15 March between PCCs and members of the SSRB was noted, with the intention that approximately 15-20 PCCs would attend. ▪ The Acting Chair said that the SSRB would then assess all the evidence gathered and make a recommendation to the Home Secretary, who would then decide the outcome. She noted the settlement date of 1 May but added that the Government could respond later than that date.

- The Acting Chair noted that there were different views and that the process would allow all to be expressed.
- The Acting Chair also raised the issue of PCC security. She noted the meeting at the APCC/NPCC Joint Summit, and outlined the conclusion reached by the APCC Secretariat that a further meeting would likely be more of the same.
- The Acting Chair noted that HMRC had been invited to join the meeting, in relation to the tax bill associated with PCC security, with a view to seeking parity with the arrangements of MPs. She said that HMRC had declined this invitation, and that they had indicated that the ad-hoc nature of such security arrangements meant that blanket advice in an open forum would not be suitable.
- The Acting Chair noted a debate on this issue at the APCC Board meeting, and suggested that PCCs had reached different conclusions on their personal need for security. She also said that security provision by forces was varied. She noted that the APCC Board would be writing to the Home Office and HMRC to set out PCC views, and calling for a national policy so PCCs can assess their circumstances with Chief Constables.
- She said that the APCC would press for central funding for security provision in the same way as MPs, but she noted that this would be a challenge. She extended an invitation to PCCs to provide an anonymised case study regarding their specific security concerns, to support the APCC in making this case to the relevant authorities. The suggestion was made to work with PACCTS (Police and Crime Commissioners' Treasurers Society), to get a clear outline of the tax situation.
- The Chair introduced a new APCC Secretariat member, Will Pryce, as a Policy, Communications and Support Officer, and noted that he would be providing support to the Conservative Group.

PCC Paddy Tipping, Chair, Police Reform and Transformation Board (PRTB):

- Raised the Grant Settlement, announced by the Government in December 2017, and noted that a Parliamentary debate on the settlement was expected in the coming days. He also referenced how, as part of the settlement, the allocation for the Police Transformation Fund had been announced.
- The PRTB Chair advised that, due to continued reductions in public spending, this allocation would be significantly less than had been originally assumed by the Police Reform and Transformation Board (PRTB). He said that the Police Transformation Fund (PTF) had been confirmed at £175m for the 2018/19 financial year, and a further £175m was expected for the 2019/20 financial year.
- He said that the PRTB would meet on Monday 29 January 2018 to discuss this.
- The PRTB Chair advised that existing bids against the PTF were more than double the allocated settlement. He noted that these existing bids included: funding for a number of programmes that have received multi-year funding (more than £80m), £90m of funding for the national programmes, and additional funding for the National Crime Agency (NCA) bid on serious and organised crime (SOC).
- He suggested that the Board will need to take difficult decisions on funding priorities for next year. The PRTB Chair advised that with some revising, rescaling and phasing down of existing commitments the Board could sustain the existing portfolio for the next two years. However, he noted, there was a significant cliff-edge at the end of the 19/20 financial year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PRTB Chair noted that the Home Office was proud of the settlement and referenced the flexibility of the fund. ▪ The PRTB Chair advised that PCCs would need to commence work with Treasury on the next CSR and proposed that a future session would be convened with PCCs on how the CSR should be approached. <p>Katy Bourne, Chair, Police ICT Company</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Chair noted that the new Chief Executive Officer of the Police ICT Company, Ian Bell, had been appointed, with his tenure commencing on 5 February 2018. She noted his leadership role in the development of the National Enabling Programmes, and his position as the Vice Chair of the National Police Technology Company and the former Chief Information Officer for the Tri-Force (Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire) ICT collaboration. She congratulated Ian on his appointment. ▪ The Chair advised that the next meeting of the ICT Company Board would take place on 8 February, and that at this meeting Ian would be presenting his first '100 days' vision for ICT Company. They would also be discussing the findings of the Deloitte work commissioned by PRTB, which had examined the options for the Police ICT Company to act as the delivery vehicle for major national technology programmes. 		
Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date	
PCCs requested to provide anonymous case studies and practical examples of their experiences to demonstrate the current issues faced by PCCs, and to assist the APCC in presenting this case to the Home Office.		Police and Crime Commissioners	Ongoing.
3.0	<p>Item Title: National Enabling Programmes (NEP)</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stephen Mold: Chaired the item and explained his role as PCC representative on the National Enabling Programmes (NEP) Programme Board. He introduced Ian Bell and Simon Parr to present in this item. ▪ Ian Bell: Suggested that the previous 12 months had seen a significant step forward in the delivery of a set of programmes that would harmonise force technology and deliver transformational change to the way that business was done. ▪ He outlined three elements to the NEP: Productivity Services, which would deliver common, enhanced software with cloud storage; Identity Access Management, which would allow the effective sharing of information; and the National Monitoring Centre, which would provide the capability to protect forces from cyber threats. ▪ Simon Parr: Highlighted the benefits of a harmonised system with a common IT platform across all forces, and suggested that it would allow effective and efficient information sharing. He said that officers would be able to work anywhere, and that this would allow flexibility and deliver savings on fleet and estates costs. He noted that this would help to change the focus on money and police numbers towards talking about numbers of operational hours and how many would be freed up to use on other activity. ▪ He also highlighted the significant threat that cyber-attacks posed including the shutting down of networks and ransomware costs. He suggested that secure data held more effectively would prevent the loss of data, cash and reputation. He added that secure and readily available data could also mitigate the risk of hefty data protection fines. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He cited NCA data which said that £190bn had been lost in the previous year to cybercrime, including £40bn by the public sector. ▪ He noted the challenges for forces of finding the funding to make these changes and the wider culture change needed to ensure that policing used the technology available to its fullest. ▪ Ian Bell mentioned that the cost of licences would be more but suggested that forces would be receiving a lot more, and that there would be cost savings in the longer term. ▪ Ian Bell noted that the work with Kent and Essex had identified potential savings of £14m over the next 4 years, and said that the NEP team would help forces with their business cases. He concluded by noting that Assistant Chief Constables had been appointed in Kent and Essex to lead their change teams.
	<p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked about the costs for forces and notably those on licensing. ▪ A: The panel suggested that the costs would be different for each force, in part dependent on existing local investment, and that licensing costs would also differ. It was also noted that the NEP Board was negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding with Microsoft to allow for a competitive and common pricing model with costs fixed for 3 years. ▪ Asked about sharing of information with partners, how that could reduce cost and what cultural changes were needed. ▪ A: The panel noted that there would need to be a governance process around who information could be shared with, but suggested it would be fairly straightforward. They added that the risk associated with sharing information needed to be balanced against the risk of what happens when information is not shared.

Tea and Coffee

4.0	<p>Item Title: Portfolio Updates</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mental Health Portfolio - Matthew Scott: Introduced Matthew Lees and Stephen Gilbert. He noted his appointment on the Review Panel for the independent Mental Health Act (MHA) Review, alongside CC Mark Collins, and suggested that it was positive that policing had a voice in the process, alongside health providers. ▪ Steven Gilbert: Noted his personal history as a service user. He raised the important role of the police in this process and noted his activities on these issues over the past five years, including 300 Voices, about high demand and poor outcomes and his work in West Midlands on users with multiple needs. ▪ He noted that his specific focus in the MHA Review was on the experiences of Black Minority Ethnic (BME) community in particular. ▪ He briefly outlined the Terms of Reference for the MHA Review, and he drew attention to the issues of detention rates, accident and emergency services, police involvement, safeguards for patients, and the involvement of families and carers. ▪ He suggested that detention had at times been used to detain individuals in crisis, rather than for treatment. He raised issues about the delays in accessing treatment or getting transfers. ▪ Matthew Lees: Noted the role of PCCs in driving huge reductions in the use of police custody for mental health crises, and flagged the significant involvement of police officers. He shared
-----	---

	<p>quotes from Sir Simon Wessely and the APCC Mental Health and Custody Portfolio Lead and Deputy, which he said indicated a shared agenda on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He said that policing was likely to form a specific work stream within phase 2 of the Review, and he discussed a number of ideas currently being considered in relation to s136 powers. ▪ Steve Gilbert: Flagged the statistics in relation to BME communities and noted that this has been a longstanding issue, on which there have been many reports. He suggested the Review was a real opportunity to look at this problem in a different way, and noted the inclusion of the Review's African and Caribbean Working Group, in response to the specific overrepresentation of Black African and Black Caribbean people detained under current provisions. He noted the importance of engaging with different parts of the community to better understand the problems, and to look for solutions. ▪ In relation to the Review process, he noted the interim report which was due in Easter, and suggested this would be about identifying the scope. He mentioned the working groups; on service users and carers, data and evidence, African and Caribbean, and a group aimed at pulling together the report. ▪ He expressed an interest in understanding the impact of recent changes in policy; getting an idea of variations by geography; BME overrepresentation and what that means to policing, including on informal admission and secondary/primary mental health care. He also noted the advisory group as a method of information gathering for the Review. ▪ Matthew Scott thanked the speakers and asked members if a Deep Dive on Mental Health would be helpful. This was supported. ▪ Citizens in Policing Portfolio - Alun Michael: Thanked PCCs for their responses to the survey on volunteering. ▪ He noted the voluntary contributions of police staff and officers in the community, in addition to the usual Citizens in Policing considerations, and welcomed the contribution they make to society. He drew attention, in particular, to police officers volunteering with youth workers. ▪ He suggested that the Chiefs Council had agreed to a proposition for a central resource; profiled at £7.5k, followed by £5k and then £2.5k the following year, and that this would be a matter for further discussion. ▪ He said that on 6 February, there would be a national workshop in York on these issues, which he would be attending. He welcomed any input from colleagues to take to the event. ▪ He suggested that the work provided by volunteers is only as good as the support provided to them. He proposed a virtual network, with points of contact in each PCCs office. ▪ He noted the recognition PCCs had received regarding this, and said specifically that the Lord Ferrers Awards would be including a section on volunteering and PCCs, including Independent Custody Visitors, animal welfare visitors, Neighbourhood Watch, Speedwatch, etc. ▪ He drew attention to the paper circulated by the APCC Portfolio, proposing a series of priorities in this area. He also noted the Portfolio's survey findings, which he said included good practice and innovation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q: Asked whether the Portfolio had a view on paedophile hunters, in terms of police volunteers? ○ A: Alun Michael suggested he was not in a position to give APCC position, and he urged caution on this issue. ▪ Integrity and Transparency Portfolio - Julia Mulligan: Noted the scope of work in this Portfolio.
--	--

- She referenced the official delay on phase 3 of complaints reforms until early 2019 and said that there were still opportunities for PCCs to bring forward business cases, with local chiefs' agreement to trial 'transition' models.
- On data protection, and implications of General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) reforms, she suggested that PCCs need to look at complications. She said that the APCC was working with the Information Commissioners Office to get clarity, and noted that it would likely vary on local circumstances, and the nature of the data handled by OPCCs. She said there was a debate about OPCCs and CCs data sharing – important for PCCs to engage with forces locally on this.
- Regarding the Legally Qualified Chair (LQC) Survey, due to be published the following day, she noted that the main LQC concern was around indemnity for LQCs; she suggested that there was a mixed picture about the provision of indemnity insurance across OPCCs. She noted that Cleveland OPCC had taken legal counsel, and had received the view that it would be "pragmatic" for PCCs to indemnify LQCs.
- Regarding the Rural Crime Network, she noted that it had appointed researchers for Domestic Abuse research, and she asked the relevant PCCs/OPCCs to help get people to get involved, to ensure that a national picture is developed.
- **Standards Portfolio - Stephen Mold:** Noted that the lack of a College CEO for some months had left a gap and suggested that there was a need for direction within the College of Policing. He said that PCCs do have influence but highlighted how many other stakeholders are represented in key committees (referred to slides outlining a list of current members).
 - Q – Asked about the training of future leaders, and how much it would involve digital.
 - A: He agreed that more could be done in this area, but flagged the recent review of the Police National Assessment Centre and the Senior Command Course.
 - Q – Asked whether there was a need to increase the competition for police leadership posts.
 - A: He agreed that building this pool of talent was very important.
- He closed by noting there was a still a vacancy for a Deputy Lead on this Portfolio and asked his colleagues to consider taking this on.
- **Victims Portfolio - Vera Baird:** Updated colleagues on her recent meetings and noted that the Victims Strategy was now expected between Easter and the summer.
- Regarding the draft Domestic Violence Bill, she suggested that this was not imminent, but she has received an indication that it is likely to be next year before it becomes legislation, following a consultation.
- Regarding refuges and supported housing funding – she referenced the proposed new funding process, and suggested that those PCCs which welcomed the localism of this approach to raise this view with representatives of the refuge sector, who she said were deeply concerned.
- Regarding future devolution, she suggested that there was a discussion about sexual violence being devolved to PCCs. She proposed that PCCs approach this cautiously, but noted it was on the cards, as was the court-based witness service.
- Regarding the Worboys case, she said that an eight week consultation on the parole board had opened in that week, and that it would be focused on challenges, outcomes, transparency and Victims Code. She encouraged PCCs to consider making submissions
- She noted that NHS England now had a sexual violence strategy and suggested that there was a great deal of commitment behind it.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finally, she noted that PCC Marc Jones would be establishing a Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) network, akin to Modern Slavery Network, and she invited PCCs to be involved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q: Asked whether there was an APCC view on the disclosure issues raised about the Met, and the Director of Public Prosecution's (DPP) stance. ○ A: She made clear that a number of cases were deplorable, but in turn that there were serious issues around disclosure. She noted concerns about the viability of a comprehensive search of smartphones, and noted that the DPP had been asked to reconsider. She drew attention to scheduling, and suggested there that there were serious questions around the police role in doing this. She also noted that disclosure issues can go both ways. ○ Q: Asked about how a lack of proportionality on disclosure could discourage victims of rape being willing to come forward, due to invasion of privacy. ○ A: She agreed and referred to Home Office Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) funding for supporting disclosure applications. She suggested that victims' Article 8 rights are often not respected and that rape myths flood into disclosure questions. ○ Q: Asked whether there was a need to earn confidence both on disclosure rules, and on police judgement in the use of evidence. ○ A: She agreed that this was important and drew attention to the Northumbria scheme, which she proposed was an approach that might help earn this confidence.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local Policing and Partnerships Portfolio - Keith Hunter ▪ Regarding the Portfolio's survey of PCCs/OPCCs on Local Policing and Partnerships, he noted that there had been replies from 32 OPCCs, which were currently being summarised and would be shared. ▪ Regarding policing and health, he said that the APCC had circulated information on improving partnership work with health partners in the previous week. He said that Andy Rhodes, NPCC lead, had developed a plan and produced a statement for partners to sign up to. He said that he would welcome PCCs' views on the statement, and whether the APCC should sign it. ▪ Regarding the Draft Neighbourhood Policing Guidelines, he noted that the College of Policing had provided a consultation draft, which had been circulated to PCCs. He urged PCCs to consider it and provide their comments. He suggested that the College of Policing intended to publish these in April. ▪ Workforce Portfolio - Ron Hogg: ▪ He provided a brief update on staff pay; he said that employers had amended the offer to say 1% consolidated, and 1% non-consolidated as a lump sum. He noted Unison were also keen to remove the bottom two pay points. He said that the APCC had agreed to this and considered this to be an affordable offer which will deliver a deal. ▪ He expressed his intention to put something out by end of the week on submissions for Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB) and said he would like PCCs views. ▪ In respect to the Minister's Wellbeing Event, which had taken place the previous week on workforce mental health issues, he noted that there had been a fund for providing enhanced welfare support but suggested that Police Treatment Centres were being excluded from bidding for the fund. He requested PCCs to contribute their views on this issue. He quoted the Policing Minister as confirming that this event would not be a one-off and that there would be further roundtables – he said that the Minister had asked for best practice evidence on this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regarding the Self-Assessment Wellbeing Tool, he noted that the College had produced this tool, and he suggested that PCCs take a look at it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q: Asked about Police Education Qualification Framework (PEQF), and whether there was agreement that disadvantaged people need to be able to see a way into policing and that higher education must not become a barrier. ○ A: He agreed that the framework needed to be inclusive. ▪ Finance Portfolio - Roger Hirst: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He noted that the paper on the final funding settlement had gone out, and he agreed with PCC Paddy Tipping that co-operation with NPCC had resulted in a better outcome. He suggested that it was now important to look forward. He also noted that the Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society (PaCCTS) had put in a response, which was critical of council tax as a regressive structure of taxation. ▪ He said that this was intended to be a 2 year settlement, and that he expected a similar deal next year, predicated on efficiency and productivity advances. He said that there were awaiting more concrete statements on this. ▪ He discussed the need for PCCs and CCs to gather data on efficiency, productivity, measured outcomes, and the benefits of policing. He referenced a PTF bid regarding this but noted that there was a debate about where to hold this data; he listed the options as the APCC, NPCC or PaCCTS). He proposed that this data would also help inform the debate on metrics (for Home Office and HM Treasury) ▪ Regarding reserves, he recognised that they remained an issue. He noted the proposal relating to letters being written to justify general reserves levels above 5%. He suggested that feedback from the NPCC indicated support for this, but said there was some reluctance from Treasurers. ▪ Alcohol and Substance Misuse Portfolio - Arfon Jones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He noted the Home Office view on Heroin Assisted Treatment, and Drug Consumption Rooms, but confirmed that this is a position that can be challenged. He thanked West Midlands OPCC for hosting their recent conference on substance misuse and the need for a harm-reduction approach. 						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Approved / Agreed Actions</th><th>Responsible Person</th><th>Due Date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>APCC Secretariat to arrange a Deep Dive on Mental Health</td><td>APCC Secretariat</td><td>20 March 2018</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date	APCC Secretariat to arrange a Deep Dive on Mental Health	APCC Secretariat	20 March 2018
Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date					
APCC Secretariat to arrange a Deep Dive on Mental Health	APCC Secretariat	20 March 2018					
Lunch							
5.0	<p>Item Title: Transforming Forensics</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mark Burns-Williamson: Introduced the item, as APCC Lead for Forensics and Co-Chair of the Transforming Forensics Executive Review Board. He noted that, following the issues raised by Randox and the Forensic Science Regulator's most recent Annual Report, there was renewed interest in this subject. ▪ He outlined PCC support for the Transforming Forensics Programme, and noted the progress that had been made. He referenced in particular the development of a new Full Business Case, 						

	<p>which had been trailed extensively at regional meetings of PCCs and Chiefs in the latter part of 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He said that a bid for additional Police Transformation Funding to take the Programme forward in 2018/19 and 2019/20 would be considered by the Police Reform and Transformation Board (PRTB) at its meeting on 29th January. ▪ Jo Ashworth, Programme Director: Presented an update on the progress of the Programme. ▪ She suggested that the Programme had reached a key set of milestones: the discussion of progress at this General Meeting, the funding bid at PRTB on 29th January and the publication of a new Full Business Case (FBC) at the end of January. ▪ She discussed the work to persuade forces to join the Transforming Forensics Programme, to develop a new business case and to submit a comprehensive funding bid to PRTB that would take the Programme forward over the next two years. ▪ She suggested that the vision for Transforming Forensics remained the same: to deliver high quality, specialist forensic capabilities in support of the 2025 policing vision to rapidly protect communities and the vulnerable, which is sustainable to meet future threats and demand. To this end, she said, the Programme aimed to improve outcomes, reduce costs and react at pace to a changing world to deliver a forensic landscape that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lowers cost through savings and efficiencies; - Maximises capabilities by developing new skills, quality accreditation and roll out of Capability Networks; - Is affordable and fair by securing efficiencies and value that is available to all; - Maximises Research and Development innovation, for example in the use of DNA; - Generates its own investment. ▪ She noted that in May 2017, the TF Programme had presented an Outline Business Case that included an emerging preferred option – a so-called ‘Option 5’ – that proposed full national integration of forensic services with an iterative staged implementation to effectively manage risk. She acknowledged that this approach had not been accepted by PCCs and Chiefs as desirable or achievable in a one step process. ▪ She suggested therefore that, for the new Business Case, the Programme had moved to a more incremental approach, particularly focused around the development of Forensics Capability Networks and the aggregation of forensic capabilities at the local and regional level. ▪ She said that since May 2017, 44 forces and agencies had agreed expressions of interest in TF. Now, she suggested, key decisions would need to be made – on funding (by PRTB on 29th January) and whether forces join-up for the delivery phase (by PCCs and Chiefs following publication of the FBC at the end of January). She proposed that to support the latter, the Programme would visit individual PCCs and Chiefs in February and March to discuss and canvass views about the Business Case.
	<p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confidence in figures – some concern was expressed about figures and diagrams used in earlier drafts of the Business Case that had been seen by PCCs. In particular, a diagram showing the ‘baseline efficiency’ of forces based on the unit costs for fingerprint work was queried – the figures for some forces (Dyfed-Powys, Gloucestershire, Cumbria) seemed to be very high and at variance with the average.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCCs agreed it was very important that there was confidence in the numbers being used if there was to be confidence in the overall business case and the funding bid that would be considered by PRTB on 29th January. ▪ Mark Burns-Williamson reminded PCCs that the TF has been considered by the Gateway Group and recommended for adoption at PRTB on Monday. Notwithstanding this, Jo Ashworth agreed that confidence is very important and the figures for baseline efficiency would be rechecked and discussed with relevant PCCs ahead of the PRTB meeting. 	
Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date
(a) Figures for baseline efficiency in the draft Business Case to be rechecked.	Jo Ashworth (MBW)	29.01.18
(b) Discussions with relevant PCCs as necessary before PRTB considers the TF bid.	Jo Ashworth (MBW)	29.01.18
6.0	Item Title: Lynne Owens, Director General, National Crime Agency (NCA)	
	Key Updates (speakers):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lynne Owens: Referenced the NCA commitment to working with PCCs and that, as part of this commitment an NCA Director level or above had been allocated to each PCC regional meeting. ▪ She stated that there is a responsibility for the Agency to lead a whole system approach to Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) and PCCs have a responsibility under the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR). She suggested that the NCA will deliver an intelligence picture, ops and support forces and regions to do the same. ▪ She said that victims had not been served well by the way law enforcement is structured in this country. ▪ She mentioned the forensic complications and the resources required in other cases, and said that the traditional way of addressing crime would not have captured recent high-profile suspects. She noted a need for investment in undercover online. ▪ She said that the NCA are working up the case to government that the whole system approach to SOC is not currently resourced to the right level. She proposed that there were a number of areas which required additional resources including the NCA Data Exploitation Centre and the National Centre for Economic Crime. She also suggested that the national response to fraud was not in the right place, and that there were gaps in the ability to respond. ▪ She stated that targets are operating a funding model in a world of no boundaries and noted the importance of responding to threats at the right level. ▪ In terms of CSE, she said that there was a focus on those viewing online CSE as well as those physically involved. She suggested that the NCA were building capabilities to address this and were working with the CPS to develop national guidance. ▪ She noted that the bid to PRTB recommended an uplift in CSE, Economic and Cyber capabilities. ▪ She referenced concerns that each force is different and there is sometimes a cross over with NCA and said that evidence was needed to advise government on what the optimum delivery model looks like. She said that some capabilities wouldn't sit with the NCA – but PCCs would need reassurance about these. She suggested that a conversation was needed about what capability was needed and where it should sit – in the context of a national structure. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Acting Chair drew attention to the paper and asked PCCs to endorse the approach outlined in Annex A and invited questions from attendees. <p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lynne Owens reassured PCCs on the intention to make capabilities like undercover, held at ROCU level, as seamless as possible with NCA capabilities. ▪ Concern was expressed in relation to the difficulty of investigating complex fraud – Lynne Owens stated that the government recognise the scale of the problem and that policing and the NCA now needed to illustrate the scale of the response required and that this response should be systemised. She suggested that PCCs and Chiefs had not yet had a meaningful conversation about this, and that they needed to evidence what has been done, what needed to be done and what the cost would be. ▪ On the question of whether County Lines is fully integrated, Lynne Owens responded that it was and this was being nationally coordinated. ▪ On the question of resource pressures on forces, Lynne Owens stated that the NCA were bidding for funding from a number of different areas and that they were also restructuring internally looking at addressing duplication and looking at areas like reducing overtime. ▪ One PCC stated that he supported the bid but was concerned that the amount fell short. ▪ Concern was expressed that there would be an increase in the volume forces were dealing with and pressure on the courts. Lynne Owens stated that there was already increased pressure on courts and discussed the need to get the courts to understand the seriousness of CSE cases - particularly to get the courts to consider aggravating factors when sentencing. ▪ PCCs stated that they fully support the approach outlined in Annex A.
	<p>Item Title: Sir Philip Rutnam, Home Office Permanent Secretary</p> <p>Key Updates (speaker):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Julia Mulligan (as Acting Chair): Introduced Sir Philip Rutnam as the Home Office's new Permanent Secretary, and congratulated him on his knighthood. ▪ Sir Philip Rutnam: Opened by outlining his intention to discuss his experience at the Home Office for approximately 10 minutes, to be followed by questions from the floor. He said that he wanted to hear how PCCs think the Home Office could improve its interaction with them and with forces. ▪ He noted his experience at HM Treasury, and suggested he was keen to use this to make best possible submission around police funding. He said he would do this by working with PCCs, Chiefs and others in the Home Office. ▪ He suggested there was a need to recognise fundamental trends to gain popular support for more resourcing. He outlined these trends as; the changing nature of demand (particularly hidden/complex demand); changes due to globalisation and better technology. ▪ He advised that the fiscal context was also likely to continue, and that there was little prospect of a let up in financial restrictions. ▪ He noted that whilst technology had been a source of harm and exponential growth, it could also be an enabler of doing policing differently, and at lower costs. ▪ He also referenced the need to attract talented people into policing.

- He suggested that a spending review was coming at some point and they needed to think how to prepare for it; he proposed that a collaborative and effective approach was needed. He said that the strands to be considered included; efficiency, demand and productivity. He suggested that there was a need to consider how to define a portfolio of plans to change and invest over the medium term; technology/digital for the rollout of mobile technology (outcomes/productivity/ interface with customers) and major central programmes, such as ESMCP.
- He said that specialist capabilities were also key to addressing a changing world delivered in an efficient way.
- He discussed his motivation to make a success of this, as he suggested he recognised the value and importance of policing.

Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):

- Asked for his view on whether the Home Office has gone too far in its desire to see a self-reforming service, with negative outcomes.
- Asked about Home Office support for fire business cases.
- Asked about the intentions of local mayors to take over PCC roles, and questions about the capabilities of said mayors to fulfil the accountability role outlined in the establishment of PCCs.
- A. Sir Philip Rutnam suggested that there was a need to take system wide view to get good outcomes. He said that this can't be done across local areas, but that the Home Office needed to work with PCCs and Chiefs.
 - Regarding fire governance, he said it was important that fire business cases were considered rigorously, but he also acknowledged that there are time pressures.
 - Regarding mayors, he said that he was not aware of any proposal to change governance. The Acting Chair suggested there could be learning to be taken from the proposals in Yorkshire.
- Agreement expressed regarding a collaborative response to the CSR and questioned whether it would be sensible to do a Funding Formula review now to implement at the start of a post settlement review.
- Raised questions on productivity and efficiencies, and what savings targets will be, and also questions on longer term thinking /settlement arguments
- Noted that HM Treasury will take a longer term view in some areas e.g. defence – and queried whether policing could develop a case for similar treatment.
- A. Sir Philip Rutnam said he would take away questions on how productivity would be assessed.
 - Regarding the Funding formula, he said he had heard the concerns voiced and suggested that this would continue to be a subject of discussion.
 - Expressed concern about a fire case having not yet been approved.
 - Asked whether, in relation to drugs policing, the Home Office would look again at proposals to reduce harm and demand outside the existing approach.
 - Asked about his views regarding a general power of competence for PCCs, and the demand shift to policing from other partners. It is suggested that there is a conflict between Home Office policy and local authority funding.
 - Sir Philip Rutnam suggested he would continue to look at innovation in drugs policy but that the existing approach remains the framework they would work within.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He also suggested that he would take with him PCC's concerns regarding fire business cases and general power of competence.
8.0	<p>Item Title: AOB / Close</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There were no AOBs. The Acting Chair closed the meeting.
<p>Meeting Close</p>	