

APCC – General Meeting Minutes – 20 March 2019

Venue: National Crime Agency Conference Centre, Citadel Place, Spring Gardens, Tinworth Street, London, SE11 5EF

Item No.	Title
1.0	<p>Item Title: Welcome & Minutes</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): Mark Burns-Williamson OBE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair welcomed everybody to the meeting and thanked the NCA for hosting it and for a number of other events they had hosted recently and will be hosting shortly. • Graeme Biggar, in his new role as Director General of the National Economic Crime Centre at the NCA, also welcomed everyone to Spring Gardens. The NCA will be hosting an event for PCCs the next day to explain their role and how they link to territorial policing. • The following items from the minutes of the last General Meeting were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The finance and spending review: Work was ongoing regarding how PCCs were using precept rises locally. The action relating to PA Consulting was also on the agenda for later. - Outline Business Cases for Business Enablers: PCC views were being collated ahead of a proposed discussion on a Full Business Case at the July General Meeting. - Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP): Discussion of the ESMCP was deferred to a future General Meeting. - Francis Habgood’s letter to Philip Rutnam: This letter has been circulated. • There were no other matters arising and the minutes of the last meeting were agreed.
2.0	<p>Item Title: Finance Portfolio and Prevention Research</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): PFCC Roger Hirst; PCC Paddy Tipping; Neil Amos PA Consulting</p> <p>PFCC Roger Hirst (APCC Finance lead):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the recent SR Senior Sector Group meeting on February 27th, the Minister used the session to reshape the direction of the work. For reference the 4 Pillars for this work are: Increasing capacity and capability; Crime prevention; Better support for frontline officers; and Building a smarter police system. • The general feedback from this meeting was that it will be difficult to deliver this work in the time that is available. A 1 year rollover will probably be announced in July but this will be too tight for the November budget. • Roger stated that we need to be alert to the possibility of another year when Council Tax payers do the heavy lifting and that we need to be equitable and fairer as it should not be up to the local taxpayer to shoulder the burden in this way. We need to fit this into our ongoing discussion and narrative with the Home Office and in relation to the 2020/2021 Settlement. • A big change in our SR focus is the increased lens on what works in relation to crime prevention. PA Consulting have done some work for us on this and will be presenting this today.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference was also made to the work that Mark Sedwill is doing which involves an audit of who is doing what on SV across government. <p>Neil Amos (PA Consulting):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neil stated that PA had been commissioned by the APCC and NPCC to look at the impact of crime prevention and the cost benefits of current approaches. PA were working closely with Professor Gloria Laycock on this and their focus was on what could be delivered by PCCs and police forces. Neil reported there was some strong academic work out there in relation to this but it was weak in terms of analysis and research of cost and benefits. Many of the crime prevention initiatives were small scale and much of the research was historic. One of the most important findings was that how you do crime prevention is as important as what you do. PA had looked at 55 crime prevention initiatives. 32 had delivered a positive effect that stood up to rigorous scrutiny but some had not worked whilst others had delivered broader effects. Tailored approaches that were locally relevant, had targeted a specific problem and were based on robust research had been more successful. More success had been achieved where there was robust training, strong analytical experience, crime prevention knowledge and infrastructure. <p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst we should be making the case for funding policing, we should reference the public health approach as we have evidence of impact there. We need to cost this into the CSR work. Answer: Whilst this is more Gloria Laycock’s area of expertise PA could look at how crime prevention fits into a broader approach. Is there sufficient quantum to draw definitive conclusions? Answer: There are a few large scale national initiatives you can point to and say they definitely work. The SVC review included the Scottish work and shows they had an impact based on targeted deterrence work. It shows that it is better targeting those that are in the system early rather than conducting more dispersed early intervention work. The cut of the cake is wrong and we need to deal with this in the round. Answer: You are correct that the distribution is as important as the quantum. It has always been the policy position that the core grant distribution formula is broken and needs fixing. However it is clear we will not come back to this until we have done the CSR. Paddy said we need to get the prevention message out there. The Spring Statement indicates timetabling and unless there is a no deal Brexit we have a 1 year rollover into next year. What is important is the anticipated further reliance on Policing Precept to plug the gap. We need to draw a line and the time is close.
3.0	<p>Item Title: Victims and CJS Portfolios</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): Edward Argar MP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Minister set out the unique role played by PCCs in respect of victims and witness which has grown and evolved significantly and has brought justice and the CJS closer to the communities that they serve. PCCs are able to form a whole system view of the CJS but one that is rooted in local communities. Most people’s contact with CJS is as a victim of crime and we need to encourage a joined up integrated approach. The Minister provided some examples of work that PCCs were taking forward in this area such as West Mercia’s new victims’ advice line, Sussex’s victim focused approach and work being done by Leicestershire and Cambridgeshire. The monitoring of VCOP compliance also represented an important local role for PCCs and joint work was ongoing developing a compliance framework to ensure compliance is not a tick box process and measures quality of service. Initial consultations on amending VCOP which is aimed at addressing complexity and accessibility will be held but PCCs should not wait for this if they wish to feed in their views.

- The Government's Victims Strategy places victims and their journey at its heart, has listened to their voice and is about creating services that meet their needs. This cross government strategy looks at the whole system and includes proposals to improve the court process for victims and recognises this is a cross party issue we can all work together on. The Government had delivered on many of their commitments through working with the APCC such as on pilots to explore the full local commissioning of **SV** services.
- On the law relating to victims we need to look at what is needed to underpin the entitlements for victims so that they are not a victim of the process as well as a victim of the crime. We also need to work together to share and learn together through working in partnership as the victim does not see the different parts of the system.
- The Minister reaffirmed his commitment to work closely with PCCs and also referenced a wide range of other actions (such as the review of CICA) that PCCs may wish to cover in Q&A.

Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):

- The issue of victims of major frauds and NDAs that come with any compensation for victims of bank fraud was raised.
Answer: Fraud is one of the biggest and most complex challenges we face. We have spoken with the HMT around this issue and we will continue to take this work forward.
- We have done quite a lot of work on victim's journey in the CJS but the difficulty in the court process is that it works against a seamless journey and victim satisfaction then falls away.
Answer: We have made some progress on this and PCCs have been a key catalyst in it and we are continuing to work in this space.
- No one owns domestic violence at a local level in terms of statutory responsibility.
Answer: You are right to point this out, it is a complicated landscape with multiple responsibilities. We are seeking to increase the sustainability of funding for services and move to 3 year funding and away from multiple funding to make it easier for services. We are also mapping all women's centres in the country and the financial health of them. We held a recent victims' event with courts and there was a sense of the need to join up the system to develop an end to end process.
- The Tampon Tax £1M turnover threshold frustratingly went to big national organisations. The Witness Service is also not meeting the needs of young victims and witnesses nationally.
Answer: This is a good point about smaller organisations needing access to funding and we will look into the young witness point too.
- There are serious issues with CSA victims not being supported by NHS provision. The Rural Crime Network is also about to publish research on Domestic Abuse in a similar vein.
Answer: We are happy to take all this work forward.
- There is a major piece of work on CJS transformation and PCCs would appreciate further discussions with Ministers about this.
Answer: We are happy to do this.

Vera Baird session on VCOP compliance:

- Procedural justice and how victims are communicated with is key to victim satisfaction. The number of victims dropping out is increasing significantly across all offences. Only 45% of witnesses would give evidence again. It is about quality as well as quantity and we need to learn what best practice is already out there.

Key points raised by PCC (Q&A):

- There is a legacy issue for long time victims that has not been taken seriously. Judges need to be won around but the police are also a key part of this.
Answer: The point of using LCJBs is that they are already a key part of the local partnership landscape. This has worked well in Northumbria.
- We need to come around to the idea of a Victim's law as a way of getting the police to do what they need to do.

	<p>Answer: PCCs need to work with the MOJ on VCOP compliance which will then provide evidence to argue for a Victims Law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can understand how this falls down in terms of policing. Surely there is a role for technology to support the CJS to provide automated information? <p>Answer: Claire Waxman is publishing a report on compliance tomorrow which will be shared.</p>
4.0	<p>Item Title: Address from the Rt Hon Nick Hurd MP, Minister of State for Policing and the Fire Service</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): Rt Hon Nick Hurd MP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nick Hurd reported that the policing service currently faces a huge number of issues and that prioritisation is important. The single biggest priority is securing more resources as the service is too stretched. Small steps have been taken in previous years but it is always clear that the major prize and opportunity is CSR. There are still things we do not know which are linked to Brexit. • Nick felt that the core elements to a successful CSR bid include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of demand and cost pressures: We need strong analysis, a smart more for more argument and a compelling story about efficiency and productivity. We need to define a police productivity plan that involves the use of technology and support for frontline policing. - Change and improvement plan: We need a plan what is owned by the system. Policing is managing a huge amount of change, maybe too much, but we have not yet brought it together into a coherent narrative around continuous improvement. We have however articulated 4 Pillars for policing including crime prevention, better support for the frontline and a smarter police system. • In terms of where next, a conversation needs to be had about building and delivering national capabilities including technology delivery; the need for central funding to drive innovation; tackling SOC and the future funding of ROCUs and the NCA; and addressing CSE. • There are a whole set of system issues. The challenge to PCCs is how do you respond to this? We understand your priority is to your voters and you also have responsibilities as part of a system that is under pressure. How you as a group step into that and respond to a change and improvement plan is Nick Hurd’s challenge to PCCs. • This is a necessary condition and we need to work together closely. The Home Office have looked at everything we can see that is being done within 4 pillars and are able to share it with the APCC within 2 to 3 weeks. We need someone from the APCC to work with us to improve that which needs to be done it by the end of June. • We have to communicate to the centre that this is a service that has learnt and has a plan to deal with systemic issues. We need to make an imperfect system work better and you have a responsibility to help do that. <p>Key points raised by PCCs and Nick Hurd (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCCs said that it has been difficult to invest in prevention and we all want to see a rebalancing of investment and some crossover into prevention. There is a more proactive role for the Home Office in prevention and we need to use the Home Office’s power to convene discussions and include the business sector e.g on moped crime, motor vehicle crime and burglary. We have a joint responsibility to convene those stakeholders that can do something about it and that extends beyond the police. Please also include the rural community in anything on vehicle theft. • Regarding the next iteration of the PRTB we need more clarity around roles at a national level. • PCCs are on the same page as the Minister. We need a systems approach but we currently have a fragmented approach. Given the amount of change we need to think carefully about a more strategic approach and strategic body and funds in the centre. We need to sit down to agree this

	<p>with an effective delivery mechanism. We need collective agreement on a plan and need to look at delivery, governance and accountability and what you want to do first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to persuade the Treasury why this will be different and we need a credible account. We welcome acknowledgement that the Home Office has been too passive. Can we agree a set of core outcomes that sit in parallel with local plans? • It is all too easy to talk of collaboration as a panacea. The question is about how it is being led and managed. We should encourage it of course but it is not being managed as a system. • The devolved system is better than the one it replaced. Where things are going wrong the desire to take funding back into the centre is not necessarily right. There are fewer pots of money, we need to look at core funding and there is a greater role for the Home Office in convening. • We are localist by instinct but have responsibilities to a system that is too fragmented. • There needs to be a significant ask for the NCA and the battle against economic crime. The message is about prioritisation. If we do not get all the resources then we are in the prioritisation business. We need to resist the urge to draw funding back. As much core funding as possible should be awarded. • We need to resolve the link between national, regional and local. More and more needs to be delivered regionally and nationally. Future funding structures could deliver that change. • We need investment in prevention. We need to see crime coming down and the Home Office are your biggest allies in making that happen. It is about reprioritising and preventing much better. Look at our prevention work and tell us what more you need. • The Home Office will be a more active partner in the collective endeavour. We need to get the balance right, otherwise we will spend a lot of money on a system that does not deliver good outcomes. As politicians we need to determine what the priorities of the public are.
--	--

Tea and Coffee	
-----------------------	--

5.0	<p>Item Title: Chair's Update</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): APCC Chair Mark Burns-Williamson OBE; Susannah Hancock APCC CEO</p> <p>APCC Chair Mark Burns-Williamson OBE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Burns-Williamson provided an update of the APCC's work in relation to serious violence. • Several PCCs also attended the Ministerial Roundtable event on March 19th which was chaired by Nick Hurd. The meeting was very positive with Ministers committing to engage fully with PCCs. The key asks of Government were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need for a strategic long-term approach - Sustainable and guaranteed funding - A request to bring wider partners and stakeholders together - A commitment to work more closely with PCCs. • Following the announcement of £100M of police funding to combat serious violence, £60M of this will be for 'surge' policing and £30M for PCCs for setting up Violence Reduction Units. The APCC are assisting the Home Office on the design of the allocation mechanism and PCCs have been clear they do not want an overly bureaucratic formal bidding process. The APCC Serious Violence Working Group continues to meet and will oversee the proposals. • The meeting was reminded of the recently published 'PCCs Making a difference – Serious Violence in focus' which has been warmly received. • Meetings had taken place with the newly appointed NPCC Chair, Martin Hewitt, and work on the CSR is progressing. <p>APCC CEO Susannah Hancock:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was provided with the following details and options on the General Meeting 'refresh':
-----	---

	<p>Aims / Objectives: Aims/objectives will be clearly set out in agenda items in order to encourage Group discussion of key issues ahead of time.</p> <p>The Business: Agendas will be structured around our Portfolios and ‘the business’ of the APCC.</p> <p>Balance: Agendas will offer a balance of external engagement and (internal) business discussion.</p> <p>Good practice: There will be greater focus on sharing good practice.</p> <p>Agendas: There will be more bottom up agenda planning with more Regional and Welsh input. Alignment will occur with NPCC agenda planning.</p> <p>Meeting number: We will move from five to four meetings so we are more productive and business focused.</p> <p>Venues: Two meetings will be held outside London, one of which will be at the College of Policing.</p> <p>Format: We will trial new formats to aid discussion and decision making for example a Council / Roundtable format.</p> <p>Date coordination: We will avoid key statutory periods and time dates with NPCC meetings.</p> <p>Deep Dives: We will refresh the Deep Dive format through using different approaches such as hosting events with partner agencies and ensuring wider involvement of OPCCs.</p> <p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a strong view that General Meetings should generally be held in London owing to travel and the ability for PCCs to schedule other meetings. Quarterly meetings were supported.
6.0	<p>Item Title: Police Public Contact</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): ACC Alan Todd, PSNI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As the NPCC lead for police public contact, Alan explained that the National Contact Management Strategy had been updated and circulated to PCCs. Alan was now looking to update their principles and practice document which would also take account of the developments with digital public contact. Some of the challenges were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 999 calls were rising in number each year and were up 7.5% last year on the year before and 101 calls also continued to grow in number and complexity. There were both opportunities and challenges in having an increasing range of ways in which the public could contact the police. - Tighter budgets meant there was pressure to reduce the number of contact management staff but contact management centres were under increasing pressure to reduce demand on service. - The original concept for 101 was that it should be multi-agency. A considerable number of calls have not been for policing and the need for a multi-agency non-emergency number is required. This needs to be considered again when looking at the future of 101. <p>Alun Michael said that bad publicity over call waiting times had prompted an in-depth review in South Wales which had highlighted long waits when there were spikes due to local emergencies e.g. multi-car crashes. It was important to let the public know when that sort of thing was happening. He also flagged the experience in Cardiff which had a pilot 101 multi-agency number where the local authority pulled out and policing and the fire service had to do their own thing.</p> <p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several PCCs supported trying to make 101 multi-agency again and asked how the strategy was addressing people’s ability to communicate from an equality and exclusion perspective and what the strategic intent was in terms of servicing the community. Alan said that we needed a granular understanding of demand, what the nature of 999 and 101 calls were and which agencies were best placed to address them. South Wales had done some good work in this area. He recognised the importance of inclusion and the need for multiple channels but not for everything. Alan mentioned that a PTF bid had been submitted to do some analysis but PCCs warned that the restricted funding might mean that was unsuccessful.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other comments included the reticence of older people to call 999 even if a crime was in progress as they thought it was only for the most serious crimes. Awareness raising was needed. There were concerns at the abandonment rate and the need to monitor this as well as concerns that if we go down the multi-agency path it may fall apart again. Alan recognised the perils of the multi-agency 101 route but recognised we had to address the issue of non-police demand. ▪ Some PCCs mentioned the risks of not having a 24/7 101 service which would put more pressure on 999. One PCC noted that the online contact system had not reduced the number of calls just generated more contact although that had the benefit that more intelligence was gathered. There was an issue with frequent callers, many of whom had no one else to speak to. One PCC wondered whether 101 was recoverable as it had such a bad press. Alan said the reality was not as bad as made out but that a lack of confidence in 101 had resulted in more 999 calls. ▪ Alan said that he agreed that opening other channels would not solve the problem and the more channels on offer the higher the volume of contact. We needed to agree on the service we were going to offer and for some services only offer them on certain channels. Further discussion on this would be welcome. We also needed to look at the use of 999 as only 20% of calls were considered as genuinely requiring an emergency response. ▪ Approved / Agreed Action: CC Olivia Pinkney, the new NPCC lead on Local Policing, was to set up a working group to consider these issues and renegotiation of the 101 contract. Alun Michael, Julia Mulligan and Arfon Jones would represent PCCs on the working group.
7.0	<p>Item Title: Systems Leadership</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): David Lloyd: Chair of the PRTB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Lloyd gave a recap on progress so far in relation to the PRTB and systems leadership. The establishment of a Portfolio Board meant that the PRTB no longer needed to actively manage the detail of the PTF which had created an opportunity for PRTB to develop a more strategic focus. At the December PRTB away day, options were considered for the future focus and direction of the PRTB including a refocus of the Board into more of a Strategic Policing Board. • PCCs were presented with 3 options earlier this year in terms of (1) Continuing with existing PRTB (2) Closing the PRTB down or (3) A development of the PRTB. A number of PCCs responded both individually and through groups and noted option 3 as preferred. • David Lloyd noted that whilst PCCs have been asked for comments, this is an ongoing consultative process. This work is closely linked to wider discussions taking place as part of the SR programme on the need for a strategic policing board of some description to provide national coordination across the policing system. The PRTB is moving to a new stage and PCCs and Police Chiefs must decide what the PRTB is a vehicle for. This may involve a radical change and renaming of the PRTB. <p>Key points raised by PCCs (Q&A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paddy Tipping, Nottinghamshire PCC, was invited to begin the discussion. Paddy noted that whilst no decision was being made today the important thing was to have a discussion to find common ground and progress as part of an ongoing process. Decisions on this are closely linked to the SR and the case to get more resources out of the Treasury. The system is as we know devolved and frequently fragmented and PCCs working in partnership need to find a mechanism to make national decisions together. The second issue is around the delivery of national projects. There is a plethora of different arrangements which can cause confusion and we need national delivery mechanisms to support delivery of national capabilities. The centre is greatly underfunded and policing needs a mechanism by which it can move forwards in difficult times. NPCC is funded far more substantially than APCC and we need to achieve a better balance. • Following discussion, key comments by PCCS included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need for delivery and decision making in a national and regional setting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If PCCs do not have a body that is capable of formulating national strategies, other policing partners will go ahead without PCCs. This body would facilitate PCCs having a seat at the national table. - There was a concern about scope creep. It was highlighted that the PRTB was set up to administer the PTF and the PTF is now at the end of its lifecycle. There is a role for a strategic board but it is better to stop the PRTB and then start a new strategic body as a new proposal. A tweaking of the PRTB will not appeal to the Treasury. - It was acknowledged that this is a seminal moment for PCCs. The Police ICT Company is an example of something national which PCCs own which can forge the way for a body to tie something together for commissioning and delivering national. - It was noted that any national capability has to be identified and described. The APCC and the NPCC need to be working more closely and more strategically together so the Home Office approaches both PCCs and Chiefs. - The importance of resources was emphasised. A risk of establishing a new body is that it may lose the powers hard won by the PRTB. A change of membership would be preferable to changing the whole body. - Only through conversations with the Home Office can we arrive at the best solution and assuage fears of this body becoming a cabal of the few deciding for the many. - By stopping the PRTB we may lose momentum. Dissolving the PRTB will disband a place where Police Chiefs, PCCs and officials can come together for common endeavour and it may be hard to start again. A new body has to be representative of the motivation, integrity and direction of the whole of the policing family. It may fill two roles of commissioning and/or creating a collegiate environment. • David Lloyd concluded that there is agreement of the need for a national body to drive forward policing. However any PRTB development needs to be consultative, acknowledge sensitivities and recognise the importance of avoiding an ‘inner and outer circle’ mentality. Policing must decide what it is looking to design and recognise the need for a properly resourced model. This discussion would inform future work to develop options. Next steps: • Susannah Hancock noted that form follows function and that we need to understand the role and scope of this new board before deciding on the form and who sits on it. The PRTB has commenced this work with PCCs and CCs. Any future board does not have to be called the PRTB or indeed have the same people as members. • The next steps for the PRTB are to work closely with SR programme and the Home Office amongst others and to commission work in order to develop in more detail a costed set of options for what this future board should do/look like. The first step towards this is to develop and agree a ToR for this piece of work. The draft ToR should be shared with PCCs and CCs ASAP for comments. <p>Other issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question of what would happen if a Chief Constable refused to release resources was discussed at a meeting with the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary can exercise a power to enforce mutual aid and shared resourcing in cases of emergency. • It was emphasised that other agencies and stakeholders should not expect the police to step into the void in areas of risk and fill in the gaps for issues that are not policing responsibilities. This has been stressed with the Department for Transport and other departments. • The question was asked if Local Resilience Forums have been established and up to date.
8.0	<p>Item Title: Portfolio and Policy Update</p> <p>There were no portfolio or policy updates due to a lack of time.</p>

9.0	<p>Item Title: AoB</p> <p>Key Updates (Speakers): Lord William Bach (on the Brexit Working Group)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Update on Interpol warning notice on Schengen 2: Interpol have asked police forces to send in information on old cases in Schengen 2 as there is a risk that they will not have a backup if they do not use the Interpol system. Lord Bach will be sending a note out on this.
Meeting Close	