



# OFFICE OF THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR NORFOLK

MINUTES OF THE POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY FORUM MEETING  
HELD ON THURSDAY 21 JULY 2016 AT 7 P.M.  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL, ELIZABETH  
HOUSE, WALPOLE LOKE, DEREHAM, NR19 1EE

1. **Attendance:**

Mr L Green	Police and Crime Commissioner
------------	-------------------------------

Also in attendance:

Mr S Bailey	Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr C Hall	Deputy Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr N Dean	Assistant Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr N Davison	Chief Superintendent, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr A McCullough	Chief Superintendent, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr M Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN
Mr J Hummersone	Chief Finance Officer, OPCCN/Norfolk Constabulary
Mr M Barsby	Director – Communications and Engagement, OPCCN
Ms S Lister	Director - Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Mrs C Buckley	Senior Business Support Officer, OPCCN

## Part 1 – Public Agenda

1. **Apologies for absence:**

Apologies were received from Miss S Hamlin, Assistant Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary.

2. **Declarations of Personal and/or Prejudicial Interests**

There were none received.

3. **To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016**

The Chief Executive confirmed the minutes of 24 March 2016 meeting had been formally approved by the former PCC and were published on the website. In relation to the actions contained within those minutes, these had all been discharged.

#### 4. **Financial Outturn Report – 2015/16**

The PCC complimented the Chief Constable on good financial management, and as a result the budget had been brought in to a good degree of accuracy. The Auditors had provided an unqualified audit with very few areas for improvement. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) had graded the force as one of the most efficient forces in the country and good financial management played a key part in that assessment.

The PCC questioned the Chief Constable in relation to the £800k overspend in overtime and queried whether regular demand modelling reviews were undertaken to avoid overtime costs. The Chief Constable clarified that 50% of the overtime costs would be reimbursed from other forces, leaving the overspend at £400k. He reassured the PCC that overtime was the most efficient way of managing resources. Norfolk was recognised as having an outstanding policing model which was set in 2008/9, with other forces following Norfolk's example. The force was operating with the right numbers of officers but incidents occurred which were unforeseen and unpredictable which would incur overtime.

In relation to the Capital Programme figures within the report, the PCC queried why only half of the £9m allocated had been spent. ACC Dean advised part of this underspend related to the Estates Programme; a comprehensive programme looking at deployment of resource and modelling moving forward. This involved planning and development at major stations and linking with other agencies to ensure that the facilities provided were fit for purpose for the future. The Estates Plan had been ambitious during 2015/16, but revisions had been made to ensure the force delivered on that deficit in the future.

The PCC highlighted that body worn video cameras served many purposes including protecting police officers, reducing complaints and providing evidence in courts of law. He questioned why Norfolk officers had not been provided with them, when other forces around the country were already using them. The Chief Constable advised that as Norfolk was collaborated with Suffolk, the top priority had been to ensure that the infrastructure for the two forces was aligned and officers and staff were working on the same systems. In respect of the body worn video cameras, a business case had been prepared and money set aside to invest in these for officers. However, whilst they could be issued to officers immediately, there were difficulties around the data generated from the cameras i.e. how to store, review and retrieve data to comply with the management of police information. Until the correct infrastructure was in place to ensure the data generated was retrievable, it would be a false investment for the force. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) had identified that body worn video systems needed a national solution and the Chief Constable advised he would wait for a national solution to be introduced as this would be best value for money for the taxpayer. The PCC challenged the Chief Constable highlighting the safety provided to officers by having these cameras. The Chief Constable advised that it was essential and of a higher priority that officers were able to contact colleagues should they be in difficulty by having a good radio system and correct infrastructures in place, than having cameras.

In relation to the £5.5m deficit by 2020, the PCC identified he would not wish to raise taxes and questioned to what extent were there possibilities for further substantial efficiency savings within the Constabulary. The Chief Constable advised that the force were 300 officers lighter than 5 years ago and if further reductions in budget were required, then these would have to be found from the frontline. He advised that the back office support functions had already been significantly reduced to the minimum capacity to deliver the functions. In terms of efficiency savings, the force had been awarded 'outstanding' in this respect by the HMIC and the Norfolk 2020 review team were looking at how further efficiencies could be achieved. The Chief Constable identified that outcomes from the Seven Force Collaboration agreement would provide significant efficiency savings for all forces involved in the future.

*The PCC noted the report.*

## 5. **Athena**

The Chief Constable advised that Athena, which was 'live' in Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk, provided intelligence, crime investigation, recording, custody system and case preparation in one system. He identified that the system had been implemented and was now operating as business as usual.

The PCC advised having spoken with a number of officers, it appeared that difficulties were still being experienced with the system; training had been deemed as insufficient by officers and the processes behind the system were complex and too lengthy. The PCC queried how could it be operating as business as usual.

Chief Superintendent McCullough provided clarification around the way Athena operated and the difficulties which had been experienced during the implementation phase. Training had been an issue as to train an officer on the system caused abstractions from the frontline.

The PCC highlighted the paper stated "the operational lead did not believe that resourcing was in the right place so structures needed to be modernised to handle workflows being realigned". He questioned how the system could be deemed as "operating as business as usual" if the structures still required realignment.

Chief Superintendent McCullough, as operational lead, identified that with previously having six systems in each of the two forces and then moving to one combined system, the structure of the forces needed to be restructured to correctly align under the one system. The force were moving to "business as usual" due to the project having been closed as the system was operating successfully and the force would always need to change their systems to accommodate new legislation.

The PCC questioned the Chief Constable as to why none of the forces which had gone 'live' with Athena were putting data into the Police National Database. DCC Hall advised that the Police National Database was maintained by the Home Office and had stringent criteria in place to allow data to be loaded into the system. There were a number of gateways the data had to go through before it would be completely uploaded and many systems (including Athena) had difficulty in passing the gateways. DCC Hall advised that progress had been made in getting data past several of the gateways in recent weeks and it was expected that the data would be fully uploaded within the next month.

*The PCC noted the report.*

## 6. **Strategic Performance Overview**

The PCC questioned around the availability of forward looking Fraud assessments; these highlighted the threat posed by fraud to the communities of Norfolk. Following the last Police Accountability Forum, had these been produced? The Chief Constable advised that these had not yet been produced due to challenges around Athena data.

**Action: The Chief Constable to provide an update on the progress of Fraud Assessments to the PCC in due course.**

The PCC identified that following discussions with Mr Alan Parr, Homewatch Co-ordinator at Snettisham, it had been highlighted that police support and visibility had considerably dropped over the last few years. The PCC questioned what message could be fed back to Mr Parr from the Chief Constable regarding this perception.

The Chief Constable advised that in respect of the Homewatch Schemes, he acknowledged that the Constabulary had lost focus in this area and in light of budget deficit activity, they had scaled back on neighbourhood watch co-ordinators. The Chief Constable accepted that this had been a mistake and he identified that they would be reinvesting in a Volunteer Co-ordinator whose role would be to develop Homewatch teams. Over the next 1-3 years they would increase the number of Homewatch Schemes and Volunteer Co-ordinators to work with the Citizens in Policing Team. An Inspector post would be identified to have oversight of work of the Volunteer Co-ordinator.

**The PCC identified that Mr Parr could expect a call and visit from Pc Emily Carter, the Community Engagement Officer to discuss Homewatch further.**

*The PCC noted the report.*

## 7. **Protective Services Command Update**

The PCC highlighted the report identified a significant risk to the High Tech Crime Unit in relation to the implementation of the ISO 17025 for digital forensics and that a pre-inspection had taken place in May 2016. The PCC asked for clarification as to what the accreditation would mean for the force.

Chief Superintendent Davison gave an overview of ISO 17025, which placed a requirement on all public and private sector organisations that present digital evidence in a court room to be accredited in the ISO so there would be confidence that what was being presented in court was correct and accurate. Digital evidence under the ISO included seizure of computers, mobile phones and police downloading of files from such items. It was a mandatory requirement for forces to become accredited and as a result of the pre-inspection assessment in May, 60 points had been identified as needing attention. These points had been developed into an action plan and were being worked through by the High Tech Crime Unit.

The Chief Constable highlighted that significant investment had been made in the High Tech Crime Unit and the force were seeing the dividends from that investment. He identified the Unit were increasingly undertaking activity relating to indecent imagery of children and for every warrant executed, there could be up to 11 devices, containing up to 160,000 images which would require reviewing. The Unit were turning around examination of those devices in six weeks, which was quicker than any other force in the country.

*The PCC noted the report.*

## **8. Human Resources Update**

The PCC advised that upon election, he had removed the position of Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner from his office and transferred £75k for the next four years to the Chief Constable for the provision of two additional officers on the beat. The PCC questioned when these officers would be seen out on patrol. The Chief Constable clarified that he had increased the establishment by two officers to reflect the funding provided by the PCC - a group of transferees had been received into the organisation and the funding was being used for that purpose.

The PCC referred to a section of the report which stated that Police Officer establishment was projected to reduce over the next financial year to under establishment; how was the force planning to achieve more visibility if there were plans to reduce officers. DCC Hall advised that officer numbers were measured in two ways – by funded establishment (i.e. how many officers would the budget allow) and the strength of officers in post. Due to retirement, leavers etc, these figures were often different. DCC Hall advised that the force, where possible, ran strength slightly above funded establishment in particular due to seasonal demand on constabulary but to balance the budget they would dip below funded establishment during the lower demand periods. This was kept under continual review and would assist plans for next year dependent on budget provision.

The PCC identified there were three categories of officer – constables, PCSOs and Special Constables. He queried the salaries for each category and questioned why it appeared that a Police Officer with full powers would not receive the same salary as a PCSO who had limited powers for at least six years and that a Special Constable with full powers did not get a salary as they were volunteers. DCC Hall advised a fully trained Police Constable started on a salary of £22k, a PCSO was on a salary of £26k but as they were considered as police staff members (thereby falling under the job evaluation scheme) they received various enhancements (unsociable hours etc), therefore it was difficult to compare. The Chief Constable identified that in relation to the Special Constabulary, a budget of £200k per year was set aside which equated to £1,000 per head. Every two months the force had an intake of 12 Special Constables and they were keen to expand those numbers as they were an invaluable resource.

The PCC acknowledged that policing was a dangerous and stressful role for officers and staff. He questioned whether it would be prudent to have mental health support provided by Occupational Health Department and queried whether there was sufficient support provided in this area. DCC Hall advised that a Health and Wellbeing Advisor had recently been recruited and consideration had been given to whether there was a requirement for a dedicated Mental Health nurse to be

recruited. However, as the Constabulary already had advisors in place who understood the health pathways available to get support this was not currently being considered. DCC Hall advised they would monitor how that function rolled forward over time and would keep the area under review to see how it evolved.

The PCC highlighted that as part of his Police and Crime Plan consultation, he had spent time with the diverse communities within Norfolk. He questioned how reflective the Constabulary were in terms of employees from those communities. The Chief Constable advised that within the four main areas (BME communities, Disabled, LGBT and over 56+ years), the Constabulary had 351 members of staff who fell within those areas, equating to nearly 20% of the workforce. The PCC queried the gender equality across the force within the senior officer structure (i.e. Chief Superintendent, Assistant Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable and Chief Constable). The Chief Constable provided reassurance that the Constabulary had a strong representation of females to males in the senior management structure.

The PCC queried in light of recent media coverage around fitness tests for officers and failure rates, he questioned how regularly Norfolk officers completed the fitness test. DCC Hall advised all officers were required to complete the test every year, which involved shuttle running a distance between beeps which sped up; officers were required to achieve a pass rate. The pass rates were closely monitored, with the Constabulary routinely seeing an annual 98-99% success rate. Officers not achieving the pass rate had 2 months in order to reach the pass point.

*The PCC noted the report.*

9. **Complaints and Professional Standards Update**

The PCC noted the report.

10. **NHS Custody Liaison and Diversion Update**

The PCC noted the report.

11. **Annual Health and Safety Report 2015/16**

The PCC noted the report.

12. **Emerging Operational/Organisational Risks**

*Blue Light Service Collaboration (Police and Fire Services)*

The PCC sought an update on future plans around emergency services collaboration. The Chief Constable provided an overview, advising that proactive and positive collaboration had commenced which had seen the Norfolk Fire Service senior command team working jointly with the Police at Wymondham, with the Headquarters rebranded as a joint Headquarters. Further moves were scheduled, with the Fire Service intelligence analyst staff, Director of Human Resources and Control Room staff moving into the joint Headquarters over the next month, collaborating effectively and breaking new ground.

The PCC sought clarification around what governance had been put into place to manage collaboration. The Chief Constable assured the PCC that discussions were being held with colleagues within Norfolk County Council and they were looking to develop the governance structure in the future.

#### *Tasers*

The PCC questioned the Chief Constable regarding the use of Tasers. The Chief Constable provided an overview of the device, which emitted 50,000 volts when used. He highlighted that 256 officers within the Constabulary were trained to use a Taser, which was an invaluable tool; giving officers confidence when faced with violent incidents and was a less lethal method than using baton guns, which could cause significant damage. The Chief Constable advised that ACC Hamlin was in the process of reviewing the cost of providing the devices and establishing whether the Constabulary needed to increase the number of officers trained in its use. The PCC highlighted he had been made aware of a disparity between the deployment of Tasers within local policing teams; whereby one team was trained and the second team had no Taser trained officers within it. The Chief Constable identified the responsibility for deployment sat with individual District Commanders. The Chief Constable would review the disparity identified by the PCC and report back in due course.

**Action: Chief Constable to review the disparity in deployment of Taser trained officers as identified by the PCC and report back in due course.**

#### *Toughbooks*

The PCC had been made aware that the toughbooks issued to officers, funded by money from central government, were not effective. He queried whether sufficient risk analysis had been undertaken prior to them being purchased, around appropriate network connectivity etc. The Chief Constable identified that money had been issued from Central Government and Police Forces were instructed to find an appropriate mobile solution. It was acknowledged in some parts of Norfolk the signal was very good but some had bad/limited 3G or 4G signal. The deployment of the devices should have been more closely considered.

The PCC indicated that his role was to represent the community at large and he thanked the Chief Constable for the nature of the responses and the openness given to the challenges the PCC had made at the meeting.

The PCC introduced members of his team from the OPCCN. The Chief Executive highlighted that the Police Accountability Forum was only one of the statutory public meetings that the PCC was required to hold; the other being Audit Committee. The PCC would be recruiting for an Independent Member to sit on the Audit Committee in the near future should any of those in attendance be interested.


## **Part 2 – Private Agenda**

13. **Misconduct and Professional Standards Update**
14. **Estates Strategy Update**
15. **Joint ICT Strategy**

These items had been reviewed and appropriate decisions made by the PCC prior to the Police Accountability Forum public meeting. It was identified by the PCC that all future agenda items would be discussed in public with no private agenda.

16. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting would be held during October 2016 – final details to be confirmed.



.....  
Lorne Green  
Police and Crime Commissioner



.....  
Simon Bailey  
Chief Constable