

Minutes from Annual General Meeting 20th January 2016

General Meeting Date:		Item.	1.0
-----------------------	--	-------	-----

APCC - Annual General Meeting (AGM) – 20th January 2016

Item No.	Title
1.0	Welcome & Previous Minutes

The Chair welcomed all attendees. The Minutes of the last meeting were agreed, noting that actions were either complete or covered on the agenda.

2.0	ICT Company Business Plan
-----	----------------------------------

Nick Alston and Martin Wyke introduced this item.

- Attendees were reminded of a letter sent to all PCCs on the 4th January discussing financing of the Police ICT Company and informed that responses had been taken into account in the Company Business Plan.
- The General Meeting was informed that Ian Bell, Head of ICT in Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire has been appointed to the Company Board as a representative of Police Technology Council. This was part of a wider effort to include Police ICT professionals.
- PCCs were reminded that all are welcome to attend the Company Member’s Council. Yesterday a strong council meeting was held with good discussions and strong representation.
- Martin Wyke (MW) informed PCCs that the Company has achieved over £3 million saved so far in year one. The Company has also added value through other work such as driving collaboration through the Police Innovation Fund.
- MW expressed understanding that The Company needs to demonstrate a return on PCCs money. More potential savings had been identified that were yet to be realised. The Company must give more back than PCCs put in. The Company is asking for £2.7million from its members to fund its core team. The Company will achieve more than this in savings.
- The Company exists to help policing in making communities a safer place by providing better IT. It will start small, think big and grow incrementally. The Company wants to make ICT more efficient in the short term and more effective in the long term. In addition to focusing on in year savings the Company will work on long term structural projects including standards, long term strategy and architecture, digital programmes and data networks.
- Heads of ICT in forces have requested a long term national strategy and the Company will create one on their behalf but also drawing upon their expertise. MW explained that there were potential big savings from data networks. These savings will increase once networks were futureproofed to allow for increased data demand such as through BWV.
- MW explained that the Company would be taking on national systems from the Home Office and transforming them to deliver savings for policing. The Company would create a catalogue of

products, accessible to policing reducing work in each force, increasing interoperability and providing a choice of products that meet standards.

- The Company Business plan would be approved at the 6th March Board meeting and the Company was seeking to save a minimum of £6 million by the end of next financial year. If the budget was approved on a flat rate each PCC would pay approximately £60,000 annually but there was an option, expressed by The Board, of a £25,000 membership fee topped up according to the funding formula. MW informed PCCs that The Company Council suggested that it would prefer a flat rate cost.
- The Company would not seek to access money from funds without the approval of PCCs. It was seeking money from the Innovation Fund and Transformation Fund to achieve more on top of core work.
- MW explained that there was a place for some things to be done locally but others needed to be done nationally to deliver the best service to the public. All PCCs had a pack of all the projects the Company wished to embark on the next financial year with the full detail of the Company business plan distributed on the 25th January.
- The General Meeting expressed confidence that Chief Constables and Chief Information Officers were being well represented on a Board led by PCCs providing a vehicle for coherence. It was important to note that the Company existed within the policing family.
- The General Meeting expressed that communication on activities of the company was vital. This has been achieved and MW had done well to ensure the message was clear.
- The General Meeting discussed Company Funding. It was felt that all Members paying the same fee would prevent policing becoming divided. Most PCCs expressed support for the three year commitment to the business plan in order to provide stability but others expressed concern over a three year obligation without the Company having delivered measurable savings.
- MW said the three year commitment would be seen as an agreement in principle. If the Company delivered as expected, the majority of savings would go back to policing. The Company's work around national contracts had helped reduce the cost by £3million with potential for greater reduction in the future. This was a smaller cost to policing.

3.0

Standing Group Update

Performance and Standards

The Chair asked Commissioners to agree to the papers which were circulated. They were agreed.

Workforce and EDHR

The Chair introduced the discussion on Police Staff Council (PSC) funding. PCCs had received a paper on future funding of the PSC from the standing group just before Christmas.

The Home Office had withdrawn funding from 1 April 2016.

The paper set out the benefits of the PSC, outlined work being undertaken on pay and reward reform and gave PCCs information on the consequences of removal of funding.

The proposal from the standing group was that PCCs as employers should fund the PSC going forward at a cost of £50,000 a year divided equally between those forces that were members of PSC.

Cumbria were prepared to re-join the PSC and pay a full subscription.

Thames Valley were not members of the PSC but acknowledged they benefitted from PSC products and were prepared to contribute 50% of the subscription.

Kent and Surrey had never been members of the PSC, and would not be joining.

The Chair said that if PCCs didn't fund the PSC it would have a negative effect on industrial relations police staff pay and conditions.

- The Chair proposed that PCCs fund PSC for the next three years and the motion was **AGREED**

Transparency and Integrity

The Chair outlined that the Association of Policing and Crime Chief Executives (APACCE) guidance will be fed through Group Representatives before being circulated to the wider membership.

A discussion on the APCC purdah guidance elicited the following points:

- Deputy PCCs – it was concluded that Deputy PCC contracts expire at the same time as PCCs.
- APACCE should look at the difference between business as usual and campaigning in their purdah guidance. PCCs should not use the OPCC as a party political campaigning tool.
- It is business as usual right up until purdah starts. After that, it is slightly more complicated but if you are not making party political statements on behalf of your campaign while acting as a PCC then you are okay.
- APCC Purdah Guidance was **AGREED**.

The Chair raised the issue of the draft IPCC/PCC Protocol around complaints

- For complaints in a PCCs force, there is an agreement that the IPCC will provide information on press releases in advance – how far in advance should this happen?
 - The IPCC say that wherever possible they will give 24 hours' notice, but also that they may not do so. There is a difference between what is in a press release and what is on their website.
- Section 1- of the protocol should also include independent members, as investigations can go on ad nauseam. Complaints should progress as quickly as possible.
- Section 10 'panels must refer to IPCC' seems disproportionate and does not allow the panel to exercise discretion, in cases where the issue is extremely minor (such as a speeding fine). – This is in the legislation and the IPCC responds to legislation.
- It was clarified that if there is an alleged criminal offence then issues go straight to the IPCC.
- The Chair summed up that PCCs should challenge the IPCC over this if it is not appropriate.

Reforming IPCC Governance

- The Chair reminded PCCs to respond to the consultation around the strengthening and challenging of the IPCC. The changes are attempting to strengthen the accountability of the IPCC, to enshrine the regional structure into law.
- How can PCCs challenge what the IPCC is doing?
- Should the IPCC should have the power to investigate PCCs?
- This is being reviewed because the IPCC does not want the role they have in relation to PCCs, but the government has reviewed it and decided to keep the system in place.
- A representative is meeting with the IPCC around these issues and will feed the information back into the APCC.

Resources, Efficiency and Finance-

CSR discussion - agreement that it was a good settlement but some still face difficulties. Main issue is that we still do not have any idea of victims funding. Minister has stated that this was imminent.

Key areas going forward are police funding distribution (FF) and innovation fund/transformation fund

The Minister wants to introduce the new FF arrangements for 1/4/17 – SG has made the point that last year the process was rushed with insufficient involvement of PCCs and that the clock is ticking and the Minister needs to get on and do it. The response was muted at Gold Group (GG).

HO felt very badly bruised by the FF process and Number 10 was involved directly. The alternative is to have a longer discussion of police funding with reference to the capabilities work – need a live discussion. At the GG we talked a bit about the innovation fund (IF) and the transformation fund (TF). It was thought that ultimately the IF and TF would become one fund in future years.

The Chairs referenced the graph shown in the meeting. This seemed to be related to funding centrally and locally and we need to be involved in this debate.

This information had not been through the Minister. Management and governance of these funds should involve PCCs.

It was agreed that we must get a hold of it. Also that there was a real opportunity for the new board and the NPCC to work closer together.

- PCCs requested the Gold Group paper shown to them at the meeting.
- It was suggested that the Strategic Policing SG and the Police Reform group work closely together over the next few months.
- It was suggested that there is a risk that the PCCs role could be undermined. Topslices mean they cannot use it locally. Public think the money has been protected but it hasn't. Reference to 'extra' CT money – spin that it is new funding. The Perm Secretary stated that there was one police budget – this was not helpful.
- There is an issue of precept flexibility. PCCs on the SG are pushing hard on this. The SG do not consider 1.99% plus £5 as flexibility. Minister supportive, Treasury not.
- There was concerns as to whether Treasury had an eye on reserves because PCCs do not want to make financial decisions without clarity. The Chair stated that there was still an eye on them and advised that PCCs need a narrative around this

Working in Partnership to Reduce Crime

The Chair referred PCCs to the standing group paper and sought their views on two items.

The Home Office were keen to know of any blockages to collaboration with Fire and Rescue Services being experienced by PCCs. If there were any local blockages being experienced PCCs were asked to feed this into the APCC.

At the last standing group meeting members had expressed concern about the provision of suitably trained paediatricians in SARC, the standing group were keen to know if this was widespread and went beyond the standing group?

- It was stated that there were problems in Yorkshire and Humberside and there was ongoing correspondence with Ministers.
- Following a show of hands it was remarked that the problem clearly went beyond Yorkshire.
- There was comment that the unaccountability of the health service was of concern. He was at meeting with the NHS and would raise with MPs.
- In Wales there were a different set of issues PCCs needed to find a way of connecting common issues between E&W.
- It was asked why we were doing this under the radar? Why weren't we making a noise and doing it publically as a group.
- It was stated said these were issues where we can work cross party.
- It was commented that asking an MP to ask a question to get the Minister to get a grip was a good way of focusing the mind of the Minister.

In response to the standing group report she noted that children in police cells was a massive problem; there was nowhere for them to go due to the closure of secure units in the North West. Those children had to go to Wakefield or Staffordshire. It was a huge waste of resources and a breach of human rights. It was a decision taken by another government agency that we could not influence and we would be writing a letter.

Joining up the CJS

The Chair up-dated the Meeting

- Significant progress had been made since last General Meeting – the SofS for Justice was very supportive of the localism agenda and of PCCs role in the CJS locally.
- Sit on the National CJB – and presented a localism paper at the last board.
- Met with challenge from some national agencies and CJS – but SofS behind the work
- Likely that more of the CJS will be coming under local control
- The question is just how far the ambition stretches – nothing is off the table and the SofS is open to radical change and innovation
- CJB will be considering the role of PCCs in the CJS at their March meeting – but the work would really take off post-May
- Question of how you define “local” and now this plugs into the wider devolution agenda
- Standing Group was being held on 21st January – which would flesh out how PCCs would wish to see this taken forward and what the PCC “ask” of Govt. would be.

It was noted that the judiciary may be reluctant to support more radical approaches to CJS governance at a local level and posited that a counter-vailing strategy could be taken forward to lobby for

- More police prosecutions
- Greater use of out of court disposals – backed with a coherent strategy/matrix; and also
- Drive forward RJ locally

It was stated that he wished to be able to get an end to end grip of the CJS locally and that the local CJB needed to move forward to make this happen – but there was currently a hiatus waiting to see what was coming out of central Govt. on the role of the PCC in the CJS.

It was stated that while any Govt. work on governance arrangements for partnership working would help, this would not be available until after May - PCCs should not wait, but to go with what works locally now.

The point was made that the direction was needed on the connectivity between local, regional and national.

It was commented that there were opportunities to create local leadership and drive innovation – in South Wales they had successfully merged the LCJB and the IOM Board.

The example was also given of Greater Manchester- where although the PCC had decided not to be the chair, they had designed the local partnership arrangements.

The Chair concluded by saying that all too often where partnership arrangements worked locally this was down to the personalities involved and we need to re-inforce how the CJS works locally to ensure that successful partnership working is not dependent on personalities.

Supporting Victims and Reducing Harm

The Chair up-dated the meeting on the work of the Standing Group.

The Chair recently attended the inaugural meeting of the Victims Advisory Panel chaired by Mike Penning. No other organisation that commissions victims services sit on the Panel and other than the Victims’ Commissioner, the other Panel members are from victims’ organisations.

At the Panel meeting the Chair made the point that in order to build capacity and resilience the grant allocations for victims funding should be made for a three year period rather than annually. Also, that consideration should be given to devolving responsibility for nationally commissioned victims' services down to PCCs. Also, we are pushing to have the mandatory training of publicly funded advocates in sexual offences cases extended to privately funded advocates as well.

More generally victims were not seen as anyone's responsibility within the CJS – they should be seen as at the heart of the CJS. PCCs should be at the forefront of taking this forward and PCCs have considerable leverage both a national and a local level.

The Chair then asked the meeting if they would support her writing urgently to the MOJ about the delays in notifying PCCs of the funding allocations for victims' services. PCCs expressed support for this and concern about the impact the delays were having with numerous organisations waiting to find out if funding would continue after March.

There was concern that a letter could be counter-productive, but the general view was that writing would not impact on any funding decisions might speed up when PCCs were notified.

There was support for the idea of writing and suggested also raising the issue of funding for the court based Witness Service moving to PCCs. The Chair agreed to raise the issue, but separately to the letter on funding.

Up-date – an urgent letter was sent to the Minister at MOJ (Mike Penning) on 21st January. A reply was received on 22nd January, and, on the same day MOJ notified PCCs of the funding allocations for Victims' Services for 2016-17.

4.0

Police Reform and Transformation Board

The Chair introduced the oral update on the reform agenda following on from the Home Secretary's Police Reform Summit on December 8th, 2015.

Following a number of meetings and the joint conference in November the Home Secretary summit had taken place in December. Sara Thornton had also attended a General Meeting to discuss specialist capabilities.

Since then the APCC and NPCC had agreed that a joint board needed to oversee the reform work. NPCC had done a lot of work on how the board might look with four sub-streams of work.

It was proposed that the Board would have the following membership:

- Chaired by the APCC and NPCC Chairs on an alternate basis.
- 3xPCCs and 1x Non-geographical Policing Body
- 3xCC, 1xCoP CE and 1x Head of NCA

The presence and participation of PCCs on the Board would be really important.

The structure was agreed, now the ToR needed to be agreed.

23 February was the date of the first meeting and the main item on the agenda would be the ToR.

The ToR should be as few as possible and clear as possible, i.e. "To oversee the development of national change to ensure it is coherent and oversees the best police service."

- It was said that national institutions, including the NPCC were on a roll, and there was a real danger they would ignore local accountability.
- It was asked if the Chair could say something about the four work streams and APCC involvement?

- The Chair replied that with regard Specialist Capabilities there were two OPCC chief executives involved: Andy Champness and Fraser Sampson.
- It was said there was a NPCC chart with 4 work streams on which they'd mapped out standing groups and NPCC co-ordinating committees. PCCs needed to make sure they had representation at the appropriate levels. Chief executive's participation didn't necessarily mean that the voice of PCCs had been heard. PCCs needed to make sure they were co-ordinated in inputting into these work streams.
- There was support for beefing up PCC representation. He was uneasy with the alternating Chair. Our strengths were governance and oversight, we should insist the Chair is a PCC and the board controls spending of money.
- The Chair said he too had concerns about alternating Chairs and handing over authority to Chiefs. Sara Thornton was content for the APCC to chair this board for the first six months.
- It was said we needed continuity and the ability to respond quickly.
- It was agreed with the concerns expressed and asked for the circulation of the four work streams. Chief Constables recruited people onto these boards and that shouldn't happen with this Board, it should come to PCCs.
- The Chair said the Board was keen to take PCCs with them. This was an innovative step and decisions must be informed.
- It was asked why would the APCC chair for just the first six months? The APCC Chair should chair the Board permanently.
- The Chair replied that at least if a PCC was chairing at the beginning then the longer term could be addressed.
- It was said there was a view from PCCs that an alternating Chair was unacceptable. Governance decisions needs to be clear with PCCs working closely with Chief Constables but not quite equal partners: one governs, one executes.

5.0

APCC Chief Executive Discussion

A copy of the letter from the Chair to all PCCs was discussed.

This sets out key questions about the role and whether this should be a CEO position or more akin to a chief of staff (COS). There were also questions about whether recruitment should begin immediately or be delayed until after the elections in May.

The discussion was very helpful to the APCC Board. Although opinions were divided, there was a very clear majority in favour of keeping the role as that of CEO and of proceeding with the appointment process immediately.

The Board will now proceed to draw up a role description (taking into account the observations of the former CEO) and will advertise as soon as possible.

6.0

Caroline Dinenage MP, MOJ Minister on Female Offending

Caroline Dinenage MP (CD), the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Women, Equalities and Family Justice spoke to PCCs on developing whole system approaches to female offending.

The main points of her address were:

- The CJS and the police force should address the needs of women who come into contact with them.

- The prison population is only 5% female – currently 4000 women. Female offenders are twice as likely to have suffered abuse in childhood, to have mental health issues and to have committed acquisitive rather than violent crime.
- The way we deal with women must change – early intervention can change women’s lives and give them a second chance, and has the potential to changes the lives of their families and especially their children. The government wants to see fewer women serving custodial sentences (especially those with children); and fewer re-offending.
- The government has allocated £200k grant funding for local partnership models – it requires a joint approach to tackling issues, with partnerships between statutory bodies and NGOs.
- Police triaging is a key element in all partnership models.

ACC John Stratford (South Wales, JS) NPCC Integrated Offender Management Lead took questions from the floor on the technical aspects of the Ministers presentation.

- JS stated that the Police service has for too long been left out of the debate about keeping women out of jail.
- The Chair raised the consequence of imprisoning a female is compounded when she has young children
- CD replied that the cost to society of women in prison is very high as children go into care. The more we can step in the better it is for society
- It was stated that this requires greater joined up working between the APCC and NPCC
- A member explained that a pilot running in Sussex shows an increase from 14% engagement to 70% by putting someone in the custody suite.
- It was stated that IOM needs to be further developed and that he is in discussions with CC Simon Burn to have this codified by the NPCC. TP followed that this requires a proper dialogue with PCCs
- A member outlined that diverting individuals away from courts works well in stopping people reoffending. He explained Operation Checkpoint, a contract for offenders: 1. Do not reoffend. 2. Restorative justice. 3. Attach a navigator to establish what their reason is for offending. 4. If there is alcohol or drug problem then give them help to overcome problems.
- A member raised the issue of women receiving harsher sentences than men. She stated that pathway services for women such as mental health, housing and women’s centres are strained by a lack of funding, and that the £200k scheme was welcome but needed back up
- CD replied that virtually all bids for funding had attracted matching or will attract rest funding from elsewhere. More people now reporting domestic violence than ever before. Women’s services are very important – CD has met with CRCs and told them to support programmes for women
- It was outlined that some the funding streams (MOJ) are separate to the general victims fund that PCCs commission –funding should come together in holistic stream for PCCs.