

AGENDA

KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Dear Councillor

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the **KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** will be held in the **Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone** on **Tuesday, 3rd February, 2015, at 10.00 am** when the following business will be transacted

Members of the public who require further information are asked to contact Joel Cook on 03000 416892

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting in the meeting room

Membership

Councillor Paul Clokie	Ashford Borough Council
Councillor Pat Todd	Canterbury City Council
Councillor Anthony Martin	Dartford Borough Council
Councillor Sue Chandler	Dover District Council
Councillor John Burden	Gravesham Borough Council
Mr Mike Hill (Chairman)	Kent County Council
Councillor Annabelle Blackmore	Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Les Wicks	Medway Council
Councillor Peter Fleming	Sevenoaks District Council
Councillor Malcolm Dearden	Shepway District Council
Councillor Andrew Bowles	Swale Borough Council
Councillor Peter Campbell	Thanet District Council
Councillor Mark Rhodes	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Councillor Caroline Derrick	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Mr Roger Latchford	Co-opted member – Kent County Council
Councillor Gordon Cowan	Co-opted member - Dover District Council
Councillor Ian Chittenden	Co-opted member - Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Rupert Turpin	Co-opted member - Medway Council
Mr Dan McDonald	Independent Member
Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman)	Independent Member

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

- 1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- 2 Apologies and Substitutes
- 3 Declarations of Interests by Members in Items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- 4 Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 4th November 2014 (Pages 3 - 10)

B - Commissioner's reports requested by the Panel/offered by the Commissioner

- B1 Draft Police and Crime plan 2015/16 and Precept proposal (Pages 11 - 48)

C - Commissioner's Decisions

- C1 Commissioner's decisions for November & December (Pages 49 - 50)

D - Panel Matters

- D1 Panel Annual report (Pages 51 - 54)
- D2 Future work programme (Pages 55 - 56)

E - For Information

- E1 Notes of the Commissioner's Governance Board meeting held on 14th October 2014 (Pages 57 - 60)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services
03000 416647

Monday, 26 January 2015

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 4 November 2014.

PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE (Chairman), Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman), Cllr P Clokie, Cllr P Todd, Cllr Mrs S Chandler, Cllr Mrs A Blackmore, Cllr L Wicks, Cllr R Turpin, Cllr P Fleming, Cllr M Dearden, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Mr I S Chittenden and Cllr K Pugh (Substitute) (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles)

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs A Barnes, Mr M Stepney and Mr S Nolan

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Campbell (Policy Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

105. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 9th September 2014
(Item 4)

1. The Chairman outlined one matter arising; that the Commissioner had agreed to provide an update as to the success or lack thereof in relation to securing Innovation Funding. The Commissioner explained that there had been excellent success in securing funding earlier in 2014 for the use of Body Worn Video cameras for officers but stated that there had been limited success in the second round of bids where only £40,700 had been awarded.
2. The Commissioner's Chief of Staff explained that the feedback from the Home Office was that the bids were good but there was limited evidence of the benefits to Kent and Essex.
3. The Commissioner also highlighted that she had been successful in securing £100,000 from the Ministry of Justice Innovation fund to support the serious sexual assault project and another £600,000 to assist in the setting up of the Victim Centre.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 9th September be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

106. Impact of the Youth Commissioner
(Item B1)

1. The Commissioner explained that the appointment of a Youth Commissioner had been an election promise, designed to ensure representation of young people (under 24s) who represent 30% of Kent's population.
2. Kerry Boyd had been in post for nine months and has been listening to young people, initially via public engagement and latterly through a secondment with

CXK (Youth Charity based in Ashford that supports young people in developing skills and raising aspirations). Ms Boyd has been collating the feedback from this work and will be providing a report that will be published on the Commissioner's website in due course.

3. The Commissioner highlighted some key points that Ms Boyd had raised so far as being training and engagement opportunities, better use of online communication and how best to access young people.
4. The Commissioner referenced a recent report from the All Party Parliamentary Group for Children and Young People which highlighted the difficulties Police and Crime Commissioners and the Police face in engaging effectively with young people.
5. The Commissioner commented that Ms Boyd has performed very well in her role, showing that the concept of Youth Commissioners works. The Commissioner added that she is looking forward to the final report which will contribute to the refreshed Police and Crime Plan.
6. In response to Member questions, the Commissioner explained that the first Youth Commissioner had never formally taken up her role and that Ms Boyd had demonstrated the value of the Youth Commissioner role. The Commissioner stated that she was very pleased with Ms Boyd's work and that the future of the role would be discussed with the Police and Crime Panel.
7. The Vice-chair praised Ms Boyd and asked the Commissioner to explain how she herself engaged with Young People. The Commissioner stated that she engaged with young people all the time through regular engagement activities. She explained that the Youth Commissioner works closely with her on relevant issues, including recently agreeing to provide money to a youth charity that seeks to help young people at risk of 'drifting' into the Criminal Justice System.
8. Members praised the work being done by the Youth Commissioner, commenting that the engagement and prevention focus was very positive and they were keen to see the emerging recommendations. Members asked how the Youth Commissioner's work would feed into the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan.
9. The Commissioner explained that the Youth Commissioner worked in her office when not off-site and worked closely with the Commissioner's staff as well as Chief Officers. The Youth Commissioner's report will influence the proposed Police and Crime Plan before it goes out to consultation. Furthermore, the Youth Commissioner was advising on improving access to Police information for young people and how to encourage such engagement.
- 10.A Member asked how much the Youth Commissioner was linking with the Community Safety Units (CSU) and whether she was carrying out enough external engagement.
- 11.The Commissioner estimated that the Youth Commissioner had engaged with approximately 5000 young people but stated that there has been little direct contact between the Commissioner's office and the CSUs.

12. A Member asked whether any specific work was being done around engaging with children in care, given their vulnerability.
13. The Commissioner explained that Kent County and Medway Councils were leading on supporting and managing children in care through social services. The Chief of Staff, stated that the Force was addressing the issues surrounding children in care, using specialist officers. Additionally, the Force was working on a protocol with Children's Homes to limit the unnecessary criminalisation of young people in care.
14. Responding to a question, the Commissioner explained that the Ms Boyd would return to her studies once her contract expires early next year. The Commissioner stated that this experience will be of great benefit to Ms Boyd.
15. A Member suggested that closer engagement with the CSUs would be beneficial and suggested that the Youth Commissioner go out with Community Wardens and Police Community Support Officers. The Commissioner stated that work was being done to maintain a relationship with the CSUs and joint visits were taking place. The Commissioner reiterated her commitment to building bridges with young people.
16. A Member asked for reassurance that consideration would be given to how valuable the Youth Commissioner was in light of the high number of alternative youth engagement and access groups available to assist the public sector, such as the Youth Parliament, Youth Council and established youth groups.
17. The Commissioner stated that she respected all the other groups working with young people but emphasised that she believed the Youth Commissioner post was a positive addition to this and that it added value and should not be seen as an 'instead of youth group engagement' but rather a representative approach to youth engagement.
18. A Member praised the initial concept of the Youth Commissioner as it appeared innovative at its inception but explained that she was concerned that it had in practice, been a 'headline grabber' that had produced little in the way of practical outcomes with limited genuine engagement.
19. The Commissioner challenged this comment, stating that the Youth Commissioner was a genuine attempt to better engage with young people on Policing issues.
20. The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for her report and stated that the Panel looked forward to hearing the plans for the future of the Youth Commissioner.

RESOLVED that the Panel thank the Commissioner for her report; that the report be noted and that the Panel note the Commissioner's offer to discuss the future of Youth Commissioner role with the Panel.

107. Progress with the local Mental Health Concordat

(Item B2)

1. The Commissioner introduced the report, requested by the Panel. The Commissioner explained that the Concordat was developing well as an excellent piece of partnership working that affirmed the key partner agencies' commitment to providing joined up care for people in Mental Health Crisis.
2. The Commissioner stated that while there were some issues that needed addressing, such as better integration with the Kent Health and Wellbeing Boards, significant progress had been made; examples of success include the opening of places of safety and the Street Triage Pilot.
3. The latter has been part funded by the Commissioner to allow for seven days a week operation 08:00 – 20:00 with mental health nurses available to offer advice and psychiatric nurses able to provide assessments. It is expected that the Street Triage Pilot will be commended nationally in an HMIC Prison and Custody Inspection.
4. The Commissioner commented that the report included comparative data from Thames Valley Police but highlighted that there was no national data to work from, a fact that made detailed analysis and comparison difficult.
5. A Member criticised the lack of comparative data and suggested that accessing this information should be a priority. The Commissioner agreed but explained that the information was not held by other forces.
6. Responding to questions about the increase in police involvement in mental health incidents, the Commissioner and Chief of Staff explained that this was attributed to improved training and understanding of mental health within the force. This meant people with mental health issues were managed appropriately whereas previously they may have been dealt with as unco-operative or difficult individuals without appropriate support. The increased involvement was welcome as it showed the Force was becoming better at recognising mental health issues.
7. The Commissioner highlighted the importance of other services and partner agencies taking responsibility where appropriate as the Police should not be the main responder and manager for mental health issues and should only be involved when offences or safeguarding issues arise.
8. The Commissioner added that better communication was needed and that she hoped greater involvement through the Health and Wellbeing Boards would achieve this and made a request for Panel Members to encourage relevant agencies and staff to get involved. A member recommended that the Commissioner link with the West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group that was doing a mapping exercise which could be useful in supporting Police related Mental Health work.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's report.

108. Update on the new Policing Model

(Item B3)

1. The Commissioner provided an overview of the new policing model that went live on 24th June 2014. The Commissioner highlighted the positive responses the new model had so far received inside the Force and from members of the Public and public sector organisations. Of particular note in the new model is the deployment of Community Policing Teams (4 Police Constables and a Sergeant based in the Community Safety Units), which work closely with the PCSOs on dealing with local policing issues and public priorities. This locally focused approach is emphasised at management level where the District Commander, a local Chief Inspector, directly controls all resources at district level. This allows for greater flexibility and more capacity to focus on local priorities.
2. The Chairman commented that the new model sounded positive but he was concerned that another new model had been introduced as recently as 2011. He wanted reassurance that the new model would remain fit for purpose and would not be abandoned or altered as soon as the last.
3. The Commissioner stated the new model represented the best approach now and that the financial and policing needs situation had changed since 2011. The Force has lost 20% of its workforce in the interim and any policing model must reflect such practical realities. The Commissioner explained that the Chief Constable has embedded the new model with the community and the Community Safety Units and that it should be 'future-proof' for a few years. She further stated that a significant positive outcome is the determination to keep officers and staff in their current roles for as long as possible to ensure continuity for the community. The Chairman welcomed this assurance.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's report.

109. Annual Accounts 13/14 and Annual Report 13/14

(Item B4)

1. The Commissioner introduced her Annual Report for 2013/14, highlighting some examples of positive work undertaken in the period covered.
2. Key points included the decision to commission HMIC to conduct an inspection of the Force's crime recording accuracy which revealed some failings that have since been rectified. A second inspection has evidenced improved accuracy. People of Kent can now be confident that the Force maintains the highest accuracy levels in the country. Additionally, the Commissioner highlighted the key focus of all of her work had been to place victims at the heart of Policing and that engagement with the people of Kent had been a significant priority throughout. She commended the work of her staff and Kent Police in these endeavours.
3. Panel Members sought clarification of the work done by the Commissioner's innovation partner and asked when results might be apparent from this work. The Commissioner and Chief of Staff explained that the role of the innovation partner was to help the Force to position itself to make savings in the next 4 years.
4. Members asked the Commissioner to explain whether this work included consideration of outsourcing and the Commissioner advised that joint work with

Essex, particularly in respect of the joint platform for support services, was producing significant savings.

5. Members referred to earlier discussions about engagement with young people and asked whether a version of the report could also be produced in a format that was more likely to engage young people and the general public, who might find the published report quite lengthy. The Commissioner agreed to consider this. The Commissioner was also asked to consider including some crime statistics and some graphic representations of data.
6. Members advised the Commissioner that, although the report referred to good progress in a number of areas, e.g. establishment of local policing teams, work to commission a Sexual Assault Referral Centre, work to improve the accuracy of crime recording, and support for the Special Constabulary, it did not mention the problems relating to the introduction of the first Youth Commissioner. It also did not mention the independent review which was commissioned to enable the Police and Crime Commissioner to learn lessons. The Chairman advised that, in view of the widespread publicity surrounding the problems involved with the recruitment of the first Youth Commissioner and the impact this had on the credibility of the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Annual Report should have referred to this matter. The Commissioner accepted the point but commented that the issue had been discussed at length at a previous Panel meeting in 2013.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's report, that a Panel Report be prepared, and published after consultation with Panel members and approval of the Chairman.

110. Commissioner's Decisions - September 2014 *(Item C1)*

1. Clarification was sought on the Commissioner's decision on the Victim Centre. The Commissioner explained that her recent decision reflected the work now being undertaken in Phase 2 of the Victim Centre development; the drawing together of all relevant partners to co-design the most effective joint working agreement that fits with corporate guidelines and best meets the needs of victims. This work is being supported by using consultants that are engaging with victims to identify their priorities.
2. Members asked where the Community Remedy options fit in with the victim centre and if the Remedy 'menu' could be made available to Panel Members. The Commissioner and Chief of Staff explained that it was now an operational issue for Police managing appropriate sanctions for low level crime and antisocial behaviour. The details are accessible on the PCC website. The Commissioner agreed to provide the Community Remedy Options to the Panel at the next meeting.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's decision and note the commitment to provide the Community Remedy options to the next Panel Meeting.

111. Future work programme
(Item D1)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the work programme.

112. Minutes of the Commissioner's Governance Board meeting held on 26th August 2014
(Item E1)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the minutes of the Commissioner's Governance Board held on 26th August 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank

B1

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner

To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel

Subject: Draft Refreshed Police and Crime Plan for 2015/16 and Precept Proposal

Summary: This paper provides an overview of the process for refreshing the Police and Crime Plan, including the consultation that has taken place and revisions that have been made. In addition, this paper provides details of the proposed precept, budget and medium term plan and community safety grants.

Background:

1. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 sets out the requirement for Police and Crime Commissioners to formulate a Police and Crime Plan which covers their term of office. The Police and Crime Plan must include the following information:
 - The police and crime objectives to be delivered;
 - The policing that the Chief Constable should provide;
 - The financial and other resources to be provided to the Chief Constable to exercise their functions;
 - The means by which the Chief Constable will be held to account for the provision of policing;
 - The crime and disorder reduction grants that will be made and any conditions associated with them.
2. Police and Crime Commissioners are required to keep the Police and Crime Plan under review. In particular, the plan should be reviewed in light of any changes to the Strategic Policing Requirement or recommendations made by the Police and Crime Panel.
3. Police and Crime Commissioners are also required to notify the Police and Crime Panel of the precept which is proposed to be issued for the financial year. This report also fulfils that requirement.

The Plan Refresh Process:

4. The current plan makes a commitment for an annual refresh to be undertaken. This allows for changes in national policy, local priorities and financial parameters to be incorporated, as well as consideration of Panel recommendations. The refresh will not result in a fundamental altering of the plan, as this reflects statutory requirements and the ambitions of the Commissioner during her term of Office.
5. In approaching the refresh, there has been a commitment to positively encourage feedback opportunities from individuals, communities and partner agencies as a means to improve and develop service delivery. Therefore, an extensive consultation process employing various engagement techniques has been undertaken to inform this refresh. The consultation opened on 23 October and closed on 5 December 2014.

6. On 23 October, an online survey was uploaded and promoted on the Commissioner's website asking the following questions:
- Of the existing priorities within the Police and Crime Plan, are there any that require more or less emphasis and if so, why?
 - Are there priorities which relate to policing, criminal justice and community safety which you feel should be included in the Police and Crime Plan and if so, why?
 - What policing, criminal justice or community safety priorities has your organisation identified through the annual business planning processes? Are these reflected within the current Police and Crime Plan and if not, which ones would you consider relevant for inclusion?
 - Are there any significant national, regional or local policy changes within policing, criminal justice or community safety that need to be considered for inclusion within the refreshed Police and Crime Plan? If so, what are these?
 - For 2015/16, if the Government were to permit an increase in the policing proportion of council tax beyond 2%, without requiring a costly referendum, would you support me raising it, as long as it did not go above 3.5%?
7. On 27 October, a range of stakeholders were directly e-mailed the online survey including:
- Kent MPs
 - KCC Councillors
 - Medway Councillors
 - Community Safety Partnerships
 - Parish Councils
 - Council Leaders & Chief Executives
 - District & Borough Councillors
 - Business Associations
 - Charities & Voluntary organisations
 - Kent Association of Local Councils
8. The online survey was also e-mailed directly to 5,000 subscribers of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner Newsletter and the opportunity to provide feedback highlighted in the November 2014 edition.
9. The link to the consultation was circulated to 8,600 twitter followers and the Commissioner also hosted a Policing in Kent event on 21 November 2014 where the online survey was promoted.
10. Whilst clearly a range of views and opinions were articulated through the consultation, the following is a summary of the results and outcome:
- Are there any existing priorities that require more or less emphasis – suggestions reflected in the plan include domestic abuse, hate crime and partnership working. However, the consensus agreed with the current priorities, and visible community policing was again the most consistent theme.
 - Are there any other priorities that should be included – themes reflected in the plan include road safety, alcohol misuse and drug dealing. In addition, consistent themes that have been incorporated are child sexual exploitation and police engagement.
 - Are there priorities that your organisation has identified that should be included – there was little consistency, but themes reflected in the plan include the health agenda, gang affiliation and rural policing.
 - Are there any significant policy changes that should be included – common themes that are incorporated in the plan include the use of new powers (e.g. Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014), cybercrime, human trafficking and children and young people.
 - Support for raising the policing proportion of the council tax – there was strong support for an increase of 2%, in line with existing published plans, but limited support for an increase of more than this; in particular, where there was support, it was tempered by a need to know where the funds would be spent.

11. In addition to the above, the refresh has taken into account comments received throughout the year at public engagement events and in correspondence received by the Office of the Commissioner.
12. The Chief Constable has been consulted and provided feedback which is fully reflected in the refreshed plan.

Key Changes in the Refreshed Police and Crime Plan:

13. A copy of the refreshed Police and Crime Plan in text only format can be found at Appendix A. Once the text has been finalised, photographs and graphics will be added prior to publishing on the website. It will be presented in a similar format to the current Police and Crime Plan.
14. As previously indicated, the focus has been on refreshing the contents of the plan rather than undertaking a major re-write. However, as this is both a public-facing plan and used to set the direction of policing and crime and disorder reduction, it is designed to balance the needs of both audiences within one document.
15. The Governance section sets out how Kent Police will be held to account for the delivery of policing and the priorities contained within the refreshed plan. This has been updated to reflect new arrangements introduced over the last year:
 - The People Board: In support of the Force culture change, this oversees how the Kent Police Mission, Vision and Values are being embedded, with an emphasis on organisational health, integrity and diversity.
 - The Ethics Committee: Comprising of independent members as well as Force and OPCC representatives, this was set up in line with recommendations developed by the College of Policing in the Code of Ethics. The Committee supports the Chief Constable and Commissioner in fostering a culture where ethical decision making drives activity, and ensures a quality service is delivered to the communities of Kent.
16. Aligned to the consultation findings, the core Policing and Crime and Disorder Reduction Priorities remain unchanged and are as follows:
 - Cut crime and catch criminals
 - Ensure visible community policing is at the heart of policing in Kent
 - Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and reduce repeat victimisation and offending
 - Put victims and witnesses at the heart of processes
 - Protect the public from harm
 - Deliver value for money
 - Meet national commitments for policing
17. Reflecting the consultation, working in partnership remains a core theme. With the challenging financial environment, it is more important than ever to pool resources, avoid duplication and identify and share innovative solutions to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour. Whilst Community Safety Partnerships and other statutory partners continue to play a pivotal role, the plan also emphasises the importance of less formal partnerships such as the Crime Rural Advisory Group and Business Crime Advisory Group in tackling specific concerns.
18. Visible community policing remains as the bedrock of policing in Kent, but the plan emphasises the importance of exploring other opportunities with police and non police organisations to develop fresh ideas to keep police officers and community support officers on frontline duties.

19. The plan has been updated to reflect emerging national as well as local issues, a theme highlighted through the consultation. This includes tackling so called 'legal highs', enhancing investigative capability in relation to cyber or online crime and providing e-safety advice.
20. The plan places a greater emphasis on children and young people, notably:
 - Partners working together to protect children, particularly from child sexual exploitation following events in Rotherham. To support this, the Commissioner is providing £200,000 funding to the Force in each of the next three years to boost capacity to tackle child sexual exploitation and enhance multi-agency working.
 - Further to research conducted by the Youth Commissioner since her appointment in March 2014, the plan incorporates a number of recommendations that focus on integration and engagement with young people.
 - Whilst there remains a strong focus on preventing and reducing youth offending and victimisation, the plan reflects the importance of partnership working in tackling other challenges young people face, such as gang affiliation.
21. As highlighted through the consultation, the plan has been updated to reflect new legislation and other strategies, including the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 and national/local Mental Health Concordat. In addition, the plan seeks to develop working relationships within the changing criminal justice landscape, such as with the recently formed Community Rehabilitation Company and National Probation Service.
22. With Ministry of Justice funding now coming to Police and Crime Commissioners, the plan continues to reflect the Commissioner's commitment to place victims and witnesses at the heart of the criminal justice system. The plan emphasises the importance of:
 - Developing specialist victim support services which result in real and positive outcomes.
 - Ensuring the service to victims in terms of first referral and subsequent access to specialist support is tailored to the needs of Kent; rather than the 'one size fits all' approach offered by previous national arrangements.
 - Ensuring opportunities presented by the new Victims' Centre, including co-location of the Witness Care Unit and Victim Support are maximised to support the above.
 - Delivering further improvements; a sum of money has been set aside for projects identified by partners, including the Commissioner to improve the experience of victims in the criminal justice system.
23. The plan continues to have due regard for the Strategic Policing Requirement. With the recent shocking and tragic events in France, maintaining the capability and capacity of Kent Police to respond to national, as well as local threats must be a priority.
24. The section titled 'Finance and Medium Term Budget Challenge' has also been refreshed to take account of the latest financial information and Force plans to ensure on-going delivery of a first class service in challenging times.

Policing Precept Proposal for 2015/16:

25. A policing precept for 2015/16 of £147.15 for a Band D property is proposed. This represents an increase of 1.99% or 5.5 pence per week on the current precept for 2014/15. An increase of that level is entirely in line with previously published intentions set out in the current Police and Crime Plan. Wide consultation also confirms the public are content with this level. A balance has to be drawn between any increase to council tax payers versus raising the policing element to provide some (albeit limited) mitigation against the impact on policing services resulting from grant cuts. In reality, the scope for a local judgement on that balance is constrained by the referendum trigger limit, the cost to undertake a referendum (in excess of £2m for Kent) and the very prescriptive rules on how referenda have to be run. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to explore with local council tax payers in a meaningful way even limited tax increases beyond the trigger limit of 1.99% to further mitigate service reductions, as happens in Wales.
26. Government grant is the most significant funding stream for the budget, but each 1% rise in the police element of the council tax generates £800,000 for Kent. A 1.99% increase (2% rounded) raises £1.6m and for 2015/16, this means that having to find an additional saving of £1.6m or about 30 police officer jobs – on top of the savings of £14.5 that are still required – has been avoided. In other words, a 2% increase allows the Force to keep about 30 police officers 'on the books' rather than lose them.
27. Even with a 1.99% increase, Kent's policing precept is still likely to be the third lowest in the country and as a result, well below the current national average of £169.06 per band D property.

Budget and Medium Term Plan Supporting Information:

28. In response to the last four years of grant cuts, the Force has already delivered a new policing model as well as other savings, totalling £50m. Those savings have come at a cost though, with approximately 500 police officers and 720 police staff not being replaced when they have left the Force.
29. In a new round of grant cuts, for the year 2015/16, the Government has cut the general grant to the Force by 5.1% or £9.4m in cash terms. That, coupled with routine pay and inflation pressures, means the Force has to find £14.5m of savings in 2015/16 even after applying an increase in the policing element of the council tax of 1.99%. Thanks to sensible forward planning, the Force will be able to deliver these savings without any significant cuts in front-line visible neighbourhood policing. In part, the savings for next year are being delivered by improved use of IT and innovation. However, it will still require the loss of approximately another 115 jobs, primarily through natural attrition, but also further restructuring and asking staff and officers to do even more. Added to this, the ability to protect front-line policing capability will be severely limited in the face of further grant cuts over the medium-term.
30. In more detail, the key areas of saving in 2015/16 are as follows:
- Budget alignment following the last round of savings and introduction of vacancy factors (£5.1m).
 - Non-Pay efficiency savings (£4.1m).
 - Further restructuring and innovation: Tactical and tasking operations, Force Control Room, corporate directorate, case file management (£2.8m).
 - Additional collaboration savings with Essex Police (£2.5m).

31. Overall, the planned gross budget for 2015/16 will be £306m, of which 98% will be delegated to the Chief Constable. The net budget for all operations, after taking into account assumed counter terrorism grants and local income, will be £274.1m. The operations of the Office of the Commissioner will be required to deliver an underspend of £100,000, equivalent to a real saving of 8.7% to provide one off funds for the Chief Constable to invest further in culture change within the Force. The separate commissioning Grants budget will have to absorb the average cash grant cut of 5.1%. However, again by targeted use of office budget underspends it is intended to limit actual reductions to partners in 2015/16 to that previously set out and published last year.
32. The budget plan reflects the latest indication of the specific grant allocation for Kent in 2015/16 of £1.9m to deliver the important responsibility of commissioning services for victims of crime. Turning to other new initiatives for 2015/16, one-off funding will be allocated from savings in previous years to allow:
- £200,000 in each of the next three years as a contribution to boosting Force capacity to help fight child sexual exploitation and support enhanced multi-agency working.
 - £100,000 in 2015/16 to support projects identified by partners and the Office of the Commissioner to improve the experience of victims in the wider criminal justice system.
33. In addition to revenue spending, a total of £13m will be allocated for a variety of capital and investment projects during 2015/16. Financed from a mixture of accumulated capital reserves and capital receipts, they will be kept under constant, ruthless review

The Medium Term Financial Challenge:

34. Beyond 2015/16, the latest Autumn Statement from the Chancellor (December 2014), makes clear that cuts in public spending will continue into the medium-term in response to the public sector deficit. At a minimum, the same level of cuts to the police grant from 2016/17 onwards as seen in the previous round up to 2015/16 could be faced. To put that into context, and even after assuming an increase in the police council tax of 1.99% per year, a 20% real cut in police grant over the medium-term implies minimum further savings of £46.5m for the period 2016/17 to 2018/19. This is in addition to the £14.5m required for 2015/16, making a total of £61m further savings as a minimum for the period 2015/16 to 2018/19, but it could be even worse. This £61m of savings over the medium term is on top of the £50m of savings already delivered in the previous round of grant cuts between 2011/12 and 2014/15, making a total of £111m.
35. Faced with that level of cuts to police funding, there needs to be a serious national debate about the role and expectations for policing over the medium to long-term, and in particular the balance between local, regional and national policing.
36. The Chief Constable will be developing saving options during 2015 to ensure the Force can respond effectively to the medium-term financial challenge when the national detail is known. Maximising efficiency opportunities, fully exploiting collaboration, challenging every item of spend, looking to reduce demand and making best use of police officer time through IT and innovation, with partners where appropriate, are key planning principles. However, the most important transformational aim remains to limit the impact of grant cuts on front-line policing capability as far as is possible and only taking savings from that area as a last resort.

37. To assist the Panel and for information, Appendix B is the Chief Finance Officer's Budget Statement, with additional technical supporting annexes dealing with; the Summary Medium Term Financial Plan and Statement of Reserves (Revenue). At Appendix C is a copy of the response, from the Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society (PACCTS), to the Home Office on the police grant announcement. The Kent Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer contributed to the response.

Community Safety Grants – Working With Partners:

38. Working with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour is vital. The three key principles in how the community safety funding is allocated remain:

- a. All spending plans must help deliver the key priorities set out in the refreshed plan.
- b. Working with existing partners to deliver joined up services where possible and appropriate; ensuring proportionate governance arrangements for the grants, but also commissioning services directly if that proves more effective.
- c. Providing as much medium-term funding certainty as possible in the allocations to partners whilst also taking into account the reduced funding anticipated in future years.

39. Last year, the promise was made that as much medium-term certainty in funding allocations to partners and organisations would be provided. Accordingly, the assumed allocations for 2015/16 and 2016/17 were set reflecting the understanding that allocations would have to be reduced each year on the basis of the assumed general policing grant cut suffered. Although the actual policing grant cut for 2015/16 is greater than was assumed last February, the allocations for 2015/16 announced last year will be honoured by utilising under-spends in the office budget in 2014/15. This maintains vital community safety plans without adding to the savings burden falling on the Force. That would also be the intention in respect of previously announced indicative allocations for 2016/17, but this will depend on the scale of future grant cuts imposed on policing.

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT REFRESHED

POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

April 2013 – March 2017

Version Final

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 The Commissioner's election promises
 - 1.2 The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner
 - 1.3 The Police and Crime Plan
2. Governance
 - 2.1 Holding Kent Police to account
 - 2.2 The Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel
 - 2.3 Legal requirements and considerations
3. Strategic Vision for Policing and Crime & Disorder Reduction
4. Policing and Crime & Disorder Reduction Priorities
 - 4.1 Cut crime and catch criminals
 - 4.2 Ensure visible community policing is at the heart of policing in Kent
 - 4.3 Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and reduce repeat victimisation and offending
 - 4.4 Put victims and witnesses at the heart of processes
 - 4.5 Protect the public from harm
 - 4.6 Deliver value for money
 - 4.7 Meet national commitments for policing
5. Delivery Principles
 - 5.1 Transparency and openness
 - 5.2 Public engagement
 - 5.3 Partnership working
 - 5.4 Review and Annual Report
6. Finance and Medium Term Budget Challenge
 - 6.1 Kent Police funding: The current situation
 - 6.2 Further grant cuts on the horizon
 - 6.3 Council tax plans
 - 6.4 Policing budget for 2015/16
 - 6.5 Coping with new savings requirements – working with partners
 - 6.6 Other spending plans
 - 6.7 Community Safety Funding – working with partners

Appendix One: Community Safety Fund Allocations

1. Introduction

This is the second 'refresh' of my Police and Crime Plan. It is always exciting to look ahead and there has never been a more important and critical time to examine how we can do things differently; how we can meet new challenges and how we can work with partners to achieve the best possible police service for the people of Kent.

In deciding priorities for the coming year we have to do so in the shadow of the short and medium term budget challenge. We know that next year we have to save at least £14.5 million from the Kent Police budget and over the next four years we predict that Kent will be requested to save at least another £46 million – meaning a minimum of £61 million on top of the £50 million already gone from the budget. So, it is vital that we prepare for what will undoubtedly be a difficult time ahead. We must have plans in place to identify savings and efficiencies beyond the immediate 2015/16 year and try to limit the impact. Every force in the country is currently tackling similar challenges and I shall continue to keep pushing for a national debate on what we want from our police service and how we are prepared to fund it.

The biggest challenge will be making sure that visible community policing remains as the bedrock of policing in our county and I am committed to that, but we need to be more innovative around our approach to keeping those police officers and community support officers out in their neighbourhoods on frontline duties for as long as possible.

My other absolute commitment is that victims and witnesses continue to be at the heart of everything we do. With Ministry of Justice funding coming to Police and Crime Commissioners to develop a local service to meet local needs, we have the once-in-lifetime opportunity to make sure services are accessible to all and that they are really what victims of crime themselves want, rather than what everyone else thinks they need.

We see new challenges emerging such as child sexual exploitation. Whether vile people choose to exploit children through the use of technology or by using violence, coercion and intimidation within relationships, we must all work together to make sure that our children are protected from harm. So it is vital that Kent Police and partners are better prepared. This is one of my new key priorities to which I have allocated £200,000 per year for the next three years, financed from reserves. This is specifically for this area of crime investigation and protection and is on top of what is already allocated from the annual police budget. We shall also build on the already significant achievements in the new Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC).

I want to see us building on our partnership working. With budgets tight for all, we must work together, pool our precious resources and avoid duplication. Community Safety Partnerships are a shining beacon of how different agencies are working together to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour. They have my full support. We shall continue to work with the Crime Rural Advisory Group to address the specific issues in rural communities and work with and support the Business Crime Advisory Group.

The Youth Commissioner has also been working throughout the year to look at different ways that the police can better engage with young people. Some interesting themes have emerged and I look forward to developing these with Kent Police and our partners over the coming months.

I would like to thank all those who have responded with their ideas and suggestions for the 2015/16 plan. I hope you will see your valuable feedback reflected in the plan and I commend to you my vision as the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner which Kent Police, working with partners, will be delivering.

Ann Barnes, Your Police and Crime Commissioner

1.1 The Commissioner's Election Promises:

During the election campaign the Commissioner made a number of specific promises and these are core to this Police and Crime Plan.

1. Cutting crime and boosting visible policing
2. Fighting Government cuts
3. Giving the public a greater say in policing
4. Putting victims at the heart of the Police and criminal justice system
5. Youth Commissioner
6. New Mobile Police Stations
7. Meet the Commissioner events

1.2 The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner:

This plan reflects the role and responsibilities of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Kent, which include:

- Setting the strategic direction and objectives for Kent Police.
- Ensuring that Kent Police is efficient and effective.
- Setting the Force budget and the policing element of council tax (police precept).
- Consulting and engaging with the public and specifically with victims of crime.
- Holding the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of police and crime priorities.
- Working in partnership with community safety and criminal justice agencies to deliver efficient and effective services.
- Awarding community safety funding and other grants.
- Dealing with complaints and other disciplinary matters regarding the Chief Constable.
- Appointing and, if necessary, dismissing the Chief Constable.
- Providing information to the public.

1.3 The Police and Crime Plan

This refreshed Police and Crime Plan is a **high level strategic plan**, which sets out the priorities for policing and crime and disorder reduction for the period 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2017.

In refreshing this plan, my office has considered the impact of the budget reductions facing the police and other public sector agencies. Over two thirds of our funding depends upon government grant, which will be further cut over the period of this plan. As the future financial picture for policing in Kent is uncertain it may mean some difficult decisions will need to be taken about how policing is delivered resulting in the priorities in this plan being revisited. However, as Kent's elected Police and Crime Commissioner, I am committed to ensuring local visible community policing remains at the heart of Kent's policing model.

In refreshing this plan, it is recognised that the police deal with more than just crime. Indeed crime only represents about a quarter of all incidents reported to Kent Police. Other responsibilities include dealing with anti-social behaviour and road traffic collisions, locating missing persons and addressing welfare concerns. These are all critical services provided by the police and make our communities safer. This plan sets out how Kent Police will work together with other agencies to deliver first class policing and community safety within our communities.

The Chief Constable has a duty to deliver against this Police and Crime Plan and my office will hold him to account for this. However, the Chief Constable has complete operational independence over how policing is delivered. Nothing in this plan seeks to restrict this.

2. Governance

2.1 Holding Kent Police to account

Police and Crime Commissioners have a number of powers to hold the police to account on behalf of the public. It is important for police accountability arrangements to be visible to the public, and for policing to be responsive to local communities. It is vital that the public's voice is heard on how policing is delivered across the county and my office will ensure this happens.

To exercise these powers and duties to hold Kent Police to account, a suite of governance arrangements have been established. These include:

- A public Governance Board that enables my office to hold the Chief Constable to account for the effective delivery of policing across the county. This is an open meeting and members of the public are welcome to attend.
- The People Board is aligned to the Governance Board and focuses on the culture of the organisation, ensuring the Kent Police Mission, Vision and Values are being engrained. This meeting is held twice a year in public and is broadly concerned with organisational health and the workforce, including integrity, morale and equality and diversity.
- A number of other forums also sit under the Governance Board and allow my office to robustly scrutinise how Kent Police is delivering this plan. These forums cover areas such as finance, human resources, performance and complaints and conduct.
- A joint Audit Committee looks at financial and risk management as well as internal controls.
- Weekly one-to-one meetings with the Chief Constable to discuss policing issues as well as regular informal contact.
- An established scheme of Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs), who check on the welfare of people in police custody by visiting police stations unannounced. These ICVs fulfil an important role in reassuring the public that the police is fulfilling its duty to protect people detained in their custody from harm.
- The Ethics Committee formally meets twice a year and was established following recommendations in the College of Policing Code of Ethics. Recognising officers and staff must act ethically and with integrity, and that policing needs to be transparent, the scope of the Committee includes supporting integrity in decision making, influencing police culture and fostering attitudes and practices which are ethical.

In addition to the above, my office receives regular management reports in relation to matters such as performance, complaints, finance, equality and diversity, human resources and safeguarding children. Kent and Essex Police also share a number of operational and non-operational resources and appropriate governance arrangements are in place, such as the Kent and Essex Collaboration Board to oversee these shared resources.

In specific circumstances, where there are matters of significant public interest, other methods of holding to account may also be used, including:

- Writing 'open letters' to the Chief Constable which require a public response.
- Holding Commissioner Inquiries into matters of interest, at which the Chief Constable will give evidence.
- Calling upon public bodies, such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), to produce reports on Kent Police on my behalf.

2.2 The Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel

Actions and decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner are scrutinised by the Police and Crime Panel, made up of representatives from local councils and independent members. This panel provides checks and balances on the powers granted by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The panel has a duty to both support and challenge the Commissioner, working together to provide the best possible outcomes for the people of Kent.

2.3 Legal requirements and considerations when developing the Police and Crime Plan

There are a number of factors and legal requirements that are taken into consideration when developing this Police and Crime Plan. Examples of these include:

- Force Strategic Assessment: an intelligence-led assessment by Kent Police of what is expected to happen over the next 12 months. In particular, it identifies threats and opportunities around crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Strategic Policing Requirement: sets out the Home Secretary's view of the national threats that the police must address, and the capacity and capability police forces must have available to deliver this requirement.
- Views of partners and stakeholders: the police cannot reduce crime and anti-social behaviour alone and there are many partners and stakeholders who deliver these responsibilities.
- The Commissioner's Election Promises: these are central to this Police and Crime Plan.
- Public and victim consultation: feedback from the public and specifically victims about their expectations and experiences are at the heart of this plan.
- Views of the Chief Constable: the Chief Constable is responsible for delivering against this plan, and has therefore been consulted on its development.
- Police and Crime Panel: the panel has powers and duties to scrutinise and support the Commissioner in delivering this plan.
- Medium-term financial plan: recognises the potential impact of Government grant cuts.
- Partnership priorities: My office recognises the value of partnership working and in developing this plan has considered, in particular, those of the District Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), Kent Community Safety Partnership, Medway Community Safety Partnership, Kent and Medway Strategic Plan for Reducing Re-offending and the Kent Criminal Justice Board.

3 Strategic Vision for Policing and Crime & Disorder Reduction

The Chief Constable, Alan Pughsley, and I are committed to working together to secure the best possible outcomes for policing and reducing crime and disorder for the people of Kent. This commitment is reflected in our joint vision for policing in the county which focuses on partnership working, placing victims first, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour as well as protecting the public from harm.

"Our vision is for Kent to be a safe place for people to live, work and visit and by protecting the public from crime and anti-social behaviour, we will allow our communities to flourish. We will work closely with our partners to ensure that a seamless service is provided and that opportunities for joint working are explored. By working with partners and listening to the public we will provide a first class policing service that places the victim first and is visible and accessible. We will ensure local visible community policing is at the heart of everything we do. We will be there when the public need us and we will act with integrity in all that we do."

In order to achieve this vision, this plan's strategic priorities are to:

- Cut crime and catch criminals.
- Ensure visible community policing is at the heart of policing in Kent.
- Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and reduce repeat victimisation and offending.
- Put victims and witnesses at the heart of processes.
- Protect the public from harm.
- Deliver value for money.
- Meet national commitments for policing.

4 Policing and Crime & Disorder Reduction Priorities

4.1 Cut crime and catch criminals

This priority sets out the activities that will ensure a focus on cutting crime and catching criminals. This includes anti-social behaviour as it is every bit as important as crime and can significantly affect the quality of life of individuals and communities. In addition, the needs of different communities and groups are recognised, for example supporting rural communities is equally as important as tackling crime and disorder in urban areas.

To deliver this priority Kent Police and/or partners will be expected to:

- Use innovative technology such as Predictive Policing to identify crime trends, locations and emerging issues, ensuring the appropriate targeting of resources.
- Focus on reducing crime that causes the greatest harm to society and individuals.
- Target resources effectively to tackle both the supply of and demand for illegal drugs and work with partners to deliver a coordinated approach to dealing with 'Legal Highs'.
- Ensure a focused and joined-up approach to tackling night time economy related crime and anti-social behaviour in support of safer socialising.
- Tackle youth crime and youth victimisation, focusing on improving the education and life chances of young-people through early intervention and preventative activities to divert them away from anti-social behaviour and crime.
- Work in partnership with the Crime Rural Advisory Group (CRAG) to recognise and address the specific concerns of rural communities when deploying resources.
- Increase resources within the Business Crime Advisory Group and work together to recognise the specific concerns of the business community, reduce the volume and impact of business crime and identify emerging issues.
- Agree a partnership strategy and protocols for dealing with anti-social behaviour which enables a seamless service for victims and is aligned to the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

4.2 Ensure visible community policing is at the heart of policing in Kent

Visible community policing is the bedrock of policing in the county, and finding new ways of keeping police officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in Kent's communities is essential. My office will maintain a relentless focus on ensuring that the police are responsive to public priorities and address the issues that matter most.

To deliver against this priority Kent Police and/or partners will be expected to:

- Maximise the proportion of time officers spend on front-line activities, particularly those that are visible and accessible to the community.

- Continue to utilise police community support officers (PCSOs), special constables and police volunteers, recognising the significant and valuable contribution they make to keeping Kent safe.
- Continue to engage with partners to recognise and develop the role of other community resources such as Community Wardens and Neighbourhood Watch Schemes.
- Whilst recognising the geography of Kent, attend appropriate calls for service promptly across the entire county.
- Increase the satisfaction of communities by maintaining a quality local policing service, delivering high standards of conduct and behaviour in all interactions with the public.
- Make appropriate alternative accessibility arrangements before any police station closure decisions are taken.
- Ensure all individuals and communities are treated fairly and with respect.
- Ensure Kent Police services are young-people friendly, including the development of existing and new services.
- Kent Police to pro-actively engage and maintain a rapport with young-people. This may include delivering educational packages, youth programme inputs or referring young-people onto community programmes.
- Raise awareness of young people during officer and staff training.
- Develop and improve ways of working with partners in areas such as information sharing and local community engagement. Clearly define roles and responsibilities to enable more effective targeting of activity, joint problem solving and seamless service delivery to all communities.
- Ensure that there is an effective and timely response to complaints made against Kent Police, and improve transparency in line with Government proposals.
- Ensure the College of Policing Code of Ethics is adopted by Kent Police and fully embedded.

4.3 Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and reduce repeat victimisation and offending

The police cannot reduce crime alone, and preventative work is pivotal to sustaining long-term reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour. Working closely with partner agencies, such as Community Safety Partnerships to tackle the root causes of crime and anti-social behaviour is key.

To deliver this priority Kent Police and/or partners will be expected to:

- Implement and support strategies that prevent repeat offending and victimisation.
- Engage with the Ministry of Justice's Transforming Rehabilitation Programme, ensuring that Kent's priorities are known and understood and that effective working practices are developed with the Community Rehabilitation Company and National Probation Service.

B1 Appendix A

- Ensure there are robust processes in place to identify and manage repeat and vulnerable victims of anti-social behaviour.
- Work with partners to improve the health and well-being of our communities, particularly tackling mental illness in line with both the national and local Mental Health Concordat and development of mental-health liaison and diversion schemes.
- Provide preventative information and advice on how to avoid becoming a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour, including information and advice on e-safety.
- Work with partners to develop more positive activities for young-people within communities, including identifying and engaging with those at risk of gang affiliation or involved with gang activity.
- Promote and support projects that aim to integrate young-people from diverse backgrounds. Work with partners to encourage the use of shared community spaces in a safe and non anti-social manner.
- Work with partners to deliver consistent crime prevention and safety messages to young-people, including an awareness of what is considered anti-social behaviour and information on substance misuse.
- Support the work of the Kent Troubled Families Programme and Medway Action for Families.
- Support delivery of Integrated Offender Management and ensure that the root causes of offending are identified and tackled, including lack of education, training, employment and stable accommodation.
- Work with partners to ensure drug and alcohol intervention programmes are effective and targeted appropriately.
- Support partnership approaches and ensure good practice is captured and shared across the county.

4.4 Put victims and witnesses at the heart of processes

The policing service in Kent must focus on the victim in everything it does, and people must be put before process. Victims should expect that the crime or anti-social behaviour they report is dealt with efficiently and effectively and that they are supported through the criminal justice system.

Police and Crime Commissioners now have responsibility for the commissioning of victim support services, which enables them to be tailored to meet the specific needs of Kent's victims.

To deliver against this priority the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner will work with Kent Police, the Kent Criminal Justice Board and other partners to:

- Enhance and develop the capacity of Kent Police and other agencies to deal with child sexual-exploitation.
- Maximise opportunities afforded by the new Victims' Centre and the new arrangement with Victim Support to deliver a county-wide service. Using virtual and digital access to

B1 Appendix A

information, integrate the victim's journey through the criminal justice system with the appropriate support.

- Develop the commissioning approach for specialist victim support services in Kent which is based on need and ensures capacity within services to deliver effective support to victims.
- Commission a long-term contract for core victim support services in Kent, which ensures that victims who report crime or those who don't wish to report are able to access services tailored to their individual needs rather than a 'one size fits all' approach.
- Use victim-survey results, focus-groups, public consultation and needs assessments to ensure that services place the victim first and that a high quality service is provided to those who report crime or anti-social behaviour.
- Earmark resources to enable criminal justice agencies to invest in further improvements to support victims and witnesses of crime or anti-social behaviour.
- Focus on resolving crime and anti-social behaviour so victims feel they have had a quality service from the Force.
- Provide an effective service to support those who have suffered domestic abuse, particularly those who are vulnerable or nervous of the criminal justice system.
- Support victims and witnesses through the criminal justice system to reduce the number of collapsed trials and increase the number of successful convictions.
- Regularly update victims on progress when dealing with the crime or anti-social behaviour they have reported, including promoting the use of TrackMyCrime.
- Develop victim initiated Restorative Justice which supports the victim or their family to cope and recover from the crime they have experienced.
- Meet the standards set out in the national Code of Practice for the Victims of Crime and Witness Charter.
- Improve the service offered to victims of sexual assault by enhancing the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC).
- Ensure appropriate police ownership of procedures and practices in relation to children and young-people.

4.5 Protect the public from harm

There is a need to balance the delivery of local, visible community policing with effective services that protect the public from serious harm. Policing activity to manage this work is often invisible but the impact of these crimes can cause serious harm to individuals and communities. For example hate crime can not only be distressing for the victim, as it is motivated by prejudice or hostility for who they are or who the perpetrator believes they are, but it can also impact on the wellbeing of communities.

To deliver against this priority Kent Police and/or partners will be expected to:

- Focus on disrupting and dismantling serious and organised crime groups that have the potential to cause the most harm through the Kent and Essex Serious Crime Directorate and involvement of local partnerships.
- Continue to work together to prevent violent extremism and radicalisation in our communities through the PREVENT programme.
- Work with other agencies to protect the public from emerging threats such as online or cybercrime.
- Undertake both enforcement and preventative activity to improve road safety and reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on Kent's roads, particularly through the Kent and Medway Casualty Reduction Partnership.
- Support and protect victims from domestic abuse through effective partnership arrangements such as the Domestic Abuse One Stop Shops and the countywide Independent Domestic Violence Adviser (IDVA) service. In particular, to scope existing good practice and develop a support programme for the children of victims of domestic abuse.
- Bring offenders of serious violent crime and sexual offences to justice through robust investigative processes.
- Provide an effective response to reports of missing people, and work with partners to ensure that the root causes of disappearance are addressed.
- Encourage better awareness, reporting, and investigation of all forms of hate crime.
- Ensure that children are protected from harm, including effective joined-up arrangements for the safeguarding of children and identifying and investigating child sexual-exploitation. This also includes working in conjunction with the Safeguarding Children Boards and the Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Board.
- Recognise the issues associated with human trafficking and work together with the full range of partners to identify and address it.

4.6 Deliver value for money

To deliver the best possible service in the county in a climate of diminishing budgets, it is essential that Kent Police is as efficient and effective as possible. The promise to not privatise Kent Police remains firm, but it does not prevent working more closely with the private and third sector to develop innovative and fresh thinking. This focus on innovation and continuous improvement is essential to continue minimising the impact of grant cuts on front-line policing.

To deliver against this priority Kent Police will be expected to:

- Identify options to deal with prospective future grant cuts.

- Make the best use of its resources by focussing on efficiency, effectiveness and productivity, for example, investing in new technology, innovation and other invest-to-save opportunities such as body worn video.
- Meet the savings target required in each and every year of this four-year plan, and if necessary beyond.
- Implement financial processes and regulations that provide reassurance and meet audit requirements.
- Continue to collaborate with Essex Police to identify savings and efficiencies while also exploring other collaborative opportunities with police and non-police organisations that could enhance efficiency and effectiveness.
- Reduce bureaucracy and streamline processes so officers can focus on activities the public want, such as visible patrolling, crime investigation and community engagement.
- Remain a cost-effective Force relative to other forces in England and Wales as demonstrated through Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) Value for Money Profiles.
- Put in place coherent and costed medium-term plans for finance, property and IT to deliver the Police and Crime Plan priorities, including operational requirements.

4.7 Meet national commitments for policing

All police forces nationally need to work together, particularly at times of high demand or threat, to share and pool resources across police borders. These responsibilities are set out in the national Strategic Policing Requirement. The resources allocated to the Chief Constable must be sufficient to meet these important responsibilities. In addition Kent Police will continue to work with the other emergency services to respond to major or complex incidents.

To deliver against this priority Kent Police will be expected to:

- Maintain the capability and capacity to respond to national threats.
- Make the appropriate contribution to resourcing national threats in partnership with other forces.

5 Delivery Principles

5.1 Transparency and openness

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner is committed to being open, honest and transparent. To achieve this, the public of Kent will be provided with the information required to ensure all decisions are accountable and follow good governance principles. My office will also ensure that required information is published quickly and can be easily found on the website.

My office will always be open and transparent in any decisions that are made on behalf of the people of Kent. It's important that the public can clearly see Kent Police is being held to account on their behalf and how this is being achieved.

My office will also ensure that Kent Police adheres to the highest possible standards of transparency and openness, as this will support the building of trust in the service delivered.

5.2 Public engagement

Good public engagement improves the quality of decisions made by my office as they are based on a broad knowledge of the issues that matter to communities and individuals.

An extensive public engagement programme has been developed to ensure the public can have their say in how their street and community are policed. This includes regular Meet the Commissioner and Chief Constable events and local surgeries that allow communities to put their views forward and helps to ensure the police are dealing with the things that matter most.

5.3 Partnership working

One of the core principles underpinning this Police and Crime Plan is the value of partnership working and the recognition that crime and anti-social behaviour reduction cannot be delivered by the police alone. For communities and victims, it does not matter which agency is responsible for the issues they face; what they care about is whether or not the issue is being resolved.

To ensure the involvement of partners in supporting delivery of this plan, it is vital that my office and the Force continue to actively participate in and engage with relevant partnership structures. As a result, my office and Kent Police will continue to work closely with partners, communities and other groups to eradicate 'silo working' so that the community safety and criminal justice system provides a seamless service to victims and witnesses in Kent. This will allow for effective joint working and identification of opportunities to make Kent a safe place for people to live, work and visit.

Excellent work is already being undertaken by existing partnerships in Kent, including the Community Safety Partnerships and the Kent Criminal Justice Board. My office will continue to work closely with these partnerships to ensure this work continues as well as developing new and innovative ways of working. It is also important that good practice is captured and shared across the county and my office will encourage and support this for the benefit of all communities.

5.4 Review and Annual Report

This plan will be reviewed annually and key sections revised accordingly. However, it will also be kept under review in light of any recommendations made by the Police and Crime Panel, national guidance issued by the Home Secretary, changes in local priorities or significant reductions in police funding.

Police and Crime Commissioners must produce an annual report which documents progress made in the financial year in meeting the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan. My office will provide the annual report to members of the Police and Crime Panel for their consideration.

6. Finance and Medium Term Budget Challenge

6.1 Kent Police funding: The current situation

Kent Police funding is made up of:

66% grant funding, both general and specific, from the Government;
28% from the police element of the council tax; and
6% from miscellaneous income streams.

While the financial situation remains difficult, Kent Police has risen to the funding challenges so far. In response to the previous round of grant cuts, the Force has already delivered a new policing model as well as other savings, totalling £50m. Those savings have come at a cost though, with approximately 500 police officers and 720 police staff not being replaced when they have left the Force.

In a new round of grant cuts, commencing in 2015/16, the Government has cut the general grant to the Force by 5.1% or £9.4m in cash terms. That cut coupled with routine pay and inflation pressures, means the Force has to find £14.5m of savings in 2015/16 even after applying an increase in the policing element of the council tax of 1.99%. Thanks to sensible forward planning, the Force will be able to deliver these savings without any significant cuts in front-line neighbourhood policing. In part the savings for next year are being delivered by improved use of IT and innovation. However, it will still require the loss of approximately another 115 jobs, primarily through natural attrition, further restructuring and asking staff and officers to do even more. The ability to protect front-line policing capability will be severely limited in the face of further grant cuts over the medium-term.

6.2 Further grant cuts on the horizon

Beyond 2015/16, the latest Autumn Statement from the Chancellor (December 2014), makes clear that cuts in public spending will continue into the medium-term in response to the public sector deficit. A new government, following national elections in May 2015, will decide the extent of cuts to policing as part of that broader package of public sector cuts. However, it is clear that a new government will have limited room for manoeuvre, and as a minimum the same level of cuts to the police grant from 2016/17 seen in the previous round could be faced. To put that into context, and even after assuming an increase in the police council tax of 1.99% per year, the cut in police grant over the medium-term implies minimum further savings of £46.5m for the period 2016/17 to 2018/19. This is on top of the £14.5m required for 2015/16, making £61m in total of further savings as a possible minimum for the period 2015/16 to 2018/19. This is on top of the £50m of savings delivered in the previous round of grant cuts between 2011/12 and 2014/15, making a total of £111m.

Faced with that level of cuts to police funding there needs to be a serious national debate about the role and expectations for policing over the medium to long-term, and in particular the balance between local, regional and national policing. The implied level of cuts faced in Kent would make it extremely difficult to maintain the level of visible local policing that remains very important to the public of Kent.

We are unlikely to know the actual level of grant cuts for 2016/17 onwards until late 2015 but the Chief Constable will be developing saving options during 2015 to ensure the Force can respond effectively to the medium-term financial challenge when the detail is known. Maximising efficiency

opportunities, fully exploiting collaboration, challenging every item of spend, and making best use of police officer time through IT and innovation, with partners where appropriate, are key planning principles. However, the most important aim remains to limit the impact of grant cuts on front-line policing as far as is possible and only take savings from here as a last resort.

6.3 Council tax plans

The police element of the council tax, known as the precept, is the other key source of funding, equating to approximately 28% of the total budget. For the people of Kent, living in a Band D property, the police precept stands at £144.28 per household, per year – well below the national average of £169.06.

The Government limit how much money can be raised through the police element of the precept without triggering an expensive referendum. The current permitted increase is up to 1.99% each year and this is in line with the planning assumptions and supported by public consultation over recent years.

An increase of 1.99% means that for 2015/16, the annual policing precept for a band D equivalent property would be £147.15. This represents an increase of 5.5 pence per week to pay for policing services when compared to last year's precept. Even with the increase, Kent Police's precept will still remain one of the lowest in the country.

Over the medium-term, an increase of 1.99% is assumed in the police element of the council tax; in line with previous published plans.

6.4 Policing budget for 2015/16

The annual budget for gross spending on policing and community safety is set at £306.5m. It is broken down as follows:

Kent Police budget by subject area	2015/16 £m
Police officer pay	164.5
Police staff pay	76.2
Premises related	21.4
Transport related	7.2
Other supplies and services	31.4
Gross police service spend	<u>300.7</u>
Office of the Commissioner	1.5
Grants awarded by the Commissioner	2.4
Victims services	1.9
Gross police and community safety spending	<u>306.5</u>
Less local income and specific grants for policing	-29.8
Less specific grant for victims services	-1.9
Less contribution from reserves	-0.7
Net police and community safety spending	<u>274.1</u>
Financed by:	
General Policing Grant	173.9
Council tax grants	13.3
Council tax precept	86.9
Net financing	<u>274.1</u>

6.5 Coping with new savings requirements – working with partners

As well as being as efficient and effective as possible, coping with serious budget challenges means managing public expectations of what the police can and cannot do in the future. This involves working with partners so everyone is clear about their roles and responsibilities, to help ensure the police do not pick up demand for services that should be met by other agencies. It also involves encouraging local communities to develop further, local approaches to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Again, working with the Chief Constable and partners, these are areas for development during 2015/16.

6.6 Other spending plans

In October 2014 Police and Crime Commissioners became responsible for delivering local victim support services. The budget plan reflects the latest Government indications on the specific grant allocation for 2015/16 to deliver this new and important responsibility and as per the grant conditions, this funding will be directed to support the delivery of victim services.

Turning to other new initiatives for 2015/16, one-off funding will be allocated from savings in previous years to allow:

- £200,000 in each of the next three years as a contribution to boosting Force capacity to help fight child sexual exploitation and support enhanced multi-agency working.
- £100,000 in 2015/16 to support the Chief Constable's cultural programme to further embed the focus on delivering quality policing rather than target-driven results.
- £100,000 in 2015/16 to support projects identified by partners and my office to improve the experience of victims in the wider criminal justice system.

In addition to revenue spending, a total of £13m will be allocated for a variety of capital and investment projects during 2015/16. These will be financed from a mixture of accumulated capital reserves and capital receipts. This is part of a planned £37m capital investment over the next 4 years. The vast majority of this will be available to the Chief Constable, but in the normal way will be dependent on sound business cases reflecting the Police and Crime Plan priorities. Out of the £13m allocated for 2015/16, £5m will be allocated for innovation projects that will improve front-line policing and its effectiveness. Other earmarked reserves already established in the current year for normal risk management, change programmes and one-off policy initiatives will be maintained.

6.7 Community Safety Funding – working with partners:

Working with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour is vital. There are three key principles in how the community safety funding is allocated:

1. All spending plans must help deliver the key priorities set out in this plan.
2. Working with existing partners to deliver joined up services where possible and appropriate; ensuring proportionate governance arrangements for the grants, but also commissioning services directly if that proves more effective.
3. Providing as much medium-term funding certainty as possible in the allocations to partners whilst also taking into account the reduced funding anticipated in future years.

In respect of medium-term certainty, it is important to remember the context. For 2014/15 onwards all former specific grants received for community safety were absorbed into the general policing grant. For 2014/15, allocations to partners and projects had to reflect the general policing grant cut suffered in that year; otherwise further savings would have to come from policing operations to compensate. Last year, the promise was made that as much medium-term certainty in funding allocations to partners and organisations would be provided. Accordingly, last year the assumed allocations for 2015/16 and 2016/17 were set reflecting the understanding that allocations would have been reduced each year on the basis of the assumed general policing grant cut suffered. Although the actual policing grant cut for 2015/16 is greater than was assumed last February, the allocations for 2015/16 announced last year for individual organisations will be honoured by utilising under-spends in my office budget in 2014/15. This maintains vital community safety plans without adding to the savings burden falling on the Force. That would also be the intention in respect of previously announced indicative allocations for 2016/17, but this depends on the scale of future grant cuts imposed on policing for 2016/17.

My proposed allocations

With those various factors and drivers in place, the proposed allocations for 2015/16 and 2016/17 are set out in Appendix One and include funding for the new initiatives described above. The other changes compared to previously published plans are relatively minor and see a reduction in funding for cross boundary Community Safety Partnership working initiatives and an increase in support for the project management capacity of the Kent Criminal Justice Board.

Subject to reflecting the reductions for assumed future grant cuts, the allocations to Community Safety Partnerships are otherwise protected. This is the case also for awards to Drug and Alcohol Action Teams, Safeguarding and Youth Offending Teams but again subject to other partners maintaining reasonable levels of investment also.

Appendix One

	2015/16	2016/17
Organisation		
Ashford CSP	28858	27848
Canterbury CSP	32981	31826
Dartford CSP	31857	30742
Dover CSP	28858	27848
Gravesham CSP	31857	30742
Maidstone CSP	37104	35805
Medway CSP	96782	93395
Sevenoaks CSP	31107	30019
Shepway CSP	28858	27848
Swale CSP	33731	32551
Thanet CSP	33116	31957
Tonbridge and Malling CSP	27974	26995
Tunbridge Wells CSP	28484	27487
Kent Community Safety Partnership (KCSP)	39661	38273
Young Persons Substance Misuse	92627	89385
Kent Youth Offending Team	275107	265478
Medway Youth Offending Team	90353	87191
Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team	301449	290899
Kent Safeguarding Children	45934	44326
Kent and Medway Adult Safeguarding	21120	20381
Medway Safeguarding Children Board	15434	14894
Medway Drug and Alcohol Action Team	59042	56975
Youth related diversion activity	28170	28170
National Crimestoppers	39156	37786
Local Crimestoppers	14699	14184
Independent Domestic Violence Advisors	115000	115000
Kent Criminal Justice Board support	40000	40000
Restorative Justice via KCJB	46000	46000
Kent DV Co-ordinator (KCC)	4760	4760
Kent People's Trust	20000	20000
SARC funding	55000	55000
Commissioner's Fund	100000	100000
Commissioner's Partners Fund	25000	25000
Children of domestic abuse victims	40000	40000
New		
Support for child sexual exploitation	200000	200000
Victims work with criminal justice partners	100000	
Support to the Force – staff culture projects	100000	
Total	2340080	2088765

This page is intentionally left blank

Chief Finance Officer's Budget Statement 2015-16

Preamble

It is a statutory requirement that the designated Chief Finance Officer must issue a professional statement on the adequacy of reserves, robustness of estimates and overall effectiveness of the systems of financial control and risk management generally. The following fulfils that requirement.

Financial Context

Kent Police, as with all public services, are facing major grant reductions as a result of the broader deficit reduction priority of the coalition government. For Kent, Government grant makes up 66% of funding and consequently reductions in grant will inevitably have a significant impact on policing operations. Sensible and effective planning, commended by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, has enabled the Force to plan for and deliver approximately £50m of savings as part of CSR 1; which technically ran from 2011/12 to 2014/15, but while strengthening local neighbourhood policing. However, that came at the cost of approximately 720 staff jobs and loss of 500 police officer posts.

Unfortunately, there will be a new wave of grant cuts, most likely running through the next 4 years at the very least and affecting the whole of the public sector; again in response to national deficit reduction imperatives. The grant cut of 5.1 % for Kent Police in 2015/16 is the first year of that new four year cycle of grant cuts and even if the 4 years (2015/16 to 2018/19) was simply to mirror the 20% grant cuts suffered by Kent Police in the last four years, Kent Police would have to find £61m of savings over the next 4 years including 2015/16. That could be a minimum. Clearly, if grant cuts are higher so would be the savings requirement, but even at what could be the minimum level of £61m of savings over the next four years, the nature of policing in Kent would inevitably have to change significantly. Indeed savings of the scale feared over the medium term will inevitably require a further fundamental review of the police model nationally, regionally and locally.

For 2015/16, the first year of the expected next 4 years of grant cuts, the cut of 5.1% requires savings of £14.5m. Through forward planning, the savings found by the Force should not impact significantly on front line policing in 2015/16 however it will still require the loss of jobs and further restructuring. In response to the medium term challenge, the Commissioner has asked the Force to work up options in the early part of 2015/16 so that Kent are well placed to respond to the likely further grant cut in 2016/17 and beyond, to be announced by a new government in the months after the May 2015 election.

Other Key Risk Areas

The Force and the PCC maintain active risk registers and associated risk management processes for operational and senior management which are monitored by the Audit Committee. As well as the financial challenge described above, many of the key strategic risks inevitably fall on the Force, rather than the OPCC, from both existing and newer threats. Examples of the latter include the local response to counter terrorism threats and cybercrime. Within the OPCC, on-going strategic risks relate to ensuring the core functions of the Commissioner are met; this includes overall financial governance of broader budget control and value for money. The newest risk in the OPCC area in particular relates to ensuring effective victim support services are put in place with partners.

Key statements

I am satisfied that the estimates have been drawn up in a robust way, recognising that medium term forecasts beyond 2015/16 will inevitably carry more uncertainty. At the time of the budget we have assumed pay awards have been capped at 1% for the four years 2015/16 to 2018/19. Any modest changes beyond that for 2015/16 can be dealt with from reserves. For non-pay we are assuming general inflation at 2.5% for all three years but with a major hike of £5m per year in employer national insurance in 2016/17. Beyond that, any known and quantifiable pressures have been included over the medium term. The key assumption on grant resources is the provisionally announced cash cut of 5.1% in general grant for 2015/16 and 3.5% cash cut in general grant (equivalent to 5.5% real cut) in each of 2016/17 through to 2018/19. In addition, a further 2% cut in general grants in each year 2016/17 to 2018/19 have been included for the possible negative change in grant distribution and/or further top slicing. As published last year the current plan assumes precept increases of 1.99% per annum (2% rounded) but that is subject to referendum rules.

As per decisions taken last year, reserves have been designated into three categories; costs of change, necessary risk management and available to support policy opportunities. I have considered the level and need against the strategic risk registers of the Force and the OPCC. On the whole, existing reserves are sound but I will be replenishing for likely use of the redundancy reserve during 2015, to ensure a reserve of £6m is available to face 2016/17. I have also created a new reserve of £1.5m to provide provision for significant non-normal public order events. These changes have been financed from underspends in 2015/16., Overall, in each case I am satisfied that they are prudent and appropriate after consideration of the latest key risk assessments. I am also satisfied that the operation of internal and external audit and the operation of financial controls are sound. However, the level of savings required and the dependency, and thus exposure to government decisions on grants, means that regular monitoring and review of delivery plans and active risk management, including via the Independent Joint audit Committee, remain vital parts of the local governance arrangements.

Further information

The Summary Medium Term Financial Plan including the budget for 2015/16 is set out at Annex 1.

The Statement of Reserves is set out at Annex 2.

Sean Nolan, Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner

January 2015

	Budget	Inflation	Savings	Forecast									
	2014/15	Or Growth		2015/16	Or Growth		2016/17	Or Growth		2017/18	Or Growth		2018/19
	£m	£m	£m	£m									
Gross Spending													
Police Pay and Overtime	170.3	3.6	-9.4	164.5	3.6		168.1	3.6		171.7	3.6		175.3
Staff Pay (Gross)	74.7	1.5		76.2	1.5		77.7	1.5		79.2	1.5		80.7
Premises Related	20.4	1.0		21.4	0.5		21.9	0.5		22.4	0.5		23.0
Transport Costs	7.0	0.2		7.2	0.2		7.4	0.2		7.6	0.2		7.7
Other Non-staff costs including IT, Forensic costs etc	33.0	2.4	-4.1	31.3	0.7		32.0	0.7		32.8	0.7		33.5
Other cost pressures	0.9		-0.9	0.0									
Extra National Insurance Costs					5.0		5.0			5.0			5.0
Devolution of Victim Services	0.6	1.3		1.9			1.9			1.9			1.9
PCC Office	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5			1.5			1.5			1.5
PCC Commissioning Grants	2.0	0.4	-0.1	2.4	-0.2	-0.1	2.1		-0.1	2.0			2.0
Contribution to Local council Tax localisation scheme	0.2			0.2	-0.2		0.0			0.0			0.0
Vacancy Factor							0.0			0.0			0.0
Further Savings Required				0.0		-18.8	-18.8		-13.7	-32.5		-14.5	-47.0
Total Gross Spending	310.6	10.4	-14.5	306.5	11.2	-18.9	298.8	6.8	-13.8	291.8	7.8	-14.5	285.0
Gross Financing													
Specific Grant - Victims Funding	0.6	1.3		1.9			1.9			1.9			1.9
Specific grants - counter terrorism	12.1			12.1			12.1			12.1			12.1
Locally generated income	17.7			17.7			17.3	-0.1		17.2	-0.4		16.8
Contribution From Reserves	0.3	0.4		0.7	-0.4		0.3			0.3			0.3
Net Spend Position - Gross Spend less specific grants/local	279.9	12.1	-14.5	274.1	10.8	-18.9	267.2	6.7	-13.8	260.3	7.4	-14.5	254.0
Core Policing Grant	183.3	-9.4	-5.1%	173.9	-5.6		168.3	-5.5		162.8	-5.5		157.3
Phased Removal of Floor grant protection					-2.5		-2.5			-5.0			-7.5
Council Tax Legacy Grants	13.3	0.0		13.3	-1.6		11.7	-1.8		9.9	-0.6		9.3
Estimated Council Tax Surplus	0.6			1.1	-0.2		0.9			0.9			0.9
Council Tax Precept	82.8	3.1		85.8	2.8		88.7			91.6			93.8
Net Finance	279.9	-6.3		274.1	-6.9	0.0	267.2	-9.8	0.0	260.3	-8.6	0.0	254.0
Council Tax Base	1.99%			1.7%			1.3%			1.3%			0.5%
Band D precept	573536			583274			590768.9			598153.53			600845.2213
£ increase per year	144.28			147.15			150.09			153.07			156.14
% increase	2.81			2.87			2.93			2.99			3.07
	1.99%			1.99%			1.99%			1.99%			2.01%

ANNEX 2 TO APPENDIX B

Statement of Reserves (Revenue)	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Out</u>	<u>In</u>	<u>£m</u>	<u>Comment/use</u>
	<u>£m</u>				
	2014/15			2015/16	
Change Capacity					
Schemes/pump prime New Policing Model	1.9	-1.0		0.9	To assist future savings, for use by Chief Constable
Proceeds of Crime Fund	0.6			0.6	In line with established practice
Special operations	0.1	-0.1		0.0	Closed
PCC Change Capacity	1.0			1.0	For use as directed by PCC; general community engagement projects
Custody Review	1.8			1.8	For use by Chief Constable
Redeployment & Redundancy	6.0	-2.6	2.6	6.0	To assist future savings, for use by Chief Constable and PCC
Total Change Capacity	11.4	-3.7	2.6	10.3	
Risk Capacity					
Insurance	3.1	-0.6	0.6	3.1	In line with actuarial guidelines; for self insured risks
Savings equalisation Fund	4.3			4.3	Short term Buffer against non-savings delivery
General Reserves	5.6		0.6	6.2	Non ear marked, now Set at 2% of gross budget
Localisation of Council Benefits	0.9	-0.4		0.5	For support to county wide risk management
Significant Public Order Events (non normal)			1.5	1.5	For use by Chief Constable, subject to agreement with PCC
Total Risk Capacity	13.9	-1.0	2.7	15.6	
Policy Initiative Capacity					
Policy opportunities	5.2	-1.9		3.3	To be directed by the PCC in line with her plan
CSE Reserve for 2015/16			0.2	0.2	
Innovation Reserve			5.0	5.0	To be directed subject to cases put forward by Chief Constable
MoJ Victims Funding	0.6	-0.6		0.0	For use by PCC as per grant permissions
Total Policy opportunity	5.8	-2.5	5.2	8.5	
Total Reserves	31.1	-7.2	10.5	34.4	

**POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONERS TREASURERS' SOCIETY**

President
David Clarke

Tel: 01823 355295

Email: technicalsupportteam@somerset.gov.uk

Ziggy MacDonald
Director, Finance and Strategy
Crime and Policing Group
Home Office
6th Floor Fry
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
policesourcespolicy@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

23rd January 2015

Provisional Police Grant Settlement 2015-16

Dear Ziggy,

This letter represents the response from the Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society's (PACCTS) to the consultation on the Provisional Police Grant Report 2015-16. The Society also refers the Home Office to individual responses from local policing bodies. PACCTS represent the Treasurer of each of the forty-one Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in England and Wales, as well as the Chief Financial Officer of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, and the Chamberlain of the Common Council of the City of London. Each Treasurer has the statutory responsibility for securing proper management of the finances of their police force.

Settlement Timing

The Society understands that the original plan had been for the Home Office and DCLG to publish their respective settlements on the same day. However, when the DCLG delayed their settlement publication the Home Office decided to go ahead and publish the Police Settlement as planned. Police Treasurers would like to thank the ministers and civil servants for this. When provisional settlements are published so close to the Christmas break and precept deadlines; this extra day is helpful.

Overall Funding Levels

At the 2013 Budget the Chancellor announced a further 1.1% cut to the Home Office DEL; PACCTS members welcome the efforts that the Home Office have made to absorb this cut within the Department but as a result of this not being fully achieved, the resultant unplanned 0.2% cut to Police Grant, in cash terms, on top of the 3.2% known reduction will cut further into the police service in 2015-16.

The resultant cash cut to police funding, when combining Police Grant, formula grant and the additional top-slices, is 5.1%. This equates to over 7% in real terms.

Top-Slices

Despite this level of protection, Police Treasurers were dismayed to see an increase in the number and value of top-slices to the Police Settlement. The settlement shows provisional top-slices in 2015-16 totalling £176.8m (excluding PFI and Ordnance Survey). In 2014-15 the figure was just £90m. This represents an overall increase of over 96%.

Commissioners were not consulted on these proposals and have not been given sight of the business cases. If the average cost of a Police Officer is assumed to be £53,000, this £176.8m is the equivalent of 3,335 officers. PACCTS therefore requests that the evidence base for these top-slices be published so that their effectiveness can be gauged. Without this information, these reductions simply amount to a further substantial concealed cut in local funding levels and reduce the transparency within the Police funding envelope.

PACCTS members had been expecting further top-slices for the National Police Coordination Centre (NPoCC, worth £2.3m) and the proposed National ICT top-slice (£69m). In a letter to PCCs dated 17 December, the Home Secretary explained that she felt it would be more transparent to charge police forces in order to recover the funding rather than top-slice. PACCTS agree that this is more transparent although the fact remains that this will further reduce the funding available for police force areas.

Council Tax Referendum Principles

The day after the provisional police grant report was published the DCLG confirmed that (in England) the council tax referendum principles would remain at the same level as 2014-15; that any increase of 2% or more would trigger a referendum.

PACCTS has frequently made the point that PCCs recognise the importance of minimising council tax increases for council tax payers in the current economic climate. Following the introduction of elected PCCs, police forces are more accountable than ever to their local tax payers, and this was reflected in the Home Secretary's Christmas message. Different police force areas face differing demands and the ability to allow flexibility for commissioners to increase council tax is important. It is the view of PACCTS members that the announcement of the referendum principles for English forces undermines the democratic mandate of elected PCCs and greatly diminishes local accountability.

The potential risks to the public purse combined with the significant costs associated with holding a referendum in relation to a PCC's budget exclude it as a viable option. As funding is available nationally for a further council tax freeze in 2015-16, the Society believes this should be included in the core funding for police; leaving PCCs to make decisions on council tax changes, free from the constraint of central government.

Counter Terrorism Grant

It is disappointing that, once again, funding allocations for the Counter Terrorism Grant were not announced alongside the settlement. This grant forms a significant element of funding for some policing bodies; as such, early certainty over these amounts is very important.

Capital Financing

PACCTS understands that the announcement of Home Office capital grants has been delayed whilst the minister decides whether or not to top-slice any additional funding. Further to the comments above, the Society does not support more top-slices and reiterate that late announcements hinder effective planning.

Funding for Victims

As you know the funding for Victims Services comes from the Ministry of Justice. Whilst PACCTS understands that this funding is technically not part of the Police Settlement, Treasurers would find it helpful if the timing and location of announcements from the MoJ and the Home Office could be coordinated.

Formula Review

Two years ago the Home Office announced that they would be launching a review of the Police Funding Formula which is now considerably out of date, and which does not reflect the full range of PCC responsibilities. The current distribution also uses the Four Block Model which has been widely discredited by both professionals and academia. At the request of the Home Office, PACCTS has contributed thoughts, opinions, principles and even alternatives to regression to the Department. Whilst PACCTS acknowledges that the review is now likely to be on-hold pending the result of the general election, we have appreciated the opportunity to contribute our thoughts. However, we would like to emphasise the importance of doing the groundwork in a more transparent way as; ideally, a decision on the formula would be taken alongside the long-term funding decisions in the next CSR, as it is the combined impact that will be relevant to force planning.

The current formula is now ten years out of date, during which time policing has changed considerably, yet the Government have simply applied flat rate decreases to the funding for police forces. This action tends to support the opinion that the Home Office are in agreement with PACCTS over the unsuitability of the current formula: yet there are still no alternatives on the table.

Some force areas will argue that; in a time of austerity stability is the key, whilst others will argue that the cuts mean that it is even more crucial that the funding is fair. Either way, PCC Treasurers, whilst recognising the sensitivity of discussions on issues with possible distributional impacts around election time, feel that this debate needs to be held publicly between Home Office ministers, advisors and analysts, PCCs and Chief Constables.

Police Innovation Fund

Whilst the Society acknowledges that locally the Police Innovation fund encourages discussions about both collaboration and innovation, it believes that the financial constraints which all PCCs face provide a sufficient incentive for these discussions without a need for the Innovation Fund.

The Police service alongside local government campaigned long and hard to see a reduction in the number of ring-fenced specific grants. However, we find ourselves in 2015-16 facing a huge rise in the value and number of top-slices, including the third year of the Innovation Fund. The Innovation Fund is top-sliced from the Police Settlement, creating a bid-based pot of funding which, in turn, further reduces the funding available to PCCs and their Treasurers to manage current financial risks.

Police force areas who decide to bid to the fund find that this involves a considerable amount of work in a short space of time. Applicants only find out if they have been successful in the days prior to the start of the financial year. Ad hoc allocations, announced late in the budget setting process, fly in the face of proper financial planning.

In the context of broader public policy, the process is seeing the development of several, sometimes many, local technical solutions to common innovation visions – such as body worn cameras – which must be raising questions of technical coherence and inter-operability when viewed across the whole country.

The Police treasurers would therefore suggest that the Home Office considers ending the continued use of the Innovation Fund; returning the funding to the police settlement and investigates other means of encouraging collaboration and innovation.

2016-17 Onwards

Police Treasurers are well aware that future years' funding allocations will be dependent on the result of the General Election and the ensuing Spending Review. Whilst members would like to receive indicative funding allocations as soon as possible, it is critical that the balance should be struck with the need to ensure there is a strong evidence base to support any level of savings and efficiency assumptions. A recent report by the NAO criticised the DCLG on their understanding of the likely impact of cuts on local authority budgets and the lack of assessment of subsequent impacts. Without careful consideration of future spending decisions, the Home Office puts itself at risk of receiving similar criticism.

Treasurers are working with their Commissioners to prepare medium term financial strategies in unprecedented financial circumstances; effective planning to meet budgetary shortfalls can only take place if there is clarity and certainty about future savings targets. As you will be well aware, the vast proportion of costs for police forces is related to staffing, but legislation protects Police Officers from being made redundant. Therefore early information with regard to funding becomes paramount.

Summary

PACCTS recognise that police, along with other local authorities, must share in the funding reductions outlined by the Chancellor. The Home Secretary's decision to protect police from some of the additional 1.1% cuts announced in the 2013 Budget is welcomed. Treasurers urge the Home Office to publish indicative allocations for 2016-17 onwards as soon as is possible after the next spending review and having given due consideration as to the potential impact of the decisions.

Looking to 2016-17 and beyond, PACCTS are eager for the Government to begin its review of police funding and look forward to contributing to the review process.

The Society looks forward to the Government's response to this consultation.

Yours sincerely,



David Clarke
President
Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society

Commissioner’s Key Decision – November and December 2014

Decision:

Following the key decision in May 2014 to progress a single tender with Victim Support the decision has been made to commission Victim Support to deliver core victim services in Kent for 12 months from the 1 April 2015.

Justification:

This approach provides greater opportunity to continue the collaborative arrangement with Victim Support so the scope of victim support services and the opportunities for enhancing services can be fully understood. This will feed into the development of the specification for the longer term contract, with the tender process commencing for this in the new financial year.

Decision:

Decision to become a signatory to the Kent & Medway Mental Health Concordat

Justification:

There are a number of signatories to the Concordat, including NHS, Magistrates Association, British Transport Police, Kent County Council and Healthcare providers. By signing up to the concordat agencies have agreed that they will work to develop services including:

- Making early interventions to prevent people reaching crisis point.
- Ensuring a multi-agency response for people in crisis so needs are met appropriately in a healthcare setting.
- Providing a plan that supports the recovery and prevents reoccurrence for those for people who have experienced a crisis.

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel – Annual Report for 2014

Introduction

1. The Panel considered and agreed a report in November 2013 on the first year of operation. This report summarises Panel activities during 2014.

Membership of the Panel

2. During the year the membership of the Panel was adjusted following District Council elections to ensure appropriate representation of the political parties in Kent and Medway. As a consequence there is now one Liberal Democrat member and one UKIP member of the Panel. Representation of other parties remained unchanged. Mike Hill remained Chairman throughout the year. Cllr Rupert Turpin was Vice-Chair until May and Gurvinder Sandher was elected Vice-Chair in May.

Meetings

3. During the year the Panel met 6 times and the Complaints Sub-Panel met once. In addition to the meetings Panel members also met with the Commissioner and her staff on 2 occasions. These informal meetings were intended to promote understanding and a sound working relationship with the Commissioner. The Chairman and Vice-Chair also held meetings with the Commissioner from time to time to assist and support the smooth running of Panel business.

Panel business

4. The Panel met its statutory duty to consider and make recommendations on the Commissioner's draft Police and Crime plan and her proposed precept. The Panel supported the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan and commended her decision to remove targets from the Plan. The Commissioner asked the Panel to support a precept increase of up to 3.5% but the Panel recommended that the precept increase be no more than 2%.
5. The Panel met its statutory duty to consider the Commissioner's Annual Report for 2013/14. The Panel asked for an addition to be made to provide a fuller picture of matters dealt with by the Commissioner and the Commissioner agreed to this change.
6. The Panel considered crime figures and crime recording in Kent on 2 occasions. The Panel was pleased to note that the Commissioner had requested a thorough investigation when concerns were raised about whether all crimes were being accurately recorded. The Panel was also pleased to note that the Commissioner supported the Force's efforts to instil culture change and to end any performance driven culture within the Force, although they were also keen to understand how the Commissioner intended to hold the Chief Constable to account in the absence of numeric targets. The Panel noted the Commissioner's assurance that the accuracy of

crime recording is now very high and that the public can have confidence in the published crime figures.

7. In October all Police and Crime Commissioners took on responsibility for commissioning and funding victim services and the Panel asked the Commissioner to report on these new responsibilities. The Panel was supportive of the Commissioner's desire to ensure that victims received support at the first point of referral rather than being referred on to various agencies. The Panel recognised that the provision of a Victim Centre offered opportunity for information sharing and joint best practice but was also encouraged by the Commissioner's references to outreach and satellite provision.
8. The Panel asked the Commissioner to explain the work she was doing to implement the Mental Health Concordat, agreed nationally by Police and Crime Commissioners, the Association of Chief Police Officers and other bodies. The Panel was very supportive of the Commissioner's efforts to ensure that all agencies engaged with mental health issues and that the police did not find themselves dealing with mental health issues that were the responsibility of others.
9. The Panel continued to take an interest in the Youth Commissioner and considered a report on her activities to date. They were supportive of the work being done and remain interested in the Commissioner's plans once the current postholder's contract finishes.
10. The Commissioner took part in a Channel 4 documentary that, when transmitted, led to significant criticism of the Commissioner by both members of the public and the media. The Panel held 2 meetings to consider the reaction to the programme and the possible impact on the reputation of the Commissioner and the police. The Panel was critical of the Commissioner's decision to take part in the programme and decided that the programme had damaged both the Commissioner personally and the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Panel also requested a change of style and a change of approach to public engagement by the Commissioner. The Panel was pleased that the Commissioner responded positively to these comments and conclusions and gave the Panel details of her revised approach to community engagement. The Panel was also pleased that the Commissioner decided not to pursue the idea of directly managing the Communications team in the Force.

Complaints and correspondence

11. The complaints sub-Panel met once to consider 2 complaints against the Commissioner. In both cases the Sub-Panel decided not to uphold the complaints. The Panel asked its officers to review the Commissioner's correspondence to ensure that all correspondence that should be treated as a complaint was being treated in this way; officers carried out this review and confirmed this was the case. The Panel also noted that the procedure for determining whether a matter constituted a complaint was strengthened during the year by the Commissioner's Monitoring Officer advising Panel officers on each occasion when he decided to dis-apply the Regulations.

Commissioner's decisions

12. The Commissioner met her responsibility to inform the Panel of decisions of significant public interest at each meeting. In the main these were noted by the Panel but there were a few occasions when members sought clarity or further explanation, which the Commissioner provided. The Commissioner also published details of expenditure in excess of £500 and Panel members were briefed by officers on expenditure of particular interest.

Conclusion

13. 2014 was a busy year for the Panel. The Panel discharged its formal responsibilities to consider the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan, her proposed precept and her Annual Report. The Panel also received reports on a number of the major elements of the Police and Crime Plan.
14. Generally the Panel was supportive of much of the Commissioner's work but felt there was scope for a closer working relationship which would benefit both sides and to this end the informal meetings which have taken place have been a step forward as has the change in tone and style of the Commissioner since the Channel 4 documentary. The Panel hopes that this new approach can continue into 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Police and Crime Panel Forward work programme

14 April 2015

Partnership working	Requested by Panel
Delivering value for money	Requested by Panel
Work of the Commissioner's Ethics Committee	Requested by Panel September 2014

2 June 2015

Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman	Annual requirement
Membership of Panel	Review following District Council elections
Membership of Complaints Sub-Panel	Annual requirement
Complaints against the PCC and policy review	Report by Panel officers or Sub-Panel
Force performance in 2014/15	Requested by Panel
Annual report 2014/15	Statutory requirement

13 October 2015

Working with the business community	Requested by Panel
Update on funding - body worn cameras	Requested by Panel September 2014
Accounts 2014/15	Statutory requirement
Review of Panel Communications Protocol	Review agreed by Panel (report by Panel officers)

17 November 2015

Protecting the public from Serious harm	Requested by Panel
Update on Victim Centre and Victim support work	Requested by Panel September 2014

February 2016

Draft Police and Crime plan 2016/17	Statutory requirement
Precept proposal 2016/17	Statutory requirement
Panel Annual report	Requested by Chairman

Items to note at each meeting

Commissioner's decisions

Commissioner's forward plan of decisions

Governance Board minutes

Programme updated on 19th January 2015

Meeting Notes

Kent Police and Crime Commissioner's Governance Board - **14 October 2014**

Clift Room, Kent Police HQ, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent, ME15 9BZ

Summary of Key Points and Actions

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

The Commissioner welcomed everyone to the Governance Board.

Item 2: Notes of Previous Meeting – 26 August 2014

The Meeting Notes from the Governance Board held on 26 August were noted as a true and accurate record and actions were agreed.

Item 3: Rural Crime – Presentations by Mr Mike Bax, Chair of Crime Rural Advisory Group & Chief Inspector Iain Mackenzie

Mike Bax summarised the supporting document, and gave a presentation.

Areas of Discussion:

- During year as High Sheriff, spoke to the previous Chief Constable because of frustration with criminal activity experienced, and unfamiliarity with how the matters could be best reported to the police. Out of that was born the Crime Rural Advisory Group (CRAG).

The Benefits of CRAG:

- Kent huge county – 750,000 farmed acres, over 100,000 acres of woodlands and forestry and 300 miles of coast line.
- Meet three times a year and network continually.
- A mix of rural stakeholders representing those who work upon, own, manage or rent land in the countryside.
- Knowledge of the rural areas and the potential criminal trends and hot-spots for matters such as hare coursing, pheasant poaching, off-roading and discarded syringes etc. The Group can therefore assist the police in targeting criminal activity and provide information to the community and the police to prevent those crimes.

Potential Impact of Crime:

- Mike Bax illustrated how seemingly small value theft or damage can actually result in a loss of thousands of pounds. He gave two examples.
- Theft of unprepared Pheasants – initial financial loss of £100 is multiplied, because the shooting day is cancelled. This results in loss of earnings for the local community who would have been employed as beaters, for those who would have provided accommodation and hospitality and for those left with damaged land and fences. The £100 loss can increase to £10,000.
- Theft of battery powering Electric Fencing – initial financial loss of £5 multiplies, because the lack of electrical fencing can result in ewes roaming free, leaving them and passing motorists vulnerable to injury. The ewes are also at risk to premature impregnation and the lambs will not thrive because the necessary food is unavailable when they are delivered. The £5 loss can actually increase to thousands in damage, cost or loss of profit.

Beneficial Methods of Communication: *(Further information can be sourced on-line*)*

- E-mails. Daily way to convey information and to seek assistance of others to look out for issues of interest, such as vehicles used in criminal activity. Currently managed by the National Farmers Union (NFU).
- The App, Country-Eye*. However, proceeding with caution to prevent inappropriate provision of information that will hinder rather than assist. The Commissioner is financially supporting CRAG.
- E-Watch*. Team of volunteers run this to ensure the correct information is disseminated. This system is being piloted in West Kent late this year, with an early demonstration at the Conference being held this month.
- Word of Mouth. Increased public awareness paramount to growing success.

Relationship between the Police and the Rural Areas:

- CRAG supports constructive and streamline communication between the rural community and the police, and prompt attention to criminal activity. The need for confidentiality was acknowledged, but it was felt that it would encourage the public to become involved if they heard more about past successes and strategies, because a keen appetite to assist existed.
- The remoteness of some rural locations currently causing delays within the 101 process and farms being allocated reference numbers suggested as a possible solution to sharpen the process.
- The work currently being undertaken to police the acreage involved was praised, but staff turnover was considered to be a potential weakness to this. Additionally, it was felt that specific training on rural issues for all potential contact points would be of benefit.
- The Rural Policing Strategy is to work in effective partnership with various organisations to tackle offenders and reduce harm. This relates to all levels of crime, but the current economic climate emphasises the need to use partnership and community working as much as possible, because this enables targeted action and viable interventions to ensure shared demand reduction.
- The Rural Liaison Team (RLT) are officers with high level expertise in rural matters, and they won the 2014 Regional and National NFU County Crime Fighters Award in recognition of this. The Gypsy Liaison Team (GLT) are equally dedicated and experienced officers.

There was some discussion about Crime-Stoppers and recent successful operations - Operation Parody - Operation Eagle - Operation Pirate and Operation Nonagon. These involved partnership working and tackled diverse crimes as human trafficking, modern slavery and hare coursing.

The Commissioner promoted the Rural Crime Conference scheduled for 29 October and the excellent publication, Rural Matters.

Item 4: Serious Crime Directorate – Presentation by ACC Matthew Horne, Serious Crime Directorate

ACC Horne (Head of Serious Crime Directorate) summarised the supporting document and gave a presentation.

Areas of Discussion:

Serious Crime Directorate (SCD)

- Directorate held in high esteem and considered a centre of excellence.
- Now considered business as usual for Kent and Essex.
- Other regions setting up similar facilities with fewer numbers.
- Forefront of delivering state of the art digital forensic technology.
- Potential in the future for forces to buy into some of the services provided.
- Great relationship with the Regions.
- A specialist support team is available on a daily basis for any divisional operation in Kent.

Seized Assets reinvested within Kent Police:

- As of 9 October, SCD had obtained 130 confiscation orders, totalling £2,394,671.87. £1.5m of this being in Kent. Providing there is no victim entitled to compensation, 18.75 % of all Confiscation Orders that are paid to enforcement come back to Kent via the incentivisation scheme and the remainder goes to the Home Office.

- As of 9 October, SCD had obtained 37 Forfeiture Orders totalling £592,712.21. £528,852.36 of this being in Kent. Providing there is no victim entitled to compensation. 50% of cash forfeited is returned to Kent Police.
- A lot of political will in support of challenge to develop a more streamline process to obtain realisable monies from assets seized.

Operations Lakeland and Ikon:

- Excellent examples of multi-agency working. Kent Police worked with the National Crime Agency, Kent County Councils Specialist Children's Services and the Slovakian authorities.
- Sixteen vulnerable Slovakian children taken to places of safety and nineteen men have been charged for trial in January.

Cybercrime:

- National and specialist training is being prioritised to ensure staff have the skills key to meet the growing challenge of cybercrime.
- Flavour of cyber-crime - cyber-bullying and criminals closing down IT systems and asking the owning organisation for payment for it to be resurrected.

The Commissioner asked if Kent were getting a fair share of the money invested, and ACC Horne stated not. The Commissioner sought clarification from the Chief Constable. He confirmed there had been disputes with the Home Office about this. The current situation is, that SCD would have to be disbanded to ensure a fair share, and this would present excessively more disadvantages than benefits.

The Commissioner asked if SCD were future proofed for 5 years, and the Chief Constable confirmed it was, subject to the same austerity changes impacting on the remainder of the Force.

The Chief Finance Officer asked the speaker how the savings plan would be managed. Some discussion followed about a comprehensive savings plan involving greater collaboration between Kent and Essex.

Item 5: Policing Model Update – Presentation from Chief Inspector Dave Pate, Tunbridge Wells

Areas of Discussion:

Chief Inspector Dave Pate summarised his supporting document, gave a presentation and supported by the Chief Officer Team, engaged in discussion with the Commissioner's Office:

Chief Inspector Pate's Experience:

- Ability to control local assets that the new policing model brings is viewed positively by those involved.
- Integration of the previously separate neighbourhood and response policing teams working extremely well.
- Workforce had met the changes of the new policing model with a positive attitude.
- Fundamental importance of workforce engagement to ensure their needs are fully understood and acknowledged.
- Unaware of any current refusal to meet a flexible working request but staff reductions meant that it was getting harder to accommodate.
- Anticipated reductions of CSR2 will impact upon the ability to deliver to the current standard and lessening demand was key. Demand reduction initiatives include Body Worn Video equipment and Tablets. 70 being rolled out the following day, with more to come.
- Confirmed that SCD are a valuable asset, and that it would have a serious impact if this were ever disbanded.
- Partnership with the Community Support Units (CSU) is getting stronger.

The Commissioner emphasised that the impact of the new policing model on the workforce would be a discussion point at the People Board.

Item 6: Quality & Performance Management Framework

Child Sexual Exploitation:

D/Supt Tim Smith gave a presentation and supported by the Chief Officer Team, engaged in discussion with the Commissioner's Office:

Areas of Discussion:

- o SCD and partnership working fundamental assets in this area of policing.
- o Success of Operation Lakeland – 43 victims identified.
- o High profile cases – Saville, Oxford, Rochdale and Rotherham.
- o Kent Police are a statutory partner within a multi-agency working group that focus on child trafficking and child sexual exploitation.
- o Organised Crime Groups view children as a commodity for profit.
- o In addition to the recent Rotherham Report, there have been many other reports on child sexual exploitation in the last 2.5 years.
- o Acting on all the 150 recommendations from the numerous national reports would lead to failure. Therefore a pragmatic approach has been taken by the partnership, and this has been commended by the inspection team.
- o Improving awareness within professional bodies, but a lack of general awareness by the public remains.

Item 7: Financial Monitoring

The Chief Constable summarised the supporting document and engaged in discussion with the Commissioner's Office. He emphasised that financial reductions could result in a very different Force.

Item 8: HMIC Report(s) on Crime Recording and Performance Culture and Force Performance Update

Ms Ashton (Head of Corporate Services) summarised the supporting document and engaged in discussion with the Commissioner's Office.

Areas of Discussion:

- o Performance Framework compliments the HMIC assessment system with the same marking scheme.
- o Workforce support the system which advocates rewarding recognition, integrity, good skill-base and a well-functioning disciplinary system.
- o Statistical information still available, but the Performance Framework designed to support a victim, not target centric culture.

The Commissioner commented on the Performance Framework being a complex piece of work, not replicated elsewhere and that she welcomed Ms Ashton returning to discuss in further detail at the next Governance Board.

The Commissioner suggested that the OKPCC Chief Finance Officer attends the scoring meeting to ensure full understanding.

Item 9: Update on Significant Operational Matters (verbal update)

Areas of Discussion:

There was some discussion about recent arrests and court cases supporting the efforts and successes of the Kent Police.

Closure