

Item 1.2: Minutes of the General Meeting – 16 May 2018

APCC – General Meeting – 16 May 2018 Venue: Emmanuel Centre, 9-23 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 3DW	
Item No.	Title
1.0	<p>Item Title: Workforce Transformation and Pay Reform</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCVC Ron Hogg: He noted that key elements of this agenda are expected by Government, and that the progress made on workforce reform will have an impact on the policing settlement in the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). ▪ He requested a SPOC in every PCC office, in connection to this work, and then introduced CC Francis Habgood. ▪ CC Francis Habgood: He introduced himself as NPCC Lead for Pay and Conditions, and outlined his intention to provide a brief overview of the workforce reform taken forward by College of Policing (CoP) and the NPCC Workforce Co-ordination Committee. ▪ He discussed how workforce reform related to the Policing Vision 2025, and said that this was a long-term transformation in policing that needed to be acted on now. ▪ He referenced an interactive PDF produced by CoP and NPCC, which provided a narrative for workforce transformation. ▪ He listed four different strands of work involved: entry routes, role definition and comparison, professional development, and linking payments to recognition of skills, competence and contribution. ▪ He described four key programmes in delivering reward reform: reform of initial recruitment processes, initial entry routes, professional development programme and advanced practitioner. ▪ With regard to reward, he noted that 2018/19 was the fourth year of the Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB) process, and discussed the NPCC principles for pay and reward; including a commitment to a national pay structure with flexibility. ▪ He provided reasons for this commitment, suggesting that if the workforce landscape changes then the current pay structure won't work. He also highlighted concerns about the structure as it is now, noting issues around detective recruitment. ▪ He emphasised that workforce and pay reform remained a key element in funding decisions, but added that policing needed to accept the benefits of these reforms in and of themselves. ▪ He noted four pay and reward workstreams: constable pay scale; P-factor; benchmarking and variable pay. He also mentioned the need to review Chief Officer pay, and suggested that the same methodology could also be used if PCCs supported that approach.
	Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The need for the process to recognise police staff, alongside officers, was emphasised from the floor. ▪ The number of ranks in policing was questioned, and concerns were raised about the lack of applicants for senior posts. ▪ A query was raised about the risk of the Police Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF) discriminating against parts of society that are disproportionately deterred by academic study, particularly economically deprived communities. ▪ The Police Staff Council (PSC) was supported from the floor as the appropriate place for police staff terms and conditions to be addressed, and questions around the living wage were raised. ▪ The competence based approach received support from the floor, and issues around the apprenticeship levy in Wales were discussed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Francis Habgood suggested that a lot of the reforms that had been discussed in his presentation referred to both police officers and police staff, and he expressed his excitement around Advanced Practitioner for PCSOs. He also noted that his presentation had also been made at the PSC. ○ He suggested that all proposals needed to be tested against the aspirations of the living wage, and described the apprenticeship approach as a fantastic opportunity to recruit from deprived communities and support social mobility. ○ He noted a previous review of ranks, which found no evidence base to support the removal of ranks, but emphasised that in practice it came down to organisational design. ○ He discussed the challenges around senior recruitment, and noted other important elements in addition to pay such as tax, pensions and expenses. ○ He noted the concerns raised from the floor around the apprenticeship level in Wales, and agreed to carry on the discussion with PCCs.
2.0	<p>Item Title: Minutes and Chair Updates</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Lloyd, as APCC Chair: He noted the minutes from the last meeting, and discussed the status of the agreed actions. ▪ He updated PCCs on the issues discussed at the most recent APCC Board Meeting, starting with the Articles of Governance. On this issue, he noted robust ongoing discussions between PCCs and emphasised the importance of having clarity about the next steps ahead of the APCC AGM in July. ▪ He referenced APCC Board discussions on Brexit, and noted concerns about the cross-cutting impact on policing. He recognised the hesitance to rely on the model of national leads, but suggested that for this issue the agreed approach was for each political group to nominate a Brexit lead. ▪ He noted the ongoing discussions around PCC security, in particular concerning tax relief. He reported that HMRC would be considering each case on its merits. He reported that he had questioned Lord Bew about why PCCs were left out of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) 'Intimidation in public life' report.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He reminded PCCs to send views on the CSPL consultation to Oliver Shaw, APCC Secretariat, and noted that the issue would continue to be raised with the Home Office by Susannah Hancock, APCC Chief Executive. ▪ He further reminded PCCs to complete the APCC Feedback Survey, and said that the results would be used to inform the development of the APCC Business Plan. ▪ He noted the Police Reform Summit, to be held on 7 July 2018, and informed PCCs that the Policing Minister and the Home Office Permanent Secretary will attend. He then reminded colleagues to sign up for it. ▪ He informed PCCs that Clarissa Hawthorne would be starting at the APCC Secretariat, on a seconded basis, to take forward proactive comms activity as part of the communications team. ▪ PCC Paddy Tipping, as Chair of the Police Reform and Transformation Board: He reiterated the importance of the Police Reform Summit, and further emphasised the role of this work ahead of the next CSR. ▪ He reflected positively on the joint work between the APCC and NPCC with regard to the previous year’s CSR, and suggested that this had led to a better outcome than would have otherwise been delivered. ▪ He suggested that the focus this time would need to be on meeting the asks made by the Home Office with regard to policing reform, and noted that there would also be some conversations proceeding about what the next CSR might involve. ▪ He outlined the key factors as workforce reform and pay reform, police digital, and a greater focus on collaboration and efficiencies through the National Commercial Board. ▪ He noted that the APCC had been working with NPCC and the Home Office to develop a route-map document, outlining the reforms needed in advance of the CSR. ▪ With regard to transformation funding, he explained that this is limited to the current CSR, and said that a strategy needed to be prepared to explore how reform will be continued after this. ▪ He noted that the CSR would involve strong competition from all government departments, so a strong case for policing funding needed to be developed.
Tea and Coffee	
3.0	<p>Item Title: Critical Incident Management and Governance Process</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Lloyd: He presented the proposal developed by the APCC Task and Finish Group (TFG). ▪ He informed members that the TFG had consisted of five PCCs, APACE, PaCCTS and the NPCC. ▪ He noted that the TFG had developed core principles; that an incident must have a national bearing, that it followed an operational recommendation, that a monetary cap was imposed and that there must be an immediate requirement to commit funds. ▪ He explained the proposal for the APCC Chair to have an Executive Power to commit funds on behalf of all PCCs, to be committed following a consultation with another PCC, CFO, NPCC and a Monitoring Officer. ▪ He further outlined the proposal, which specified that funds would be accessed from the PCC’s force making the decision.

- He added that the process would be underwritten by a s22 Collaboration Agreement, and that a review would follow any use of the process.
- He then asked the meeting to:
 - Provide a steer as to whether there was broad agreement or need for the process
 - Agree the process
 - Propose alternatives should this process not be adopted
- He suggested that a 'do nothing' was not an option, and noted that the Home Office were not likely to change their stance on their requirement for PCCs to agree a process.

Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A)

- Several members proposed that the Home Office should take all or more responsibility, particularly when the incident in question results from Government policy – such as the disbanding of the Forensic Science Service, it was suggested.
 - David Lloyd acknowledged the concerns raised, though he added that policing was the responsibility of PCCs and that occasions would arise in which PCCs needed to act in conduit.
 - He further noted that the Key Forensics Service (KFS) incident wasn't about bailing out the companies involved, but it was about ensuring that rape and homicide cases were not compromised by any inaction.
 - He also raised the possibility that if PCCs didn't act, then the Home Office would impose a solution which involved taking some PCC powers away.
- Concerns were raised that the process could be used for bad contract management, and some forces would be bailing out others where they had not applied due diligence.
 - David Lloyd pointed out a S22 Agreement could stipulate that only forces impacted would be required to reimburse the paying force.
- Some members felt a process was unnecessary and were unclear as to where the gap was currently. Members also asked for examples, in addition to those mentioned in the paper, where the process could be used.
 - David Lloyd agreed more examples were required, but he referenced the challenge of predicting what might happen. He said that there was a requirement to understand the level of risk nationally and this was work that needed to be completed.
- Some members expressed a view that this was another ask for PCCs to underwrite or pay for services out of their direct control and setting a precedent that PCC's would bail out failing contracts.
- Some members were concerned about 'earmarking' reserves for the process. Reserve funds were fully accounted for and local contingency plans were in place.
- Some members agreed that PCCs needed to show leadership and that a process was required, though felt further work was required in relation to unknown risks and further examples.
- Members expressed gratitude and were positive about the way that the KFS matter was dealt with at such short notice, and said that the concerns noted today should not take away from their important contribution.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David Lloyd summarised the views of members as indicating a level of support for a process, but that there first needs to be a clear understanding of what the process would be used for and the framework of how it might be used. In addition, he noted that more work was requested by members on understanding the risk nationally and the responsibility of PCCs in relation to those risks. He summarised; ○ Home Office role - There was a strong view from several members that the Home Office should be taking more of a lead role in this area, particularly where incidents arise from government policy (such as closure of the FSS) and beyond the control of PCCs. ○ Examples needed - There was a broad requirement for further examples of when the process would be used, and a strong feeling that any fund should not be used to bail out failing companies, or to provide 'insurance' to the private sector. ○ Mission creep - There was a concern the government will use this process to 'offload' other liabilities onto PCCs. ○ Understanding risk - Work was required (with the NPCC and PACCTs) to understand the level of risk nationally. A view was expressed that risks such as KFS should have been known and mitigating factors put in place. ○ Wider roles and responsibilities in policing - This led to the broader issue of the wider policing landscape and understanding the respective roles and responsibilities of PCCs and the government. ○ Impact on communities - Several PCCs recognised that we need to take responsibility, and this was required due to the impact to local communities of any inaction. 												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 1048 935 1117">Approved / Agreed Actions</th> <th data-bbox="935 1048 1315 1117">Responsible Person</th> <th data-bbox="1315 1048 1495 1117">Due Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 1117 935 1256">More work required on a National Risk register to understand the level and nature of the risks PCCs may be exposed to.</td> <td data-bbox="935 1117 1315 1256">APCC/ PACCTs</td> <td data-bbox="1315 1117 1495 1256">18/7/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 1256 935 1361">Identify further examples of where the process may be used</td> <td data-bbox="935 1256 1315 1361">APCC</td> <td data-bbox="1315 1256 1495 1361">18/7/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 1361 935 1464">Reconvene Task and Finish Group to develop further proposal</td> <td data-bbox="935 1361 1315 1464">APCC</td> <td data-bbox="1315 1361 1495 1464">18/7/18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date	More work required on a National Risk register to understand the level and nature of the risks PCCs may be exposed to.	APCC/ PACCTs	18/7/18	Identify further examples of where the process may be used	APCC	18/7/18	Reconvene Task and Finish Group to develop further proposal	APCC	18/7/18
Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date											
More work required on a National Risk register to understand the level and nature of the risks PCCs may be exposed to.	APCC/ PACCTs	18/7/18											
Identify further examples of where the process may be used	APCC	18/7/18											
Reconvene Task and Finish Group to develop further proposal	APCC	18/7/18											
4.0	<p>Item Title: Portfolio Updates</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Munro - EDHR: He noted the shift in some forces to identify race as a specific top priority, with other protected characteristics as secondary priorities, and cautioned members on this approach due to his concern about a resulting lack of attention to the other protected characteristics. ▪ He acknowledged that this was a local decision in terms of setting priorities, and proposed that the APCC EDHR Portfolio would not be advocating a position on this. ▪ Regarding Stop and Search, he remarked that criticisms had shifted from concerns about its excessive use to concerns about its lack of use. 												

- He noted his own view that Stop and Search was in approximately the right position, which he described as better regulated and more targeted. He said that the joint NPCC/APCC working group would explore whether this position needed to be refined.
- **PCC Vera Baird – Transparency and Integrity:** She referred members to the written APCC Transparency and Integrity Portfolio Update.
- She asked for members' views on indemnity for Legally Qualified Chairs (LQCs), and suggested that there was an imperative to agree a common position.
- Although both the HO and her view was that judicial immunity attached to LQCs, the strong legal advice from the opinion commissioned by Cleveland is that, if sued or judicially reviewed, LQCs would have to engage in the initial part of the proceedings, including seeking their own legal advice, until these reached the point where the court would say there is immunity.
- She said this position was about providing reassurance to LQCs, and outlined the risks to LQCs.
- She added that this also related to covering the provisional costs in these cases, and noted the existing lack of court precedent.
- She suggested it would be better to have a united position, and re-emphasised that she and the Portfolio have favoured the indemnity as phrased in the accompanying slides, which excludes anything done in bad faith, obvious irregularity etc.
 - Members approved the definition and the proposed way forward.
- As another item of business, she asked for members' views on the proposal for PCCs to be able to demote Chief Constables.
 - Members clearly expressed the view that this was a bad proposal, and Vera Baird agreed.
- **PFCC Roger Hirst – Fire and Emergency Services Collaboration:** He noted the new Police, Fire and Crime Commissioners (PFCCs), and said that this had raised the issue of PCC representation on the employers' side of the National Joint Council.
- He explained the proposal for the APCC to be given the right to appoint to this side, without going through the LGA.
- He suggested this would be a positive move, which would entitle PCCs to one seat. He added that this membership would involve a joining fee, which would be split between the PFCCs.
- **PFCC Roger Hirst – Funding Formula, CSR and Grants:** Regarding reserves statements, he noted that the Home Office had done a preliminary screen of PCC websites to identify how easily accessible this information is.
- He suggested PCCs check their websites with regard to this accessibility, in advance of further checks of PCCs website to ensure standards of transparency are upheld.
- **PCC Hardyal Dhindsa – Alcohol and Substance Misuse:** Noted two calls for evidence; one from the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) with relation to the custody-community transition, and another from the Portfolio with regard to measuring the impact of Local Alcohol Action Areas (LAAAs).
- He mentioned the APCC Deep Dive on Drugs from the previous day, and explained how it had really demonstrated both the focus on drugs within SVS and the interest from Home Office on developing the role of PCCs in relation to this.
- He told members about his attendance at the next Drug Strategy Board, and described it as a real opportunity to develop an ask in this area. He asked for any information to be shared with the APCC Secretariat.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Lloyd – CJS: He suggested that a corner had been turned at the National Criminal Justice Board (NCJB), and that a broad agreement had been reached around PCCs having a wider role in terms of CJS. ▪ He updated members on the issues discussed at the NCJB, and talked about a broader role for PCCs relating to ensuring compliance with Victims Code of Practice. He also proposed that this would be a substantive item at the July AGM. ▪ He advised that, in discussions with civil servants at the Ministry of Justice, there was general support for getting pilots arranged in terms of expanding the PCC role. He said that the APCC would make sure PCCs are kept updated on this, both within the Portfolio Group and more widely.
<p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Munro – he was advised that four short films had been made on ‘mate crime’ in Gwent, and suggested making these short films more available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David Munro agreed that this would be a good idea. ▪ PCC David Munro – he was asked whether the S163 pilot scheme (relating to traffic stops), had been factored into the work of the joint working group? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David Munro said that it had; he noted that there were wildly divergent views on this, and suggested that police forces had concerns about extending the Stop and Search regimes to this. He said that this needed to be sorted out in a measured way. ▪ PCC David Munro – he was cautioned about setting national guidelines, with the differing local contexts cited in relation to disproportionality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David Munro noted these concerns. ▪ PCC Vera Baird – she was told that her summary was helpful, and agreed that PCCs are in a difficult situation. It was suggested that discussions with LQCs on the issue of indemnity had alarmed them locally. Two solutions were noted; a legal precedent, or explicit indemnity in legislation. It was also noted that the requirement to have LQCs had been a Home Office decision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vera Baird suggested that that certainty would emerge, as the Home Office had agreed in a letter to the APCC that there was judicial immunity for LQCs. ▪ PCC Vera Baird – she was advised on the local situation of LQCs declining the role, demanding indemnity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She welcomed the provision of additional context, and noted that this was also true in other areas. ▪ PFCC Roger Hirst – an interest was raised in publishing a breakdown of the top slice, alongside the information on reserves levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Roger Hirst noted the proposal. ▪ PCC David Lloyd – as an instructive example, he was advised on the All Wales Criminal Justice Board becoming part of a wider partnership involving Public Health Wales, and suggested that this progressed as PCCs didn’t want for approval from Ministry of Justice to proceed. It was suggested that this same process could be following on a regional basis in England.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David Lloyd welcomed this information, and encouraged all members to get involved and tell the story about what they have already done locally to expand their role with the CJS. 						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Approved / Agreed Actions</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Responsible Person</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Due Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date			
Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date					
Lunch							
5.0	<p>Item Title: Serious Violence Strategy</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Lloyd: He introduced Nick Hunt, Head of the Tackling Crime Unit at the Home Office. ▪ Nick Hunt, Home Office: He explained his intention to provide an an overview of the Serious Violence Strategy (SVS), and to note the next steps. ▪ He described the SVS as a multi-strand approach to tackling the national problem of serious violence, which incorporated over sixty commitments. ▪ He noted that the SVS identified expanding drug markets as a major causal factor leading to increased serious violence, and made the connection with the issue of county lines. He said that NCA had been provided with £3.6m funding for a new National County Lines Coordination Centre. ▪ He also outlined the changing demographics, with an increase in young offenders and victims also connected to county lines. He noted the £11m new Early Intervention Youth Fund, which he said would be launched in the summer to help with projects that addressed the root causes of serious violence through early intervention and prevention. ▪ He suggested that PCCs and local groups like Community Safety Partnerships had a key role to play in helping to deliver both the new Early Intervention Youth Fund (EIYF) and the overall strategy. ▪ PCC David Lloyd: He added that he would summarise the key points made at the Serious Violence task and finish group (TFG) that had met the previous day. ▪ He reported that the decision of which PCC would chair the TFG had been postponed to the next meeting, but it was agreed that he would be attending the June SVS Task Force meeting. ▪ He noted that the Home Office had been advised that greater PCC representation on the Task Force would help strengthen the body, and help ensure balance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nick Hunt suggested that the Home Office would be looking to keep the core group as it is, but that the Task Force would be inviting additional representatives depending on the agenda. ▪ David Lloyd said that there had been agreement that the agreed terms of reference should reflect the need for urgency and have a specific focus on short term objectives. He also said there had been agreement to divide the work into packages, with different leads on each. ▪ Regarding the EIFY, he suggested there was a preference expressed for an evidence-based approach with projects that built on existing activity and, where there had been recent agreement locally to fund such schemes, a desire had been noted that this be used as match funding to build bigger schemes. 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ He said that this was intended to assist with making applications more straightforward, as the existing evidence base justification could be utilised, and added that the Home Office had agreed to a speedy approval process. ▪ He noted some concerns from members regarding the amount of funding, and the context of investment in children and youth provision. He also mentioned that a number of members had emphasised that much could be achieved with only small amounts of funding. ▪ He referenced a preference from one or two members that funding be devolved to PCCs, given their experience of commissioning schemes.
	<p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several members welcomed the Government’s focus on this important area, and they raised a number of issues which needed addressing in this space; ▪ A member suggested there was a need to get local children’s services fully engaged, which would require national Task Force pressure. ▪ A member raised a concern around the current threshold at which social workers can intervene re safeguarding being too high. ▪ A few members noted issues around school exclusions, and the connection with youth crime and vulnerability. ▪ A number of members supported more enforcement powers for police. ▪ A few members suggested that improved data sharing was needed. ▪ A member called for the Home Office to look again at increasing the amount of proceeds of crime that go back to local areas. ▪ A number of members emphasised the need for urgency, including in the utility and usability of the EIYF. ▪ A member requested a clarification of the role of PCCs in relation to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), and urged the Home Office to ensure that the work and funding of the SVS continue beyond the next two years. ▪ One member emphasised the importance of sharing good practice. ▪ A member draw attention to the strong overlap with the Drug Strategy Board, and the work of the APCC Alcohol and Substance Misuse Portfolio. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nick Hunt welcomed the opportunity to work closely on the design of the EIYF, and he noted that local partnership working would be very important in delivering the SVS. ○ He offered to take the proposal regarding proceeds of crime back to his colleagues ○ He agreed on the need to share good practice, and suggested that there could be a role for the national and regional events that the Home Office were intending to set up in serving this need. ○ He noted that the Department for Education had commissioned an exclusions review which would conclude by the autumn, and that the Home Office were engaging in this given the linkages to County Lines.
6.0	<p>Item Title: Development of the Police ICT Company</p> <p>Key Updates (speakers):</p>

- **PCC Paddy Tipping:** He introduced the item, as Chair of the Police Reform and Transformation Board (PRTB).
- He noted that a number of large police technology programmes – such as Digital Policing (DDP) and the National Enabling Programmes (NEP) – were being supported by the Police Transformation Fund (PTF).
- He suggested that these programmes were moving now from the development to the delivery phase and, in so doing, illustrated the critical dependency of the role of a ‘contracting authority’.
- He outlined how this role includes the negotiation and management of contracts and charging and payment arrangements supported by the necessary governance, and that to undertake this role, any contracting authority needed access to sufficient capital reserves to underwrite any contractual liabilities.
- He explained that the only three options to meet this critical need were the Home Office, a lead force or a third-party organisation such as the Police ICT Company. He acknowledged that the lead force model would continue to be an option but noted that this was not without its difficulties, as evidenced by the recent experiences of the national programmes.
- The meeting noted the challenges highlighted in the report and that these lay behind the Police Reform and Transformation Board’s (PRTB) recommendation to explore the potential for the Police ICT Company to perform a third-party role.
- He acknowledged that in the past the Company had been difficult to support, but outlined the view of the PRTB that the Company was now heading in the right direction and the preference would be for PCCs to underwrite the Company.
- He said it was accepted that the Company needed significant development for PCCs and other stakeholders to have confidence in its capabilities, and that the PRTB support funding of up to £5m in 18/19 for the development of the Company to invest in the new Chief Executive’s vision and target operating model.
- He added that Home Office agreement to release the funding was conditional on there being sufficient capital available to the Company and for PCCs to contribute to this.
- He suggested that the options for raising additional capital needed further detailed work and, earlier that day, PACCTS had agreed to set up a Task and Finish Group with both Chief Finance Officers and the Company to undertake this work and report back.
- He said that PCCs were being asked at this meeting for a decision in principle to support the capitalisation of the Company and the detailed working up of proposals.
- **PCC Katy Bourne:** She reminded the General Meeting that PCCs owned the Police ICT Company, and suggested that this was a defining moment for PCCs to demonstrate their support for the Company and its future development.
- She reiterated Paddy Tipping’s concerns about the ‘contracting authority’ role, and emphasised that the only credible alternative to the ICT Company to undertake this role was that of a ‘lead force’ with an individual PCC taking the lead.
- She noted that, for Digital Policing, Sussex had recently taken on an interim contracting authority role, but this meant underwriting programmes worth £80 million, which, for a medium size force like Sussex, was a very significant undertaking.
- She suggested that the Police ICT Company was the obvious choice as delivery vehicle and contracting authority for major technology programmes like DPP and NEP. She said that the

Company was being developed for this purpose with a new Business Case, Vision and 100 Day Plan, but added that its current capital reserves were insufficient compared to the size of the technology programmes which need support.

- Therefore, she noted, PCCs were asked for a decision in principle to support capitalisation and agree work on detailed options, that could be considered at the General Meeting in July.

Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):

- A number of members queried what actual benefits forces would obtain for the additional capitalisation of the Company?
 - **Ian Bell** (Chief Executive of the Police ICT Company) detailed the work of the Company in securing commercial and other efficiency savings – worth £12.6 million in the last year and exceeding the target of £8m. He added that all PCCs had now received Force Delivery Statements from the Company showing what their force had gained from the Company’s work.
 - He discussed how the Company was now working with the National Commercial Board to identify and deliver an additional £56 million of efficiency savings in policing ICT.
 - He asked members to consider that realising the benefits from the new digital and technology programmes was dependent upon having an effective contracting authority, and that the Company would require new capitalisation to support this.
- Members queried what other options there might be if it was not to be the Company or a lead force as a contracting authority?
 - It was noted that this was not a role the Home Office wanted to take on, and questions were raised about the cost effectiveness of the national ICT systems that the Home Office are currently providing to forces.
- Several members expressed their support in principle, but said they needed to know more about the Business Case and 100 Day Plan, and they sought assurance that capitalisation was not the only means being offered to change the Company.
- It was agreed the Business Case and 100 Day Plan would be circulated to all PCCs. CIOs are signed up to the Company plans and can advise PCCs.
- Members noted that capitalisation had been raised with Chief Constables by CC Sara Thornton, had been discussed at Chiefs’ Council and that Chiefs had indicated their support for the development of the Company and acknowledged the capitalisation needed.
- A number of members suggested that more work needed to be done.
- A number of members agreed the Company was at a cross-road and it was key that there was sufficient capital behind the Company to take on the big technology contracts.
- Paddy Tipping acknowledged that it was not possible to give an assured view on the quantum required for capitalisation until further work had been done, however he indicated his early thinking was that it may be similar to the level of investment to develop the Company.
- The General Meeting was advised that Lincolnshire was the only force in England and Wales not in membership of the Police ICT Company as they needed to be convinced about the value of a £60,000 subscription. However, PCC Marc Jones indicated that, having been convinced of this, Lincolnshire would now be joining the Company; a decision welcomed by the meeting.
- Members, in supporting the case for capitalisation, agreed that the commercial activities of the Company, and that the opportunities for income generation, should be fully exploited within

	the new business plan. If the Company could be financially self-supporting, it was suggested that this would obviously reduce the call on PCCs to provide financial support in future.		
	Approved / Agreed Actions	Responsible Person	Due Date
	That PCCs support the principle that the Police ICT Company requires capitalisation to undertake the role of contracting authority in high value contracts.	All PCCs	27.04.18
	That APCC support the Company and PACCTS to analyse the options for capitalisation by Commissioners and help to draw-up detailed proposals and recommendations to be considered at the General Meeting in July.	Ian Bell / Jacky Courtney / Paul Dutton / Darren Garwood (PACCTS)	06.07.18
	That the Company's Business Case, 100 Day Plan and any other relevant documentation are circulated to PCCs.	Ian Bell	24.05.18
	That the Board of the Police ICT Company consider the future governance of the Company, in particular the role and influence of PCCs, and, as necessary, bring proposals to a future General Meeting.	PCC Katy Bourne / Ian Bell	17.05.18 and tbc.
7.0	Item Title: AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCC David Lloyd: He reminded members that the next meeting of the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Policing and Security, on 21 May 2018, would concern the SVS. ▪ He also noted that a media drinks reception would be held at the APCC Offices on 17 July, in advance of the AGM. 		
Meeting Close			