

AGENDA

KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Dear Panel Member

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, 2nd February, 2016, at 2.00 pm** 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 Chris Shippam	Dartford Borough Council
Councillor Keith Morris	Dover District Council
Councillor John Cubitt	Gravesham Borough Council
Mr Mike Hill (Chairman)	Kent County Council
Councillor Fran Wilson	Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Michael Franklin	Medway Council
Councillor Peter Fleming	Sevenoaks District Council
Councillor Malcolm Dearden	Shepway District Council
Councillor Andrew Bowles	Swale Borough Council
Councillor Trevor Shonk	Thanet District Council
Councillor Brian Luker	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Councillor Don Sloan	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Mr Roger Latchford	Co-opted member
Dr Mike Eddy	Co-opted member
Councillor Habib Tejan	Co-opted member
Councillor John Burden	Co-opted member
Elaine Bolton	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 17 November 2015 (Pages 5 - 10)

B - Statutory Reports

- B1 Draft Police and Crime Plan 2016/17 (Pages 11 - 52)
- B2 Precept Proposal (contained within item B1)

C - Commissioner's Reports Requested by the Panel

- C1 Youth Engagement Work (Pages 53 - 54)
- C2 HMIC Report on Vulnerable Persons - Commissioner's Comment (verbal report)

D - Commissioner's Decisions

- D1 Commissioner's Decisions (Pages 55 - 56)

E - Panel Matters

- E1 Panel Annual Report (Pages 57 - 62)
- E2 Complaints against a Police and Crime Commissioner - Government proposed changes to the procedure (Pages 63 - 82)
- E3 Future work programme (Pages 83 - 84)

F - For Information

- F1 Minutes of the Commissioner's Governance Board meeting held on 11 November (Pages 85 - 90)

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)

Head of Democratic Services
03000 416647

Monday, 25 January 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

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, 17 November 2015.

PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE (Chairman), Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman), Cllr A Horton (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles), Cllr G Galpin (Substitute for Cllr P Clokie), Mr T L Shonk (Substitute for Cllr L Fairbrass), Cllr M Franklin, Cllr R Hogarth (Substitute for Cllr P Fleming), Cllr B Luker, Cllr R Wells (Substitute for Cllr C Shippam), Cllr K Morris, Cllr Sloan, Cllr P Todd, Cllr F Wilson, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Cllr H Tejan, Dr M R Eddy, Cllr J Burden and Mrs E Bolton

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs A Barnes, Mr A Harper and Mr S Nolan

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Campbell (Policy Officer) and Mrs A Taylor (Scrutiny Research Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

147. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 22 September 2015
(Item 4)

1. One Member noted the comments at the previous meeting about the Force's use of Body Worn Cameras and the recent press coverage regarding their cost and value for money. The Commissioner was asked for the rationale behind the choice of camera purchased and whether she considered them to be value for money. The Commissioner explained that a business case was submitted before any money was released for the body worn cameras. The Commissioner was content that they demonstrated value for money, they were specialist pieces of equipment which were securely encrypted, with built in GPS, auto-delete functions and they had been procured in compliance with complex EU/UK rules, there was a statement on the Commissioner's website regarding this issue.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2015 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

148. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 26 October 2015
(Item 5)

1. The Chairman reminded Members that this minute was the open summary of the exempt item discussed at the Panel meeting on 26 October. The Chairman had received a letter from the IPCC in response to the Panel's letter of 27 October. This letter had been circulated to Panel Members by email on 3 November 2015. The Chairman said he had received an assurance from the Commissioner's Chief of Staff that he had put in place a system to regularly check the insurance documents of the Commissioner and any of her staff who drive on business.

RESOLVED that the open minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2015 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

149. Update on Victim Centre and Victim Support Work

(Item B1)

1. The Commissioner introduced the report highlighting some of the key points regarding Compass House and Victim Support work. Members were given an open invitation to visit Compass House which the Commissioner said was a blueprint for delivering victim services.
2. In response to a question the Commissioner explained that she did not envisage satellite 'Compass Houses' being rolled out across Kent, instead it's about providing local services for local victims of crime and making best use of services that already exist around the county. The Commissioner said that despite the financial climate, the core victim service will always be provided; any reduction in funding would not impact on this but have to come from the provision of specialist services. The Commissioner added that to help specialist services such as charities apply for funding, her Office had organised training on how to effectively write and submit bids.
3. A Member asked about paragraph 13 of the report, the service would reach an estimated 14,000 more victims than the previous Ministry of Justice model, how had this been done? The Commissioner explained that the use of Compass House as a call-centre meant that victims could access services directly, instead of going through what was effectively a 'middle man'; every penny of funding was spent on victims.
4. A number of members congratulated the Commissioner on the facilities provided at Compass House. In response to a question the Commissioner confirmed that the main constraint of running the centre was funding, it was essential to target funding to ensure it was used most effectively. Mr Nolan explained that £1million was spent on victim services at Compass House which often took the first phone call from a victim and then directed victims to specialist support services. The Commissioner had also provided grants to fund a range of specialist services.
5. One Member asked how services could be expected to continue without any certainty about their funding and their future and the Commissioner explained that all the funding available had been and would continue to be distributed to services for victims but if funding wasn't available it couldn't be given out. The first phone call from victims was vitally important.
6. The Chairman commented on the facilities and how impressed he was with Compass House.

RESOLVED that Members note the Commissioner's Update on Victim Centre and Victim Support work.

150. Protecting the Public from Harm

(Item B2)

1. The Chairman asked that, in due course, a report be provided to the Panel on the long term effect on Kent Police and their resources of recent events in Paris. Other Members also requested this information as appropriate.
2. The Commissioner introduced the report and highlighted the main areas within it. The number one priority for the public continued to be visible community policing, but there was also a need to maintain specific specialist resources to effectively deal with spontaneous incidents. The Commissioner stated that if ever there was a time not to reduce spending on policing it was now and that she would write to the Home Secretary to set out the uniqueness of Kent, including its position as the gateway to Europe.
3. One Member referred to the problem of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and the role played by taxi-drivers, lodging houses, hotels etc. The Commissioner explained that the Multi Agency Sexual Exploitation boards for Kent and Medway had strategic oversight, the CSE team was new and partnership working was essential in this area, every authority and agency had a responsibility to report any concerns.
4. Referring to the letter the Commissioner was due to send to the Home Secretary one Member requested that it also refer to Dover District and the special circumstances experienced around the Docks.
5. In response to a question about a backlog in cases of Child Sexual Exploitation the Commissioner explained that she was not aware of the matter being referred to and so was unable to comment.
6. A Member asked about cross border working and the Commissioner confirmed that there was a large amount of cross border work going on, particularly with Essex. Due to its depth and complexity, the Commissioner felt she couldn't do justice to collaborative working at this meeting and offered to report back to the Panel.
7. With reference to hate crime the Commissioner was asked how much partnership work was taking place with local authorities. The Commissioner said she had recently attended a Community Safety Partnership meeting in Swale, the Community Liaison Officers did invaluable work with hard to reach and new and emerging communities. The Chairman requested that this be revisited next year and agreed that partnership working was increasingly important.

RESOLVED that Panel Members note the report on Protecting the Public from Harm; that the Commissioner report to the next meeting on the impact of events in Paris on policing in Kent; and that the Panel receives an update report in summer 2016 on hate crime.

151. Financial Planning for 2016/17 Onwards *(Item B3)*

1. The Commissioner introduced this report explaining that it was extremely difficult to plan for the future when there was limited information about how much funding would be received, although confirmation was expected near to Christmas. There had been £61.4million cuts to police funding in Kent since 2010, there were

reasonable Reserves and recorded crime had reduced. A decision had been made by the Home Office not to pursue the revision of the funding formula at this time and this introduced a further continuing element of uncertainty. The Commissioner considered that there were likely to be further cuts of between 25-40% to the Force budget over the next 5 years. There was an increasing focus on better use of and developing technology, such as Body Worn Cameras; reducing numbers of Police Officers would be a last resort, however this would be difficult bearing in mind 80% of the Force's budget was staffing costs.

2. A Member referred to the non-pay efficiencies and the references to restructuring within the report. Mr Nolan explained that non-pay efficiencies related to procurement savings, better utilisation of property, and targeted use of specialist facilities and lease arrangements etc. Responding to the restructuring question the Commissioner explained that an example of such restructuring had been the criminal justice units, there were previously two units and these had been rationalised to one, staff had been offered the opportunity to move with the unit.
3. One Member referred to the Government's commitment of more investment in specialist services by 2020, however in his experience Parish Councils were concerned about not seeing police on the streets and police response times. There was also a query about the 'delaying' of local policing. The Commissioner explained that the present police model was the local district model and this would remain in the short term. Delaying referred to the removal, for example, of one Chief Inspector rank where there was the opportunity for two divisions to share a Chief Inspector.
4. Following a discussion about the responsibility of district commanders it was suggested that if there was dissatisfaction with the levels of service received from the district commanders this be discussed outside of the meeting.
5. In relation to the savings from further assumed staff turnover of £2.5million the Commissioner was asked about dissatisfaction amongst staff. The Commissioner disagreed that there was general dissatisfaction and explained the £2.5million represented the money saved when officers or staff left at the top of their pay scale and were replaced at a lower pay scale. One Member considered that there were added difficulties with the loss of experience and operational knowledge. The Commissioner stated that Kent's workforce should reflect the county and new officers benefitted the Force. Another Member referred to the previous dissatisfaction comment and it was established that this related to police staff and the Commissioner offered to discuss this with the Panel Member who raised it and the Chief Inspector.
6. The Commissioner was asked whether she had explored the potential savings from combining police forces. The Commissioner explained that there were close links with Essex Police and millions of pounds of savings had been made by sharing services and close collaboration. The Commissioner confirmed that while it was possible to formally integrate and combine police forces she was not sure that this was what the people of Kent would want.
7. In the short term the Commissioner considered that the current policing model was sustainable, however she said this was unlikely to remain the case in the medium term if cuts were to the levels suggested.

8. One Member referred to problems within the Thanet District, which he represented, where there was a concern about a lack of policing. The Commissioner explained that the Force had lost a huge number of officers due to funding cuts and the demand for policing had unfortunately not reduced. In response to a further comment about the problems in Thanet the Commissioner explained that there was a Task Force in each district which would deal with persistent issues and the problems described by the Panel Member should be discussed with the relevant district commander.
9. The Commissioner said that the planned budget for 2016/17 assumed a 1% increase in receipts from the precept due to new buildings. The Commissioner said she intended to stick to her plan of increasing the precept by 1.99% if the Government continued to set this as the cap above which a referendum would be needed. If the cap was removed there would be further discussions with the Panel over the appropriate level of increase.
10. The Chairman congratulated the Commissioner on the 'outstanding' grading that Kent Police had received from HMIC for financial planning. He said that the lack of clarity about funding and increased demand was understood and it was essential that the Home Office were aware of the demands on Kent Police. The Chairman urged the Commissioner to make this point strongly to the Home Office.

RESOLVED that Members note the Financial Planning for 2016/17 Onwards report.

152. Commissioner's Decisions
(Item C1)

1. The Chairman invited Members to question the Commissioner on the decisions recently made. One Member referred to the approval for Kent Police to evaluate unmanned aircraft (drones) to support policing activity. The Member had seen these tested previously and raised a number of points that the Commissioner may wish to consider such as potential limited time in the air, battery life, constraints in wet weather and how these could be overcome. The Commissioner thanked the Member for the comments and would ensure these were discussed.

RESOLVED that Members of the Panel note the Commissioner's Key Decisions – October 2015.

153. Future work programme
(Item D1)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Future Work Programme.

154. Exempt minute of Independent Police Complaints Commission discussion held on 26 October at Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel
(Item E1)

1. The Panel resolved that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 & 3 of part 1 of schedule 12A of the Act.

2. Mrs Barnes, Mr Harper and Mr Nolan left the meeting.

RESOLVED that the exempt minute of the meeting held on 26 October was an accurate record and that it be signed by the Chairman.

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Draft Refreshed Police and Crime Plan for 2016/17 and Precept Proposal
Date: 2 February 2016

**Kent Police & Crime
 Commissioner**

'Devoted to Kent'

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; and
 - 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 this 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. Unlike previous years though, there have been two rounds of extensive consultation employing various engagement techniques.
6. The first round opened on 26 October and closed on 11 December 2015 and consisted of an online survey which was uploaded and promoted on the Commissioner's website. It asked the following questions:
 - Of the strategic priorities within the existing Police and Crime Plan, are there any you feel require more or less emphasis, and if so why?
 - Are there any priorities which relate to policing, criminal justice or community safety which you feel should be included in the Police and Crime Plan and if so, why?
 - What are your views on increasing the police precept element of the council tax by 1.99%, in line with previous published medium-term plans?
7. A range of stakeholders were directly e-mailed the survey, including:

• Kent MPs	• Parish Councils
• Council Leaders & Chief Executives	• Kent Finance Officers
• Clinical Commissioning Groups	• The Police & Crime Panel
• Neighbourhood Watch Chairs	• Victim Services
• Community Safety Partnerships	
8. Furthermore, it was e-mailed to approximately 5,000 subscribers of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner Newsletter and the opportunity to give feedback highlighted in the November 2015 edition. The link to the consultation was also circulated to approximately 9,600 twitter followers and promoted by local media.

9. Whilst a range of views and opinions were expressed, the following is a summary of the feedback received:
- Any existing priorities that require more or less emphasis – whilst responses overall indicated the level of emphasis was appropriate, partnership working, support for victims, tackling radicalisation and child sexual exploitation were frequently mentioned. However, once again visible community policing was the most consistent theme.
 - Are there any other priorities that should be included – whilst most responses referred to existing priorities, additional priorities included tackling modern slavery and protecting children in care, particularly those unaccompanied and seeking asylum.
 - Support for raising the policing proportion of the council tax – there was strong support for an increase of 1.99% (in line with the Commissioner's financial plan at that time).
10. In addition, Youth Advisory Group members were invited to comment on the plan, particularly the elements relating to children and young people. There was a good level of feedback and the general consensus was that the priorities reflected current issues affecting young people, such as drugs, anti-social behaviour, cyber-bullying and sexual exploitation.
11. The second round of consultation took place following the Autumn Statement and Spending Review (25 November 2015) and subsequent Police Grant Report 2016/17 (17 December 2015) in which the Government announced:
- '...additional flexibility will be given to the 10 PCCs in England with the lowest precept levels each year (the lower quartile), so that they can raise their precept by up to £5 per year per Band D household. Other PCCs in England will face a 2.0% referendum threshold each year.*
- The PCCs to receive this £5 flexibility in 2016/17 are Northumbria, West Midlands, West Yorkshire, Sussex, Essex, **Kent**, Hertfordshire, South Yorkshire, Greater Manchester and Cheshire.*
- '...For 2016/17, direct resource funding for each PCC, including precept, will be protected at flat cash levels, assuming that precept income is increased to the maximum amount available. This means that no PCC will face a reduction in cash funding next year compared to this year...'*
12. In order to minimise cuts to Kent Police funding in the future, the Commissioner therefore has the ability to increase the council tax precept by up to 3.4% (or £5 per year on a Band D property). However, in light of recent terrorist atrocities across mainland Europe, the Home Secretary has also requested that all police forces increase their firearms capability by up to 50%.
13. As a result, the second consultation proposed a precept increase of £5 for a Band D property with a commitment from the Commissioner to use the additional money to boost the number of firearms officers. Taking the form of an online poll, it ran from the 21 December 2015 to 15 January 2016, and was circulated via e-mail to the same recipients and promoted in the same way as the first consultation. The poll consisted of one question:
- Will your family pay £5 extra to increase public safety? Yes/No
14. In total, 895 online responses were received and the outcome was as follows:
- Yes: 53.2% (476 respondents);
 - No: 46.8% (419 respondents).
15. In addition to the above, the Commissioner hosted a 'Policing and Austerity' conference on 9 December 2015, at which the audience were invited to feedback on the plan priorities (reflected under paragraph 9) and also vote on the precept. There was unanimous support from those present (approximately 60 guests) for increasing the precept by 3.4% (or £5 on a Band D property).
16. Taken together, the Commissioner received feedback from nearly 1,000 people in the two rounds of consultation and at the conference. Overall, the majority were supportive of the Commissioner increasing the police precept element of the council tax.

17. Both consultations were reported in local newspapers, on radio and television.
18. The refresh has also taken into account comments received throughout the year at public engagement events and in correspondence received by the Commissioner's Office. The Chief Constable has also been consulted.

Key Changes in the Refreshed Police and Crime Plan:

19. A copy of the draft 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.
20. 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. As previously indicated, the focus has been on refreshing the contents of the plan rather than undertaking a major re-write. For reference purposes, a summary of the main changes can be found at Appendix B.
21. Aligned to the consultation findings, the core Policing and Crime & 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
22. Also reflecting the consultation, visible community policing remains a core theme and the bedrock of policing in Kent. However, the plan continues to recognise the invaluable contribution that the extended policing family makes to protecting communities and keeping people safe, including the Community Wardens and volunteers such as Neighbourhood Watch.
23. In light of recent extremist atrocities across Europe, and reflecting the consultation, the plan places a much greater emphasis on partners working together to protect public safety by tackling radicalisation and also enhancing Kent Police's specialist capability and capacity to protect communities from local, national and international threats.
24. The plan continues to acknowledge the value of statutory partners (e.g. Community Safety Partnerships) and less formal partners (e.g. Business Crime Advisory Group) in preventing and tackling crime. The importance of the on-going collaboration with Essex Police is recognised, but also exploring other collaborative opportunities within policing and beyond to enhance organisational efficiency and effectiveness.
25. Recognising the contribution of partners in protecting the most vulnerable, and reflecting the consultation, human trafficking has been expanded to modern slavery with a commitment to increase resources and improve local and national coordination. The plan also places a greater emphasis on:
- The multi-agency child sexual exploitation team ensuring those at risk, as well as victims of exploitation are identified and protected, and offenders brought to justice.
 - Protecting children from harm, particularly those in care and unaccompanied asylum seeking children.
 - Tackling cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime and improving education to help people protect themselves online.

26. In addition, the plan continues to reflect the Commissioner's commitment to place victims and witnesses at the heart of the criminal justice system, emphasising the importance of:
- Compass House in delivering a county-wide care and advice service for victims and witnesses tailored to individual needs.
 - Ensuring the long term contract for core victim services is managed effectively, providing easy access and a first class service.
 - Delivering specialist victim services that offer timely support and have a positive impact on victims.
 - Providing effective services for all victims of domestic abuse and supporting the children of victims.
 - Kent Police continuing to effectively support victims and witnesses whilst working to meet the national Code of Practice for Victims and Witness Charter.
27. 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.

Policing Precept Proposal for 2016/17:

28. At £147.15, Kent's current policing precept is the joint third lowest of all shire areas and below the national average of £173.35. A new policing precept in 2016/17 of £152.15 for a Band D property is proposed. This represents an increase of £5.00 or 9.6 pence per week on the current precept. This is in line with the increase assumed by the Home Secretary in the allocation of grant to forces for next year. Kent is one of 10 areas with the lowest current policing precept allowed to raise the precept by £5 (or 3.4%) for next year. The rest are limited to 2%, before requiring a referendum.
29. The original budget planning assumed an increase of £2.94 or 2% and this has been applied to reducing the savings otherwise required for next year by £1.7m. The further £2.06 or 1.4% to take the increase to £5.00, generates an additional £1.2m per annum which the Commissioner intends to use to recruit 24 of the 37 additional firearms officers the Chief Constable advises he needs to protect the communities of Kent, in line with the Home Secretary's expectations.
30. Even with a £5 increase, Kent's policing precept will still remain in the bottom ten of all forces.

Budget and Medium Term Plan Supporting Information:

31. Prepared by the Chief Finance Officer, a detailed report dealing with financial matters can be found at Appendix C - highlights are set out below.
32. Undoubtedly, the national grant settlement for policing for the next four years out of the Chancellor's Spending Review was considerably better than originally feared. This has translated into a promise that force budgets will be protected in cash terms providing Commissioners maximise the council tax flexibility open to them, including the additional flexibility for those in the bottom quartile. Accordingly, the actual across the board cash cut in the formula element of the grant is 0.6% for next year (2016/17). In addition the Home Office have identified £34m of funding to help support local armed response capability and £37m to support other capabilities (not yet defined). These other funds are yet to be allocated to individual force areas. There is no detail beyond 2016/17.
33. Nationally, the Home Secretary has set aside additional funding for specialist counter-terrorism capability which will be applied via specific grants for that purpose, either regionally or to individual forces as per current arrangements.
34. The Home Secretary has repeated her wish to re-start the formula review with a potential implementation in 2017/18, but no detail on that revised process has yet been released. It would be unwise to assume the review will simply re-start where it left off, it could easily re-start by re-visiting the proposed principles, making predictions of local impact even more difficult. As any formula change will produce inevitable winners and losers, a period of potentially significant grant turbulence in 2017/18 has to be anticipated at the current time.

35. Locally for Kent, in 2016/17 the general grant will be £186.2m, a reduction of £1m or 0.6% in the formula funding element on the current year. The Force will need to consume inflation and other cost pressures, not least a £4.6m hike in employer national insurance costs and a net investment of £1.2m to fund the extra 24 firearms officers to protect the public.
36. To help smooth the impact of the national insurance increase the Commissioner will apply £3.5m of reserves for that purpose in 2016/17 and raise the precept by £5 in part to cover the cost of the additional officers but also to help moderate the savings otherwise required. The net result is a need for £8.7m of savings next year. As per previous policy guidelines the Chief Constable has found these from non-front line savings. The better than feared settlement has meant the Chief Constable wishes to review more significant changes previously being contemplated, especially in respect of the configuration and level of inspector and chief inspector support to local district policing.
37. In advance of further detail, assuming it is allocated pro-rata to current counter-terrorism funding, the assumed share of the firearms grant for Kent would be in the order of £700,000 for next year. This, in addition to the £1.2m from raising the precept up to the full £5 per Band D property allowed would enable the Chief Constable to increase his armed response capability by the 37 officers that he needs.
38. The key areas of savings to achieve the £8.7m of resultant savings for next year are set out in Appendix C and due to effective forward planning by the Chief Constable will not involve any impact on front-line policing.
39. Overall, the planned gross budget in 2016/17 will be £313.0m, of which 98% will be delegated to the Chief Constable. The net budget for all operations, after taking into account current assumed specific grants and local income will be £277.9m. As in the current year, the headline budget for the operations of the Office of the Commissioner will be held at the same cash level inherited from the previous Police Authority in 2012 but once again will be required to deliver an underspend of £100,000, equivalent to a real saving of 8.0%.
40. As well as the continuation of the £200,000 per annum for the Chief Constable to invest in child sexual exploitation capacity, one-off funding will be allocated to the Force from savings in previous years to allow:
- £30,000 to fund an Anti-slavery Partnership Coordinator within the Serious Crime Directorate.
 - A further £100,000 in 2016/17 to support the Chief Constable's continued investment in his people and the wellbeing of the workforce.
 - £75,000 to support a further year of Police Community Support Officer crime prevention work in primary schools.
 - £50,000 for IT systems to track, monitor and manage the health of detainees in police custody.
41. In addition to revenue spending, a further £15m of new monies will be allocated to the Chief Constable for a variety of new capital and investment projects during 2016/17. The headline schemes for next year are set out in Appendix C with the actual release of resources being dependent on sound business cases in the usual way. Overall, the planned release of funding to support investment in innovation and resilience is £44m to 2019/20, financed from capital reserves. This level of investment would cost a minimum of £2m of annual debt charges by March 2020 if it was being financed from borrowing, equivalent to the cost of 40 officers.
42. The planned use of reserves is also set out in Appendix C.

The Medium Term Financial Challenge:

43. Beyond 2016/17, the actual grant allocations for each force area have yet to be announced. However, on the basis of applying the same spend and grant cut assumptions for the four years to 2019/20, but including a contingency for additional top slicing, the new apprentice levy and other possible pressures, results in the Force having to find £33m of savings over the next four years. This is before any impact, positive or negative, that may arise from the way the formula for allocating grant to individual forces is changed.

44. These additional savings are on top of the £62m that have been delivered since 2011/12.
45. On the basis of the better than feared grant settlement, the Chief Constable will be reviewing previous plans during 2016/17 to respond to the revised medium-term financial challenge. 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, remain key planning principles. As well as responding effectively to the changing nature of threat and risk, 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.

Commissioning Community Safety and Specialist Victim Services – Working with Partners:

46. Working with partners to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and directly support victims of crime is vital. The three key principles in how the available funding is allocated remain:
- All spending plans must help deliver the key priorities set out in the refreshed plan.
 - 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.
 - 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.
47. The total budget for commissioning community safety, crime reduction and victim support services will be set provisionally at £4.2m. Of this, £2.1m is funded from the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) specific victims' grant. At £2.1m, the total allocation for next year protects the current level of funding for victim services, plus an uplift of £146,000, with advice being that this should be used for child victims of sexual assault. The Commissioner will be following this advice. Overall, it is a very welcome announcement from the MOJ and pleasing to see that victims are high on the Department's priorities. The Commissioner has written to the MOJ to express her thanks. At this stage, £1.4m of the specific grant has been allocated in the plan pending confirmation of funding. The remainder will be allocated through the normal commissioning prospectus approach, but on the understanding it must be allocated to victim services in line with the specific grant conditions.
48. Through the use of accumulated underspends in the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner's budget, it will be possible to ensure grants to key partner organisations, especially Community Safety Partnerships, can be maintained at the same cash level in 2016/17 as in the current year. Overall, this will ensure all key and vital support areas can continue to be funded next year. The planned 2016/17 allocations are set out in the draft refreshed Police and Crime Plan (Appendix A).

DRAFT REFRESHED

POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

April 2013 – March 2017

Updated Spring 2016

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 when developing the Police & Crime Plan

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 and Crime Commissioner's funding: The current situation
- 6.2 The medium term financial challenge
- 6.3 Council tax plans
- 6.4 Policing budget for 2016/17
- 6.5 Coping with new savings requirements – working with partners
- 6.6 Other spending plans
- 6.7 Commissioning – working with partners

Appendix 1: Commissioned Services Allocations

1. Introduction

This is the third 'refresh' of my Police and Crime Plan, which runs until March 2017.

It has been updated to incorporate some of the new initiatives which are now up-and-running in Kent but also continues to reflect the things which the people of Kent have told me matter the most to them.

The last 12 months have been busy for my Office, and for policing as a whole.

Kent's new victim and witness care and advice centre, Compass House, opened on time and on budget in April 2015 and is now one year old. When the Ministry of Justice devolved responsibility for commissioning victims' services to individual Police and Crime Commissioners, I was keen to improve upon the previous 'one-size-fits-all' model because victims deserve the very best that we can afford and offer.

Now we have a locally-focussed service here in Kent providing bespoke support for each victim. After a thorough tender process we selected Victim Support to provide the core support services, but money has also been granted to specialist providers to help some of Kent's most vulnerable victims of crime.

I'm very proud of what we have achieved, but most of all I'm proud that Kent has a first-class facility where Kent Police and Victim Support are working together under one roof putting victims and witnesses at the heart of the criminal justice system.

This year has also seen the launch of a new multi-agency team to combat child sexual exploitation. When the country woke up to the abuse which had been going on in Rotherham, the one big thing that came out of it was the need for partnership working. Thanks to my financial commitment and the efforts of the Chief Constable, agencies in Kent are now working together to identify children at risk, taking action to protect them and providing help and support to assist their recovery.

But there is always more work to be done, which is why this plan includes a renewed focus on protecting and safeguarding children - particularly those in care who are most at risk of becoming victims of this abhorrent crime. Kent has more than its share of vulnerable young people, especially when you take into account the number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children being looked after.

We remain committed to traditional community policing, but forces across Britain also face emerging threats from cyber-crime and modern slavery. Here in Kent, we're already taking proactive steps to protect the public from these new crime types and this plan sets out my commitment to do even more in 2016/17.

However, public safety is at the forefront of everyone's minds at the moment following the shocking and tragic events in Paris last autumn. Kent is undoubtedly in a unique position, as the gateway to Europe some 35 million people pass through our borders each year, and the Home Secretary has also requested that forces increase their firearms' capability by up to 50%. That is why I've taken the decision to increase the policing element of a Band D household's council tax bill by £5 in 2016/17. The extra £1.2million this raises will be used to recruit 24 of the 37 additional firearms officers the Chief Constable advises he needs to protect the communities of Kent.

I would like to conclude by thanking all those who responded to our two consultations and gave their views on my plan. We have had difficult decisions to make but now is not the time to compromise on public safety. I commend to you my vision as the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner which Kent Police and its 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 they remain core to the 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.
- Commissioning victim services and overseeing service delivery.
- 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 & disorder reduction for the period 1 April 2013 – 31 March 2017.

Beneath this plan sits a plethora of detailed tactical plans developed by the Chief Constable to ensure effective delivery of these and other priorities.

In refreshing this plan, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner has considered the impact of recent significant budget reductions on the police and other public sector agencies. Despite having to take some difficult decisions, the Commissioner has remained steadfast in her commitment, which is also the Chief Constable's, to ensuring local visible policing, the number one priority for the people of Kent, is at the heart of the policing model. Whilst there is apparent better news about the future of police funding, there are still significant financial challenges ahead; as Kent's elected Police and Crime Commissioner, this commitment to the people of Kent is once again reaffirmed.

In refreshing this plan, it is also 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 the 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 the 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 the 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. Standing items include reports on the multi-agency child sexual exploitation team, financial monitoring, Force performance and external inspection activity.
- The People Board which is of equal importance as the Governance Board and aligned to it. This focuses on the culture of the organisation and the welfare of the people working in it. In times of austerity it can be all too easy to overlook the most important asset, your staff. 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 joint Audit Committee that 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 are fulfilling their duty to protect people detained in custody from harm.
- The Ethics Committee, that 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.
- Senior staff within the Commissioner's Office attending a range of internal Kent Police meetings to observe and monitor delivery against the priorities set out in this plan.
- Requiring the Force to provide bespoke briefings to the Commissioner on significant and/or sensitive issues. Recent examples include serious & organised crime and the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme.

In addition to the above, the 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.
- Calling upon public bodies, such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), to inspect Kent Police on the Commissioner's behalf.

2.2 The Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel

Actions and decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner are reviewed 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 role of the panel includes:

- Approving the precept (the money the Commissioner wants to raise through council tax to pay for policing).
- Reviewing the person who the Commissioner proposes to appoint as Chief Constable.
- Holding confirmation hearings concerning the appointment of key staff (e.g. Chief Executive).
- Making recommendations on the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report.

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 review and support the Commissioner in delivering this plan.
- Medium-term financial plan: recognises the on-going challenges to, and financial pressures on, police spending.
- Partnership priorities: The 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 the Commissioner 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 their 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, the Police and Crime 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. All partners, and in particular the local Community Safety Partnerships and recently formed combined Community Safety Unit, have a crucial role to play. In addition, the needs of different communities and groups are recognised, for example supporting rural communities and the business sector 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 '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.
- Building on last year's increase in resources within the Business Crime Advisory Group, continue to recognise the specific concerns of businesses, reduce the volume and impact of business crime and identify emerging issues.
- Work to the partnership strategy and protocol in dealing with anti-social behaviour and ensure a seamless service to victims.

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 are essential. The 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 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, Neighbourhood Watch Schemes and other voluntary organisations.
- 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 police estate 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.
- 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 there is a transparent, effective and timely response to complaints made against Kent Police in line with legislation, including those locally resolved and those referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission.
- Ensure the College of Policing's Code of Ethics continues to be embedded in Kent Police.

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.
- Continue to engage with the Community Rehabilitation Company and National Probation Service to ensure Kent's priorities are understood and effective working practices developed.

- 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 will 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 have responsibility for the commissioning of victim support services; this 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:

- Maximise opportunities afforded by Compass House to deliver a county-wide care and advice service for victims and witnesses. Using virtual and digital access to information and to support integration of the victim's journey through the criminal justice system with the appropriate support.

- Deliver a commissioning prospectus for specialist victim services in Kent which is based on need and ensures effective and timely support to victims.
- Proactively manage the long term contract for core victim services in Kent, ensuring victims who report crime or those who don't wish to report are able to access services tailored to their individual needs.
- Use victim feedback, 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.
- Focus on resolving crime and anti-social behaviour so victims feel they have had a quality service from the Force in line with latest Home Office guidance on outcomes.
- Provide an effective service to support all victims of domestic abuse, including a countywide Independent Domestic Violence Adviser (IDVA) service and support programme for the children of domestic abuse victims.
- 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 use of TrackMyCrime and the national Code of Practice for Victims of Crime.
- Promote and support victim initiated Restorative Justice, to help victims or their families cope and recover from the crime.
- Ensure Kent Police is working to meet the national Code of Practice for Victims of Crime and Witness Charter and work with other criminal justice partners on delivering their responsibilities under the Code.
- Improve the support services available to victims of sexual assault and enhance the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC).
- Ensure appropriate ownership and effective management of procedures and practices in relation to children and young-people.

4.5 Protect the public from harm

In light of the increased threat from extremists, as well as other criminal activity targeting the most vulnerable in society, there is a need to balance the delivery of local, visible community policing with effective services that protect the public from harm. Policing activity to manage this work is often invisible but the impact of such activity can cause serious harm to individuals and communities, as recently seen in attacks across mainland Europe.

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

- Continue working together to prevent violent extremism and radicalisation through the PREVENT programme and where appropriate, enhance specialist capability and capacity to protect communities and the public from local, national and international threats.

- Build on developments last year and continue working together in the multi-agency child sexual exploitation team, raising awareness and effectively sharing information to identify and protect victims and bring offenders to justice.
- Continue protecting children from harm through effective and joined up arrangements, particularly those in care and unaccompanied asylum seeking children. This includes working in conjunction with the Safeguarding Children Boards and the Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Board.
- 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.
- Enhance capacity to tackle cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime in conjunction with industry and other policing bodies, and educate the public on how to protect themselves.
- 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 Casualty Reduction Partnership in Kent.
- 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.
- Increase resources in recognition of the issues associated with modern slavery, and through local partnership coordination and the national Anti-trafficking and Modern Slavery Network ensure servitude, forced labour and human trafficking are effectively tackled.

4.6 Deliver value for money

To deliver the best possible service in the county, it is essential that Kent Police is as efficient and effective as possible. The promise to not privatise Kent Police remains, but it does not prevent working more closely with the private and third sector to develop innovative and fresh ideas. This focus on innovation and continuous improvement is essential to minimise the impact of recent grant cuts and future financial pressures on front-line policing.

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

- Identify options to deal with grant cuts and future financial challenges.
- 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 mobile devices for frontline officers.
- Meet the savings target required in each and every year of this 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, and where necessary enhance 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. The Office will also ensure that legally required information is published quickly and can be easily found on the website to allow the public to hold me to account.

The 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.

The 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 the Office as they are based on a broad knowledge of the issues that matter to communities and individuals.

A varied public engagement programme ensures that the public can have their say on how their streets and communities are policed. This includes regular engagement visits across the county, local surgeries, joint online meetings with the Chief Constable, social media and private correspondence. This approach allows people to express their views in a way which is most convenient for them. Listening to the public helps to ensure Kent Police is dealing with those issues that matter most to the people of Kent.

5.3 Partnership working

One of the core principles underpinning this Police and Crime Plan is the value and importance of partnership working and 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 the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Force continue to actively participate in and engage with relevant partnership structures. As a result, the 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. The 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 the Office will encourage and support this for the benefit of all communities.

5.4 Review and Annual Report

Police and Crime Plans are reviewed annually and key sections revised accordingly. However, they are also 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. The 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 and Crime Commissioner's funding: The current situation

The Gross funding is made up of:

64% grant funding, both general and specific, from the Government;
29% from the police element of the council tax; and
7% from miscellaneous income streams.

The funding outlook for police looks much better than originally feared but still requires savings. In the Government's Spending Review announced in November 2015, the Chancellor set out his aim to ensure police force budgets were at least maintained at current cash levels over the next four years providing all Police and Crime Commissioners increased their respective precepts by the maximum allowed. That has translated into an actual 0.6% cash cut in Kent's general police grant for 2016/17.

That cash cut in grant coupled with inflation and other cost pressures including employing 24 of the extra 37 firearms officers the Chief Constable advises he needs, partly offset by the use of reserves and a £5 or 3.4% increase in the policing precept, requires savings next year of £8.7m or 3.2% on the net budget. Thanks to sensible forward planning, the Force will be able to deliver these savings without any cuts to front-line policing. In part the savings for next year are being delivered by improved use of IT and innovation and other efficiency measures. However, inevitably it will still lead to the loss of some posts, primarily through natural attrition, further restructuring and asking staff and officers to do even more.

6.2 The medium term financial challenge

Beyond 2016/17, the Government has given no indication yet as to force allocations in future years, but we do know it will be in the context of the relative protection for police budgets announced by the Chancellor. On that basis extending the core budget assumptions employed for 2016/17 over the whole 4 years to 2019/20 but only assuming a 2% precept increase for 2017/18 onwards, and providing for some contingency including for the new national 'Apprenticeship Levy' in 2017/18, implies a total savings requirement for Kent of £33m for the four year period. This is 12% of the net budget, roughly half the challenge initially feared, but still requiring significant savings to be delivered over the period. This will be on top of the £62m of savings already delivered since 2011/12. In addition this savings target does not take account of any further changes in grant, either positive or negative, that may arise from the review of the formula that the government uses to distribute the national pot of police grant between individual forces. The formula changes could happen in 2017/18, but with no details or figures to work with, it is currently impossible to anticipate the impact on Kent.

The Chief Constable will be developing and refining saving options during 2016/17 to ensure the Force can respond effectively to the revised medium-term financial challenge. 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 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 29% of the total budget. For a family in Kent living in a Band D property, the Kent Police precept for 2015/16 stood at £147.15 per year, the joint third lowest of all shire areas in England and Wales. In comparison, the average was £173.35.

The Government limits how much money can be raised through the police element of the precept without triggering an expensive referendum. For most forces, the current permitted increase is up to 1.99% each year, but for the ten forces with the lowest precept, of which Kent is one, the permitted increase is up to £5 or 3.4% on a Band D property. After consultation, the Commissioner has decided to raise the precept in Kent by £5. As well as helping to offset savings otherwise required, it will allow her to fund 24 of the extra 37 firearms officers the Chief Constable advises he needs to protect the public. The majority of the consultation responses supported an increase.

An increase of £5 means that for 2016/17, the annual policing precept for a Band D equivalent property would be £152.15, up from £147.15. This represents an increase of 9.6 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 2% is assumed in the police element of the council tax; for 2017/18 onwards.

6.4 Policing budget for 2016/17

The annual budget for gross spending on policing and community safety is set at £313.3m. It is broken down as follows:

<u>Kent Police budget by subject area</u>	2016/17 £m
Pay and overtime	258.7
Premises related	21.3
Transport related	7.6
Other supplies and services	28.7
Office of the Commissioner	1.5
Grants and victim services awarded by the Commissioner	4.2
Savings required	-8.7
Gross police and community safety spending	313.3
Less local income and specific grants for policing	29.2
Less specific grant for victims services	2.1
Less contribution from reserves	3.9
Net police and community safety spending	278.1
Financed by:	
General policing and legacy grants	186.2
Council tax precept	91.9
Net financing	278.1

6.5 Coping with new savings requirements – working with partners

As well as being as efficient and effective as possible, coping with significant 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 2016/17.

6.6 Other spending plans

As well as the continuation of the £200,000 per annum for the Chief Constable to invest in child sexual exploitation capacity, one-off funding will be allocated from savings in previous years to allow:

- £30,000 to fund an Anti-slavery Partnership Coordinator within the Serious Crime Directorate.
- A further £100,000 in 2016/17 to support the Chief Constable's continued investment in his people and the wellbeing of the workforce.
- £75,000 to support a further year of Police Community Support Officer crime prevention work in primary schools.
- £50,000 for IT systems to track, monitor and manage the health of detainees in police custody.

In addition to revenue spending, a total of £15m will be allocated for a variety of new capital and investment projects during 2016/17. These will be financed from a mixture of accumulated capital reserves and capital receipts. This is part of a planned £44m new capital investment over the next four 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. 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 Commissioning – working with partners:

Working with partners to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and to support victims is vital and Police and Crime Commissioners have been given commissioning responsibilities and associated funding to enable them to deliver this function. There are two aspects to the Commissioners commissioning responsibilities:

- Community Safety; and
- Victim Services.

The community safety element is an amalgamation of Home Office drugs, crime and community safety funding streams. This is non-ring-fenced funding to commission services to help tackle drugs and crime, reduce re-offending, and improve community safety.

The victim services element is devolved funding from the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) for the specific purpose of commissioning local victim services. This funding was issued to Commissioners in October 2014 and is vital to supporting the delivery of effective support services for victims of crime. This funding is utilised for the delivery of the core commissioned victim service and specialist victim service provision.

The key principles to the commissioning approach of the Police and Crime Commissioner are:

1. To adopt a flexible approach to commissioning utilising different methods to ensure the best outcomes are achieved, this may include the issuing of grants or the commissioning of services directly.
2. All grants and commissioned services must identify the priorities in this plan that they will help to deliver and satisfactory monitoring must be returned to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to evidence this link and the outcomes achieved.
3. A commitment to work with existing partners to deliver joined up services where possible and appropriate.
4. Ensuring proportionate commissioning governance arrangements.
5. Providing as much medium-term funding certainty as possible whilst also taking into account the reduced funding anticipated in future years.

In respect of medium-term certainty for the community safety element of the funding, the promise was made that as much future funding certainty as possible would be provided to partners. However it is important to remember the context. In 2014/15, all former specific grants received for community safety were absorbed into the general policing grant. This meant that from 2014/15 onwards, allocations to partners and projects had to reflect the general policing grant cut suffered. Accordingly, in 2014/15 allocations to partners were set out for the three years to 2016/17 on the basis of assumed cuts in the general grant cut over that period. Those indicative allocations were honoured for 2015/16. The cut in police grant in 2016/17 is less than originally feared. Accordingly, through the use of Office budget underspends in this current year, the commissioning allocations to key partners will remain at the same level in 2016/17 as in 2015/16. This is in recognition of the positive work undertaken by the partnerships in Kent to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and support victims.

Proposed allocations

Assuming all partners continue to engage positively, the proposed commissioning allocations for 2016/17 are set out in Appendix 1. The most significant change compared to previously published plans is the inclusion of the victim services elements, funded by a specific grant from the MOJ. For 2016/17, the confirmed grant is £2.1m, an increase of £146,000 on the previous year. As advised by the MOJ, the Commissioner will use this uplift to support child victims of sexual assault.

Appendix 1 – Commissioned Services Allocations

Organisation	2016/17 £m
Ashford Community Safety Partnership	28,858
Canterbury Community Safety Partnership	32,981
Dartford Community Safety Partnership	31,857
Dover Community Safety Partnership	28,858
Gravesham Community Safety Partnership	31,857
Maidstone Community Safety Partnership	37,104
Medway Community Safety Partnership	96,782
Sevenoaks Community Safety Partnership	31,107
Shepway Community Safety Partnership	28,858
Swale Community Safety Partnership	33,731
Thanet Community Safety Partnership	33,116
Tonbridge and Malling Community Safety Partnership	27,974
Tunbridge Wells Community Safety Partnership	28,484
Kent Community Safety Partnership (KCSP)	39,661
Young Persons Substance Misuse	92,627
Kent Youth Offending Team	275,107
Medway Youth Offending Team	90,353
Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team	301,449
Kent Safeguarding Children	45,934
Kent and Medway Adult Safeguarding	21,120
Medway Safeguarding Children Board	15,434
Medway Drug and Alcohol Action Team	59,042
Youth Diversion Fund	75,000
National Crimestoppers	39,156
Local Crimestoppers	14,699
Independent Domestic Violence Advisors Contract	115,000
Kent Criminal Justice Board Support	40,000
Restorative Justice via KCJB	46,000
Kent DV Co-ordinator (KCC)	4,760
Safer Kent	20,000
SARC Funding	55,000
Commissioner's Fund	100,000
Children of Domestic Abuse Victims	51,009
Child Sexual Exploitation	200,000
Core Victim Services	1,055,000
Continuation Grants	81,820
Counselling Services for Victims of Sexual Assault	80,000
Medium Risk Domestic Abuse Intervention Services	70,000
Specialist Victim Services to be Commissioned*	739,405
Total	4,199,144

* Including £146,225 for child victims of sexual assault.

Draft Refreshed Police and Crime Plan 2016/17 - Summary of main changes

Contents, Headings changed

Pge 2	6.1	Kent Police and Crime Commissioner's funding: the current situation
	6.2	The medium term financial challenge
	6.4	Policing budget for 2016/17
	6.7	Commissioning – working with partners
	Appendix 1	Commissioned Services Allocations

1. Introduction

Pge 3	New introduction by the Commissioner	
-------	--------------------------------------	--

1.2 - Role of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Pge 4	New, bullet 5	Commissioning victim services and overseeing service delivery
-------	---------------	---

1.3 - The Police and Crime Plan

Pge 5	New, para 2	Beneath this plan sits a plethora....
	Change, para 3	In refreshing this plan, my office has considered...

2.1 - Holding Kent Police to account

Pge 6	Addition, bullet 1	Standing items include reports on the multi-agency child...
	Change, bullet 2	The People Board which is of equal importance as the Governance...
	Deletion of bullet	A number of other forums 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, HR, performance and complaints.
	New, bullet 7	Senior staff within the Commissioner's office attending...
	New, bullet 8	Requiring the Force to provide bespoke briefings to the Commissioner...
Pge 7	Deletion of bullet	Holding Commissioner Inquiries into matters of interest, at which the Chief Constable will give evidence.

2.2 - The Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel

Pge 7	New, bullet 1	Approving the precept...
	New, bullet 2	Reviewing the person who the Commissioner proposes to appoint...
	New, bullet 3	Holding confirmation hearings concerning the...
	New, bullet 4	Making recommendations on the Commissioner's...

4.1 - Cut crime and catch criminals

Pge 10	Addition, para 1	All partners, and in particular the local Community Safety Partnerships and recently formed combined Community Safety Unit...
	Change, bullet 7	Building on last year's increase in resources within the Business Crime...
	Change, bullet 8	Work to the partnership strategy and protocol in dealing...

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

Pge 11	Change, bullet 6	Make appropriate alternative accessibility arrangements...
	Change, bullet 12	Ensure there is a transparent, effective and timely response...
	Change, bullet 13	Ensure the College of Policing Code of Ethics...

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

Pge 11	Change, bullet 2	Continue to engage with the Community Rehabilitation...
--------	------------------	---

4.4 - Put victims and witnesses at the heart of processes

Pge 12	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	Enhance and develop the capacity of Kent Police and other agencies to deal with child sexual exploitation.
	Change, bullet 1	Maximise opportunities afforded by Compass House to deliver...
Pge 13	Change, bullet 2	Deliver a commissioning prospectus for specialist victim...
	Change, bullet 3	Proactively manage the long term contract for core victim...
	Deletion of bullet	Earmark resources to enable criminal justice agencies to invest in further improvements to support victims and witnesses of crime or anti-social behaviour.
	Change, bullet 6	Provide an effective service to support all victims of domestic abuse...
	Change, bullet 9	Promote and support victim initiated Restorative Justice...
	Change, bullet 10	Ensure Kent Police are working to meet the national Code of Practice...
	Change, bullet 11	Improve the support services available to victims of sexual assault...

4.5 - Protect the public from harm

Pge 13	New, para 1	In light of the increased threat from extremists, as well as other criminal...
	New, bullet 1	Continue working together to prevent violent extremism...
	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	Continue to work together to prevent violent extremism and radicalisation in our communities through the PREVENT programme.
Pge 14	New, bullet 2	Build on developments last year and continue working together...
	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	Enhance and develop the capacity of Kent Police and other agencies to deal with child sexual exploitation.
	New, bullet 3	Continue protecting children from harm through effective and joined up...
	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	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.
	Change, bullet 5	Enhance capacity to tackle cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime...
	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	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.
	New, bullet 10	Increase resources in recognition of the issues associated with modern...
	Deletion of bullet <i>(reflected in Plan elsewhere)</i>	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

Pge 14	Change, bullet 1	Identify options to deal with grant cuts and future financial...
--------	------------------	--

4.7 - Meet national commitments for policing

Pge 15	Change, bullet 1	Maintain and where necessary enhance capability and capacity...
--------	------------------	---

5.2 - Public engagement

Pge 16	New, para 2	A varied public engagement programme ensures that the public...
--------	-------------	---

6. Finance and Medium Term Budget Challenge

Pges 18-21	New and extensively re-written to reflect latest financial position	
------------	---	--

Appendix 1 – Commissioned Services Allocations

Pge 22	Amended and updated for 2016/17	
--------	---------------------------------	--

Overview of the Current Budget

1. The adjusted gross budget for 2015/16 is £306.0m, net of specific grants (including £12.2m for counter-terrorism) and local income of £17.5m; the net budget for the current year is £274.4m. Broadly 70% of the net budget is met from general grant and 30% is met from the policing precept. The current policing precept for a Band D property is £147.15, the joint third lowest for a shire area.

Grant Settlement for Policing

2. In the Spending Review on the 25 November 2015 the Chancellor announced that the total budget for policing would be protected in real terms and that local force budgets would be protected in cash terms. Both assertions require each Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to set the maximum precept increase allowed in each of the next four years.
3. On the 17 December, the Policing Minister announced the general grant allocation for each force area for 2016/17. Certain details still remain to be published but the key highlights of the Minister's announcement, in line with the earlier Spending Review decisions set out by the Chancellor, are as follows:
 - In 2016/17, no PCC will face a cash reduction in "direct resource funding" assuming precept income is increased to the maximum available. For policing, direct resource funding is deemed by Government to be the sum of formula funding plus legacy council tax grants plus precept. The assumption of maximum precept increase is crucial to the Government's promise of a flat cash settlement next year.
 - Accordingly, the actual cash cut to formula grant funding is 0.6% for each PCC.
 - From the total allocation to the Home Office for policing from the Spending Review, the Home Secretary is setting aside £295m for schemes or initiatives to be managed centrally by the Home Office or for related national organisations such as the Independent Police Complaints Commission and College of Policing or to be decided centrally but with monies subsequently allocated to forces.
 - The key example of an item to be held and managed centrally is in respect of the new (and necessary) replacement Emergency Services Network. £80m has been set aside for this by the Home Secretary in 2016/17.
 - Examples of funding set aside or top-sliced to be subsequently allocated to PCCs in 2016/17 are:
 - £55m for the Innovation Fund;
 - £38m to be allocated to improve cross-force specialist capabilities;
 - £34m to enable a national uplift in armed policing capacity; and
 - £4.6m for digital transformation.

The actual allocations to each force are not yet known. However, the Innovation Fund will depend upon successful bids. The uplift to firearm capability will apparently be allocated to PCCs in accordance with the current counter-terrorism funding formula. The detail in relation to other funds is not yet known.

- In respect of capital grants to PCCs, the national total in 2016/17 is £64.5m, a cut of 41% on the equivalent total for the current year.

- The precept increase limit (before referendum is required) is 2% for the majority, but the 10 force areas in the bottom quartile of current precepts can raise their precept by £5.00 (typically around 3.4%) before referenda each year.
4. The Minister also announced his intention to re-start the Formula Review for implementation in 2017/18. Beyond that there are no further details as yet, but clearly there is the real prospect of significant grant turbulence for winners and losers in 2017/18 onwards, including Kent.
 5. Locally, as a result of the settlement, in 2017/18 Kent will receive a total of £186.2m in general grants and council tax grants. This is a reduction of £1m on the current year's formula grant element. In addition, in the absence of published detail, the assumed new grant allocation for firearms capacity is £0.7m for Kent in 2016/17.
 6. The current capital grant allocation is £2.1m but based upon a national reduction of 41% and a contingency for possible Home Office top slicing, the new capital grant for Kent in 2017/18 is assumed to be £1m.

Assumed Cost Pressures for Kent

7. The draft budget for 2016/17 is based upon the following key spending assumptions:
 - General pay award of 1% (plus 1% for increments).
 - Average 2.5% for general price inflation.
 - A provision of £4.6m for the impact on Kent Police of the national changes to employer's national insurance costs from 2016/17 onwards.
 - Estimated increases in IT costs in line with expanded capabilities (0.5m), changes in Serious Crime Directorate systems to comply with changing regional requirements (0.4m), increased training and HR support costs (0.2m), other various risk adjustments (0.5m).
 - Impact of a national legal ruling on the calculation of holiday pay (£0.6m).
8. In addition, a new net provision of £1.2m has been included. This reflects the estimated net cost of meeting the new operational expectation on the Force to increase its armed response capability. The new provision of £1.2m would allow for 24 extra officers to be recruited. An assumed grant allocation of £0.7m from the new Firearms Grant would allow for a further 13 new officers, making 37 and meeting the total number the Chief Constable (CC) advises he needs to protect Kent. However, the increasing threat, risk and harm to public safety, and hence demand on Kent Police, also flows from child sexual exploitation (CSE), other historic and current sexual abuse, cyber-crime, organised crime groups and domestic violence. These additional pressures are challenging and are being currently managed by the Chief Constable within existing resources supplemented by use of one off funding.
9. The Ministry of Justices (MOJ) announcement of an increase in the specific victims grant to £2.1m is welcome. This will be allocated as per grant conditions on vital services for victims, not least from Compass House. In addition, the better than feared general grant outcome from the Home Office, and use of Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) underspends, will enable the commissioning grants to partners in 2016 /17 to be retained at the same cash level as the current year. (These awards will be subject to partners continuing to play an active role in various respective partnerships). In total the combined commissioning and victims support budget of £4.2m is fully funded for next year. However, the position over the medium term will need to be adjusted in light of future MOJ and Home Office grant decisions.

Budget and Precept Strategy for 2016/17

10. Taken together these spending pressures amount to £13.4m in 2016/17 after a 2% increase in the precept for policing as per previously published assumptions. To deal with this gap the Commissioner proposes to use £3.5m of reserves in 2016/17 to allow the Chief Constable to smooth the impact of the national insurance hike in 2016/17. Again this is in line with previously published assumptions.

11. The gap then remaining amounts to £9.9m. To match the cost of £1.2m to recruit 24 extra firearms officers, the Commissioner is minded to increase the precept in 2016/17 by the maximum allowed of £5 or 3.4% per annum on an average band D property. In effect this is £2.06 or 1.4% more precept than previously planned for and amounts to £1.2m extra income. If confirmed the Commissioner expects the Chief Constable to appoint 24 of the 37 additional firearms officers he has advised are required for public safety; as per the Home Secretary's expectations and thus, avoiding the front-line being otherwise denuded. If capacity allows, other public safety pressures include CSE, organised crime and cybercrime.
12. Accordingly, the proposed precept for a Band D property would be £152.15 per year, an increase of £5 per year or 9.6 pence per week for a Band D property.
13. The combination of precept increase and use of reserves means a saving gap in 2016/17 of £8.7m. A summary of the proposed 2016/17 budget is set out in Annex 1.
14. The Chief Constable has identified and will have fully implemented appropriate savings to meet the gap next year with no impact on front-line policing. In summary this will be achieved as follows:
 - Non Pay (£1m)
 - Corporate Services (£0.2m)
 - Local policing (restructuring) (£1.3m)
 - Serious Crime Directorate – reconfiguration (£1.3m)
 - Strategic Criminal Justice – reconfiguration (£0.6m)
 - Support Service (£1.6m)
 - Staff Turnover (£2.5m)
 - Miscellaneous (£0.2m)

Medium Term Financial Plan – 4 years to 2019/20

15. As previously indicated, the Home Office has yet to issue specific local allocations for future years. For the purpose of current planning, it is assumed Kent loses an additional £1m in grant each year from 2017/18 onwards. In addition, it is assumed the cost of the new "Apprenticeship Levy" will be £1.3m for Kent Police.
16. If these grants (and special levy) assumptions are combined with a roll forward of normal wage and price assumptions, the savings gap over the 4 years to 2019/20 is £30m. This is based upon modest assumptions, indeed nearer the best case rather than the worst case scenario. Further top slicing of grant and/or increased cost pressures would add to the £30m gap. For that reason a 10% contingency has been added, in the latter two years, to make a total savings challenge of £33m over the four years to 2019/20. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, this gap does not take into account the possible impact of the Formula Review.
17. A summary of the medium term plan is set out in Annex 2. On the basis of these assumptions the savings profile would be as follows before any change caused by the Formula Review in 2017/18:

2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
£8.7m	£8.3m	£8.4m	£7.9m	£33.3m

18. The reality is that the savings gap of £33m reflects very largely the Force having to consume its own inflation and cost pressures with the assumption of only modest further grant cuts. This clearly is considerably better than feared when the assumed savings gap over the next 4 years was expected to be over £60m. The difference is almost completely explained by only suffering a grant reduction of less than 1% per annum against a previous planning assumption of 5% per annum.
19. The position for policing has to be taken in perspective particularly in comparison with other parts of the public sector in Kent, and local government partners who appear to have been badly affected. However, while considerably better than feared, a minimum of £33m over the next 4 years is a 12% real cut on the net budget over the period that has to be managed.

20. In December the Home Secretary made it clear in person to PCCs and Chief Constables that she knows savings are required and that she expects enhancements in efficiency through collaboration and partnership and step changes in the use of innovation and new technology to transform, manage and meet demand better within available resources.
21. These are themes well known to the Commissioner and Chief Constable, and are at the heart of other strategies that the Chief Constable has instigated to manage the challenge over the medium term. Key strategies and initiatives currently being planned in the short to medium term include:
 - Investment in mobile and body worn video technology.
 - Investment in a major new police business system in collaboration with seven other forces (i.e. Athena).
 - Investment in channel shift and other demand management initiatives.
 - Maximising collaborative and efficiency opportunities.
 - Investing in culture and people.

Reserve Strategy and Planning

22. The Commissioner's reserve strategy has the following key elements:
 - Earmarked reserves, those set aside for specific purposes, are grouped into three categories, namely risk, change and policy/investment opportunities.
 - A general non-earmarked reserve of 2% of the net budget will be maintained for unknown and/or unforeseeable events.
 - A prudent approach to risk management will be maintained and accordingly earmarked reserves will be created to cover for possible significant risks.
 - A prudent reserve to provide for the costs of change, especially in respect of redundancy and related will be maintained.
 - In the interest of the council tax payer, the PCC will seek as far as possible to protect its 'non-debt' status and instead of borrowing for investment, build up and rely on reserves for that purpose over the long term.
 - The PCC will take a long term approach to protecting, maintaining and investing in all its assets supporting policing for the long term as well as short term.
 - Reserves not required for the above purposes will be clearly identified as available for other discretionary policy opportunities.
23. The Panel will be aware of these key strategy elements from annual budget reports presented in the past. Furthermore, and most significantly, the policy of building up reserves for short and long term capital investment, to avoid borrowing costs, is a long established policy inherited from the previous Police Authority. They are to be commended for that.
24. The total non-earmarked and earmarked reserves as at the 1 April 2015 was £60.1m. Of this, non-earmarked reserves amounted to £5.6m or broadly 2% of the net budget in line with normal practice. The remaining reserves were all earmarked. It should be remembered that £27.6m or nearly half of those total earmarked reserves, were there to support investment and capital spending over the medium to long term as opposed to more costly borrowing. This capital reserve has been built up from accumulated underspends, capital grants and capital receipts over the years.
25. As the Panel will be aware, the total of the capital reserve at 31 March 2015 is after setting aside a cumulative amount of £9.8m in closing the 2014/15 accounts. This was due to a coding error that resulted in Pension Top up grant being incorrectly claimed from the Government in each year since the 2006 pension reforms. This over-claim had the effect of incorrectly adding to the general account each year and in line with established policy formed part of the underspends added to the capital reserve over that period. Once this came to light it was dealt with promptly, in conjunction with the external auditor, enabling the appropriate amount to be set aside to repay the Home Office and ensure an unqualified opinion on the 2014/15 accounts. Undoubtedly, this set aside has reduced the longer term available investment capacity to the extent that the PCC will probably

need to start borrowing for significant investment during the next Spending Review cycle (i.e. 2020/21 to 2023/24). However, the policy of maintaining prudent reserves for investment, rather than borrowing, has enabled the sum that needs to be repaid to the Home office to be set aside without harming medium term investment plans.

26. It is worth putting police reserves into context. The risks facing police are in parts similar to local government but in other respects quite different. The areas of difference are felt particularly in key operational events such as a murder, or public order/safety incidents, which can consume major cost suddenly and unexpectedly. Furthermore, such events in the past can generate very significant and unexpected liabilities in the future. The deeply sad events and regrettable aftermath of the Hillsborough disaster is a dramatic example. For Kent, the Chilham murders and Tonbridge robbery also put major strains on Kent finances at the time.
27. However, while there are understandable differences with the risk profile facing local authorities, the comparison with other forces is an important point of reference. In that regard, as per a recent National Audit Office study, Kent is in the middle of the pack.

Use of Reserves

28. As at 31 March 2016, due to normal movements and adjustments during the year, total earmarked and non-earmarked reserves are expected to fall to £56.8m. The non-earmarked provision will be kept at 2% of the net budget. As per previously published planning assumptions, the Commissioner will be releasing £3.5m in 2016/17 (rising to £5.5m over the next 4 years) to help the Force smooth the impact of the hike in national insurance contributions. In addition, in 2016/17 the Commissioner will continue the policy of supporting CSE capacity (£200,000 per annum for three years), supporting billing authorities for council tax base support in concert with other preceptors (£150,000) and supporting redundancy costs over the medium term (£6m). For completeness, the planned use of all reserves in 2016/17 is set out below:

Summary of Reserves

	£m	
Non Earmarked:		
General Fund	5.6	Set at 2% of net budget (PCC decides)
Earmarked:		
<i>Risk</i>		
Council Tax Benefit support	0.7	Incentive scheme in concert with other preceptors
Public Order provision	2.0	For use by CC with PCC agreement
Budget and Grant volatility	4.0	Risk of grant volatility (PCC decides to use)
Insurance fund	3.1	In line with actuarial guidelines for self-insured risks
<i>Change</i>		
Invest to Save (CC and PCC)	0.9	To assist future savings, for use by CC
Redundancy etc.	6.0	For use by CC with PCC agreement
<i>Policy Opportunity and Investment</i>		
Policy Opportunities (PCC)	5.9	To help smooth Force savings plans
Capital Reserve	27.6	To support capital and innovation investment
Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA)	0.6	Proceeds of Crime (CC)
Other	0.4	Miscellaneous
Total Earmarked	51.2	
Grand Total	56.8	

29. Over the medium term, after consultation with the Chief Constable, the Commissioner will be releasing £44m over the four years to 2019/20 for major transformational investment in mobile and other innovations as well as ensuring proper facilities and equipment for the Force. In part this

will be funded from targeted capital receipts over the period but also from a significant reduction in the capital reserve. For information, the cumulative annual debt charges to revenue for this programme would have been at least £2m per annum by March 2020, equivalent to 40 officer posts, if this investment relied on borrowing rather than reserves.

30. Given the overall Spending Review outcome, a £4m grant volatility reserve is being retained for the purpose of potential grant reductions from formula changes in 2017/18 onwards and it is assumed it will be used for that over the period. A new specific reserve of £200,000 has been established as a sinking fund for major repairs or adaptation to Compass House. This has been funded by accumulated underspends in the OPCC budget, and will ensure the facility is entirely sustainable and fit for purpose without imposing any strain on future investment funding intended for the Force in the long term.
31. Taking all these plans and provisions into account, results in total earmarked reserves falling to £19m or 41% of the current level. Excluding the on-going requirement to provide for self-insurance and redundancy, the capital reserve will be reduced to £11.6m by March 2020. This makes it highly likely that the Force will need to borrow externally for significant capital investment by 2021/22. The forecast use of reserves over the medium term is set out in Annex 3.

Capital Planning

32. The key themes driving investment can be summarised as follows:
 - Policy led with clear linkages to operational requirements and the Police and Crime Plan.
 - Using technology and innovation to reduce demand and increase the time and focus officers can devote to core policing.
 - Putting victims at the heart of the service.
 - Ensuring sound and reliable equipment and facilities for officers.
 - Exploiting tangible efficiency and effectiveness opportunities in partnership with others.
33. The planned schemes and projects for 2016/17 are set out in Annex 4. The indicative investment themes for future years are also set out in this Annex. As per normal practice, actual release of funding next year and in future years will depend on the completion of sound business cases.

Statutory Statements

34. 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.
35. For Kent, Government grant makes up 67% of net funding excluding specific grants. Consequently, reductions in grant will inevitably have an impact on policing operations. Thankfully, the level of grant cut over the next Spending Review cycle is much less than feared. However the consequence of handling inflation, other known cost pressures, a £3m contingency for unknown pressures - coupled with even a modest cut in grants - will still require the Force to find £33m of savings or 12% of its net budget over the next 4 years. Effective financial management and planning, commended by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, has already enabled the Force to deliver approximately £62m of savings as part of Spending Reviews since 2011/12.
36. On top of this, the government's planned review of the formula for distributing the national pot of general police grants between forces may have a significant positive or negative impact. There is a need to have some risk protection against any negative impact on Kent from 2017/18 onwards.
37. The Force and the OPCC maintain active risk registers and associated risk management processes for operational and management risks which are monitored by the Independent Joint Audit Committee. As well as the financial challenges described above, many of the key 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, CSE, organised crime and cybercrime. Within the OPCC, on-going strategic risks relate to ensuring the core statutory

functions of the Commissioner are met; this includes overall financial governance and value for money.

38. I am satisfied that the estimates have been drawn up in a robust way, recognising that medium term forecasts beyond 2016/17 will inevitably carry more uncertainty. At the time of the budget we have assumed pay awards are capped at 1% for the four years 2016/17 to 2019/20 and an average 1% for increments. Given recent market movements the impact of the upcoming Local Government Pension Scheme valuation in 2017/18 is a risk, but it's too soon to provide an informed figure. Any changes beyond that can be dealt with from reserves in the short term pending a necessary re-set of the savings targets. For non-pay we are assuming general inflation at 2.5% for all four years but with a major hike of £4.6m per year in employer national insurance in 2016/17 and £1.3m for the new "Apprenticeship Levy" in 2017/18. Beyond that, a 10% contingency for further grant top slicing has been included. The key assumption on grant resources is the provisionally announced cash cut of 0.6% in general grant for 2016/17 and a presumed repeat of this cash cut in each of 2017/18 through to 2019/20. The precept increase in 2016/17 is assumed to be £5.00 or 3.4% on a Band D property and 2% (rounded) thereafter, up to and including 2019/20.
39. As already mentioned, ear-marked reserves have been designated into three categories; necessary risk management, costs of change and support for policy opportunities. A significant element of total reserves is the capital reserve built up from accumulated underspends and accumulated capital receipts. This reserve, in conjunction with targeted capital receipts, is vital to help finance the major planned capital spend by the Chief Constable of £44m over the next 4 years, without recourse to the comparatively expensive cost of debt charges otherwise falling on the revenue account and having to be financed from further operational savings.
40. Overall, I have considered the level and need of reserves against the strategic risk registers of the Force and the OPCC. For example, I am retaining a grant volatility reserve to provide some cover for the risk of negative formula change in 2017/18. On the whole, existing reserves are sound and in each case I am satisfied that they are prudent and appropriate after consideration of the latest key risk assessments. However, the level of investment and consequent release from the capital reserve means the organisation will probably need to start borrowing for significant investment in the next Spending Review cycle (i.e. 2020 onwards). I am also satisfied that the operation of internal and external audit and the operation of financial controls are sound. While the Spending Review for policing is much better than the sector feared, the consequent level of savings required for Kent are still significant at £33m to 2019/20. This 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.

Sean J Nolan
Chief Finance Officer
Kent Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
February 2016

Supporting information:

Annex 1 – Proposed 2016/17 budget.

Annex 2 – Summary of Medium Term Plan, 2016/17 to 2019/20.

Annex 3 – Planned use of Reserves over the Medium Term.

Annex 4 – Summary of Capital Programme to 2019/20.

Proposed 2016/17 budget

	Adjusted Base Budget 2015/16	Inflation or Growth	Savings	Proposed Budget 2016/17
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Pay and Overtime	244.0	14.7		258.7
Premises Related	20.7	0.6		21.3
Transport	7.4	0.2		7.6
Other non pay costs including IT, supplies etc.	27.9	0.7		28.6
Cost of the OPCC	1.5	0.0		1.5
Commissioning and Victim Services	4.3	-0.1		4.2
Contribution to Local Council Tax Scheme	0.2	0.2	-0.2	0.2
Savings Required			-8.7	-8.7
Total Gross Spending on Police and Commissioning	306.0	16.0	-8.9	313.3
less:				
Specific Grant - Victims Funding	1.9			2.1
Specific Grants - Counter Terrorism (see note)	12.2			12.2
Locally Generated Income	17.1	-0.1		17.0
Contribution from Reserves - existing policies	0.4	0.4	-0.4	0.4
Contribution from Reserves - new policies	0.0	3.5	0.0	3.5
Total Net Spending	274.4	12.1	-8.5	278.1
General Policy and Legacy Council Tax Grants	187.2	-1.0	0.0	186.2
Estimated Council Tax Surplus	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Council Tax Precept	85.9	4.5	0.0	90.6
Total Net Financing	274.4	3.5	0.0	278.1
Council Tax Base	583918			595071
Band D Precept	147.15			152.15
£ Increase in Precept	2.87			5.00
% Increase in Precept	2.0%			3.4%
% Growth in Tax Base	1.7%			1.9%

Note: For specific grants, further detail is awaited.

Summary of Medium Term Plan, 2016/17 to 2019/20

	Proposed Budget 2016/17	Inflation or Growth	Savings	Forecast 2017/18	Inflation or Growth	Savings	Forecast 2018/19	Inflation or Growth	Savings	Forecast 2019/20
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Pay and Overtime	258.7	6.5	0.0	265.2	6.8	-0.2	271.8	7.0	0.0	278.9
Premises Related	21.2	0.5	0.0	21.7	0.5	0.0	22.3	0.6	0.0	22.8
Transport	7.6	0.2	0.0	7.8	0.2	0.0	8.0	0.2	0.0	8.2
Other non pay costs including IT, supplies etc.	28.6	0.7	0.0	29.3	0.7	0.0	30.0	0.8	0.0	30.8
Cost of the OPCC	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Commissioning and Victim Services	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2
Contribution to Local Council Tax Scheme	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
Savings Required	-8.7		-8.3	-17.0		-8.4	-25.4		-7.9	-33.3
Total Gross Spending on Police and Commissioning	313.3	7.9	-8.3	312.9	8.3	-8.6	312.6	8.5	-7.9	313.2
less:										
Specific Grant - Victims Funding	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1
Specific Grants - Counter Terrorism	12.2	0.0	0.0	12.2	0.0	0.0	12.2	0.0	0.0	12.2
Locally Generated Income	17.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	-0.4	0.0	16.6	-0.4	0.0	16.2
Contribution from Reserves - existing policies	0.4	0.4	-0.4	0.4	0.2	-0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
Contribution from Reserves - new policies	3.5	1.5	-3.5	1.5	0.5	-1.5	0.5	0.0	-0.5	0.0
Total Net Spending	278.1	6.0	-4.4	279.7	8.0	-6.7	281.0	8.9	-7.4	282.5
General Policy and Legacy Council Tax grants	186.2	-1.2	0.0	185.0	-1.2	0.0	183.9	-1.2	0.0	182.7
Estimated Council Tax Surplus	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	-0.4	0.0	0.9	-0.2	0.0	0.7
Council Tax Precept	90.6	2.8	0.0	93.4	2.8	0.0	96.2	2.9	0.0	99.1
Total Net Financing	278.1	1.6	0.0	279.7	1.3	0.0	281.0	1.5	0.0	282.5
Council Tax Base	595071			691260			607273			613345
Band D Precept	152.15			155.19			158.30			161.46
£ Increase in Precept	5.00			3.04			3.10			3.16
% Increase in Precept	3.4%			2.0%			2.0%			2.0%
% Growth in Tax Base	1.9%			1.0%			1.0%			1.0%

Planned use of Reserves over the Medium Term

	01/04/2015	01/04/2016	01/04/2017	01/04/2018	01/04/2019	01/04/2020
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Non Earmarked:						
General Fund	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
Earmarked:						
<i>Risk</i>						
Council Tax Benefit Support	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
Public Order provision	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Budget and Grant Volatility	7.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Insurance fund	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
<i>Change</i>						
Invest to save (CC and PCC)	1.9	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0
Redundancy etc.	6.0	6.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0
<i>Policy Opportunity and Investment</i>						
Policy Opportunities (PCC)	5.1	5.9	2.2	0.5	0.0	0.0
Capital Reserve (Inc. custody)	27.6	27.6	22.3	16.9	16.4	11.6
POCA	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2
Other	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
Total Earmarked	54.5	51.1	40.2	28.7	24.4	19.0
Grand Total	60.1	56.8	45.8	34.3	30.1	24.6
	100.0%	94.4%	76.2%	57.0%	50.0%	41.0%

Summary of Capital Programme to 2019/20 - New Approvals

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
IT Related					
Athena	0.8				0.8
Emergency Service Network - local costs	1.9	4.1	1.5	0.3	7.8
Website	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Infrastructure Modernisation	1.3	1.7	0.7	0.8	4.5
Mobile Tablets and Related	3.5	1.7	1.2	2.2	8.6
SAP and Business Objects development	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.8
Custody Systems	0.6				0.6
Specialist Business Systems	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	1.2
Estates					
Force HQ Renewal Works	0.1	0.1			0.2
Site Upgrades incl. air conditioning and DDA	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.4	2.1
Custody Works	0.2	0.5	1.7	1.5	3.9
Security Upgrades incl. CCTV on sites	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
Environmental Works	0.2	0.1		0.0	0.3
Structural Maintenance - emergency provision	0.0	0.1		0.0	0.1
Major Renewal Provisions	1.3	0.9	0.1		2.3
Total Vehicle Replacement Programme	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.5	5.8
Total ANPR related*	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.1	1.3
Total Other	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.5	3.2
Grand Total - New Approvals	15.4	13.0	8.4	7.6	44.4

* Automatic Number Plate Recognition

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Youth Engagement – progress report
Date: 2 February 2016

Background:

1. The Commissioner never underestimates the value and insight young people and those who work with young people can provide in ensuring communities remain safe, re-offending is reduced and trust and confidence in policing is maintained.
2. Following a workshop in April 2015 the Commissioner established a new forum called the Youth Advisory Group (YAG). By bringing young people and representatives from a range of established groups who work with young people together, the purpose of the YAG is to assist the Commissioner by:
 - actively engaging and consulting with young people;
 - gathering evidence from young people to inform policy development;
 - representing young people's concerns and priorities in the annual Police and Crime Plan refresh.
3. In addition, the YAG is also intended to serve as a conduit for other organisations to access young people and engage with them.

Progress:

4. YAG meetings are held every quarter, and attendees currently include young people and representatives from the following organisations:
 - Kent Youth County Council
 - Medway Youth Parliament
 - Pipeline Youth initiative
 - The Prince's Trust
 - The Young Lives Foundation
 - CXK
 - UPRISING Youth & Community, Ashford
 - The Independent Police Advisory Group (IPAG)
 - Medway Council
 - Youth Justice & Safer Young Kent, KCCHowever, the breadth and diversity of representation has, and continues to increase as the YAG develops.
5. The first YAG meeting took place in September 2015. In order to inform development of the long term victim services contract, the meeting focused on the services available to young victims and witnesses of crime in Kent. The group received a presentation on what support is available and how it's accessed, including the role of Compass House and the facilities it offers. As a result, there was discussion around a number of matters including crime reporting generally, the various stages in a victim's journey and awareness amongst young people of what support is actually available.
6. In terms of outcomes, the feedback was provided to the senior manager leading on the long term victim services contract to consider. In addition, the YAG endorsed a visit to Compass House to look at the physical environment/facilities to ensure they cater for the needs of young victims and witnesses of crime. Ideally, the visit needs to take place on a working day when Compass House is staffed, but due to school/college commitments this limits dates to school holidays. Despite best efforts, it was not possible to arrange a visit before Christmas and it will now take place either in the spring half term or Easter break.
7. Further to the first meeting, the YAG has a standing invitation to attend the Commissioner's Victims' Panel. Consisting of victims of crime and Victim Support Volunteers, this forum is used to gather views and opinions on the work being done to improve victim services in Kent. The panel was heavily involved in the development of Compass House and plays a pivotal on-going role in reviewing the services available.
8. The next YAG meeting is scheduled for the 26 January 2016. In light of the recent extremist attacks and atrocities across Europe, the South East Counter Terrorism Unit (SECTU) is presenting as part of a national consultation with young people regarding radicalisation and travel to areas of conflict. The meeting will be an opportunity for the SECTU to provide important information, but also obtain feedback on the Prevent strategy and how the police can help keep young people safe from the dangers of radicalisation.

9. As part of the annual Police and Crime Plan refresh consultation, members of the YAG were invited to submit their views, with particular reference to those actions that relate to young people. A number of responses were received, the general consensus being that the existing areas of focus were the right ones.
10. To support the work of the YAG, the Commissioner also ring fenced £15,000 to enable the funding of specific projects and/or engagement with vulnerable and 'hard to reach' young people. To date, none of this funding has been spent.
11. In its role as a conduit for other organisations to engage with young people, the Force have requested support from the YAG to inform the design of the new Kent Police website. In addition, a YAG representative now also sits on the Independent Police Advisory Group (IPAG) Stop and Search Scrutiny Panel. The purpose of the panel is to:
 - ensure police officers use stop and search powers lawfully;
 - improve trust and confidence in the way stop and searches are conducted; and
 - monitor and scrutinise the proportionality of stop and searches in Kent and Medway.The next meeting of the IPAG Stop and Search Scrutiny Panel is the 25 January 2016.
12. However, it should be noted that in addition to the YAG, the Commissioner continues to visit organisations, or attend meetings across the county in order to hear from young people first hand. Recent examples include:
 - The Prince's Trust on the 6 November 2015;
 - Kent Youth County Council on the 15 November 2015; and
 - Medway Youth Parliament on the 15 January 2016.

The Youth Diversion Fund:

13. The Commissioner firmly believes that once a young person is in the criminal justice system, it's very difficult for them to get out. Therefore, the Police and Crime Plan reflects a commitment to educate young people and divert them away from crime and anti-social behaviour.
14. Providing effective diversion activities for young people can reduce negative behaviour leading to fewer victims of crime and anti-social behaviour. It can also help divert young people from the criminal justice system and increase their understanding of the impact of risk taking behaviour.
15. The Youth Diversion Fund was launched to provide funding to community or voluntary organisations that support the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan in providing diversion activities for young people.
16. On behalf of the Commissioner, the fund is administered by the Safer Kent charity (formerly the Kent People's Trust) which reviews all applications to ensure they meet the following grant criteria:
 - divert young people from crime or anti-social behaviour; and/or
 - look to positively address potential risk-taking behaviours; and
 - look to engage with vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups; and
 - amount to a maximum contribution of £5,000 per annum, preferably with match-funding.
17. As in 2014, a number of groups received contributions towards their work with young people in 2015. Further detail can be found at <https://www.kent-pcc.gov.uk/youth-diversion-fund.html>.

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Commissioner's Key Decisions – November & December 2015
Item & Date: 2 February 2016

Decision: Appointment of Legally Qualified Chairs for Police Misconduct Hearings, and to enter into a collaborative appointment model with Hampshire, Kent, Thames Valley, Surrey and Sussex Police and Crime Commissioners.

Justification: As a result of amendments to the Police (Conduct) Regulations, Police and Crime Commissioners have a statutory responsibility for the nomination of Legally Qualified Chairs to sit on Police Misconduct Hearings from the 1 January 2016. A joint recruitment and appointment process within the collaborative model above ensured the most cost efficient and effective model of delivery for this statutory responsibility.

Decision: Public consultation on the Commissioners flexibility to raise the policing element of the council tax precept by £5.00.

Justification: The Chancellor announced the flexibility for the ten Police and Crime Commissioners whose precept was in the bottom quartile to raise the council tax precept by £5.00 (Band D property) rather than the 1.99% capped levy. As Kent is one of those areas identified, the Commissioner wished to canvass the views of the public to help inform her decision making in this regard.

Decision: To award Victim Support the contract for delivery of core victim services in Kent for three years with the option of extending annually for a further three years.

Justification: Through a competitive tendering process, Victim Support was successful in securing the contract to provide a quality and cost effective service to victims' of crime in Kent.

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Peter Sass: Head of Democratic Services
Mike Overbeke: Head of Public Protection

To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel – 2 February 2016

Subject: Panel Annual Report and review of Panel work since 2012

Introduction

1. The Panel has considered and agreed an Annual Report on its work each year since 2013. As the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner is now approaching the end of her term of office this report is in 2 parts. The first is the proposed Annual report for 2015 and the second is a review of the Panel's work since its establishment in November 2012.

PART 1 - 2015 Annual report

2. During the year the membership of the Panel was adjusted following Council elections to ensure appropriate representation of the political parties in Kent and Medway. The Panel currently comprises 12 Conservative, one UKIP and one Liberal Democrat Member; these are Leader nominations from each district council, Medway Council and KCC. The Panel also co-opts one additional Member from Medway Council in recognition of the size of Medway and then 3 additional Council Members to, as far as practicable, ensure political balance across Kent and Medway (one UKIP and two Labour Members). Gurvinder Sandher remained as one of the two required independent members and Elaine Bolton was appointed as an independent member in place of Dan MacDonald, who stood down following his election as a Medway councillor. Mike Hill was Chairman and Gurvinder Sandher Vice-Chair throughout the year.

Meetings

3. During the year the Panel met 6 times and the Complaints Sub-Panel met once. In addition to the formal meetings Panel members also met with the Commissioner and her staff for a briefing on the work of her Office. The Chairman and Vice-Chair 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 approved her recommended 2% precept increase.

5. The Panel met its statutory duty to consider the Commissioner's Annual Report and accounts for 2014/15. In noting the accounts the Panel congratulated the PCC and the Force on their work so far in managing the financial pressures successfully.
6. The Panel also held a confirmation hearing for the Commissioner's new Chief of Staff and approved her proposed appointment of Mr Harper.
7. The Panel received 2 reports during the year on the Commissioner's work to support victims and the establishment of a Victim Centre. The Chairman and Vice-Chair also visited the Centre, accompanied by the Commissioner. The Panel expressed its support for this work.
8. Following the Commissioner's decision to create a Youth Advisory Group after the end of the second Youth Commissioner's term, the Panel considered a report on youth engagement. The Panel supported the work and the decision to seek views from a wider group of young people, while noting that this should not be limited to the civic-minded but should also seek views from hard-to-reach groups.
9. Following the HMIC report into crime recording data accuracy in 2014 the Panel sought and received 2 reports on crime recording and crime performance. The Panel were pleased to note that recording accuracy is now at 96% and were also pleased to see that, once data at this level of accuracy was available for a full twelve month period, it showed reducing levels of crime. The Panel commended the Commissioner and the Chief Constable for their progress in this area.
10. During the year the Panel also received and noted reports on value for money, working with the business community and the work of the Commissioner's Ethics Committee. The Panel received a report on complaints against the Commissioner and were pleased to note that, as in the previous year, the number of complaints was very low and none had been upheld.
11. The Force received a critical HMIC report on its Custody suites and the Panel sought and received assurances from the Commissioner that the issues identified were being addressed and that she was holding the Chief Constable to account for achieving the necessary improvements.
12. In September 2014 the Panel Chairman was told of a possible misconduct matter involving the PCC and, in accordance with Regulations, arranged to refer the matter to the IPCC to investigate. The Panel received and considered an IPCC report of their investigation in October 2015. The Panel expressed its concern at the time taken to investigate and to produce the report and also concluded that the whole episode had caused damage to the PCC herself, to her Office and to the administration of justice.

Commissioner's decisions

13. The Commissioner met her responsibility to inform the Panel of decisions of significant public interest at each meeting. Towards the end of the year a format was adopted which enabled the Panel to understand more fully the reasons for those decisions. Generally, decisions 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.

PART 2 - 2012-1015

Panel's functions, duties and meetings

14. The Panel has both general and specific duties. Its general duties are to review or scrutinise decisions made by the Commissioner or actions taken by her (Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act s28(6)) and to exercise its powers with a view to supporting the effective exercise of the PCC's functions (PRSR Act s28(2)).
15. The Panel has specific duties to
 - Agree or otherwise the PCC's proposed precept
 - Consider and publish a report on the PCC's Police and Crime plan
 - Consider and report on the PCC's Annual Report
 - Agree or otherwise the proposed appointment of a Chief Constable, PCC's Chief Executive and PCC's Chief Finance Officer
16. The Panel was formally established in November 2012, coinciding with the election of the Police and Crime Commissioner. In 2012 the Panel met formally on one occasion but also met once, prior to November 2012, as a Shadow Panel in order to determine its method of operation. In 2013, 2014, and 2015 the Panel met on 6 occasions (plus 2 informal meetings in 2014).

Initial arrangements

17. In the early months of 2013 the Panel established its method of operating and worked with the Commissioner to establish sound working relationships. An initial procedure for advising the Panel of significant decisions was adopted in 2013 but, in 2014, this was found to be too onerous and was replaced by adoption of Local Government Association guidelines on notifying Panels of PCC decisions.
18. The Panel also established a work programme setting out draft agendas for meetings over the next twelve months. The purpose this programme was to give sufficient flexibility to enable current topics to be discussed, to give the PCC adequate warning of matters the Panel wished her to report on and also to ensure that, over her period of office, all aspects of the PCC's Police and Crime Plan were considered by the Panel.

19. Panel members were briefed at the outset on their role and the powers of the Panel. The Deputy Chief Constable also gave Panel members a briefing on the policing priorities at the time. As new members have joined the Panel a briefing on the role of the Panel has been offered by officers.

Review of the Commissioner's decisions and actions

20. The topics that were considered most frequently at Panel meetings (in addition to those which the Panel is required to consider each year) were:
- Youth Commissioner and youth engagement
 - Crime performance and crime recording
 - Victim support and Victim Centre
21. The Commissioner has a duty to publish decisions of significant public interest and the Panel asked that these be reported to the Panel at each meeting. The Commissioner decided to discharge her duty to hold the Chief Constable to account through a series of Governance Boards, held in public, and the Panel asked that the minutes of these meetings be added to Panel agendas for information. Panel members have also attended Governance Board meetings to observe her holding the Chief Constable to account at first hand.
22. Over the PCC's period of office the Panel has sought to be supportive of the PCC wherever possible. The Panel has been particularly supportive of the work undertaken by the PCC to remove a target-driven culture within the Force and of her and the Force's very positive response to the HMIC report that identified some inaccurate crime recording. The Panel was pleased to note that the current level of accuracy is very high and that crime levels are generally falling.
23. The Panel has also been supportive of the work by the Commissioner, following her acquisition of responsibility for victim support in 2014, to establish a Victim Centre in Kent.
24. With the exception of 2014, all precept proposals have been approved by the Panel, the Police and Crime Plan has been supported each year and the proposed appointments of a Chief Constable, 2 Chiefs of Staff and a Chief Finance Officer have all been supported.
25. Where necessary the Panel has been critical of the Commissioner and has asked her on occasion to reflect on the Panel's views. In 2014, the Panel did not agree to the PCC's proposal to increase the precept by 3.5%, if permitted without a referendum, although there was not a sufficient majority to veto the proposal. In the event the PCC raised the precept by 2%, the maximum permitted without a referendum.
26. When the Commissioner explained her decisions (in both 2013 and 2014) to recruit a Youth Commissioner the Panel's view was that a single appointment was not the best way to achieve the laudable goal of engaging more fully with young people and it made its views clear on several occasions. When, in 2015, the Commissioner

decided to establish a Youth Advisory Group the Panel expressed their support for this approach.

27. The Panel was also critical of some of the PCC's public relations work in the first part of her term of office and this culminated in some specific recommendations to her following her appearance in a Channel 4 documentary. The Panel is pleased to note that the PCC has taken note of the Panel's views.

Panel communications

28. The Panel adopted a Communications Protocol to ensure that public statements were made by the Chairman and that, where appropriate, there is liaison with the PCC and any statements she might wish to make. The Panel agreed that all its public meetings should be webcast so that the public can see it doing its work. In 2015 the Panel established its own webpage, where all its papers and minutes are available, to explain its work more fully and to provide a commentary on its meetings.

Conclusions

29. The Panel has settled into its role since its establishment in 2012 and has provided both support and challenge to the Police and Crime Commissioner. It has discharged all its specific responsibilities whenever required and has ensured that, over her period of office, it has discussed and reviewed all aspects of the Commissioner's work. The Panel has welcomed the Commissioner's willingness to meet informally with Panel members and to explain the work she and her staff are doing. Panel members have been encouraged by the Commissioner to observe her work at Governance Boards and on other public occasions. The Panel has always sought a constructive working relationship with the Commissioner and, particularly since the latter part of 2014, the relationship has been generally constructive.

Contact: Anna Taylor/Joel Cook

Tel: 03000 416478/416892

Mike Campbell

Tel: 03000 413346

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Peter Sass: Head of Democratic Services
Mike Overbeke: Head of Public Protection

To: Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel – 2 February 2016

Subject: Complaints against a Police and Crime Commissioner - Government proposed changes to the procedure

1. Introduction

1.1 The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct Regulations) 2012 set out the statutory arrangements for dealing with complaints against Police and Crime Commissioners. Police and Crime Panels bear the statutory responsibility for resolving complaints. The Government is proposing changes to the Regulations and associated guidance and is seeking the views of, amongst others, Police and Crime Panels. This report proposes a response to the consultation. The Government is considering 3 areas for change, each of which is described and commented on below.

2. Clarity on what constitutes a complaint and vexatious complaints

2.1 The Government have received representations that the current Regulations do not make clear whether decisions by a PCC on matters of policy can be challenged through the complaints procedure. The Government propose to make clear that policy matters cannot be the subject of complaint as, in the Government's view, such matters are for the electorate to pass judgment on at an election.

2.2 Some Panels have told the Government that they are spending a disproportionate amount of time on dealing with vexatious complaints and the Government proposes to extend to Panels its recent changes to the rules governing vexatious complaints being handled by Forces.

2.3 In Kent, officers, in making decisions about the admissibility of a complaint, have taken a view that a complaint must relate to actions, omissions or decisions by the PCC personally. General criticisms of the PCC or critical comments about policy matters have not been considered as complaints. It is recommended that the Panel support any changes to Regulations to make this point totally clear.

2.4 In Kent there has not been a particular problem with vexatious complaints as the PCC's Monitoring Officer, with the support of the Panel, has taken the view that there are already provisions within the Regulations to enable them to be disapplied to a vexatious complaint. It is recommended that the Panel note the Government's proposal but point out that there are already adequate provisions that appear to work well.

3. Powers to investigate

- 3.1 At present Panels are expressly prevented from “investigating” a complaint. Some Panels have told the Government they have found that this makes it difficult for them to come to a resolution on complex matters so the Government proposes to amend the Regulations to permit investigations. It also asks for views on whether the PCC’s Monitoring Officer should be empowered to undertake investigations or whether the Monitoring Officer of one of the local authorities in the area covered by the Panel would be a more suitable person to undertake this role.
- 3.2 To date the complaints made against the Kent PCC have been relatively straightforward and the Sub-Panel has been able to reach a conclusion based on the complainant’s evidence, the PCC’s written response and the advice of the officers. However, if there was a more complex complaint the Panel should have the power to arrange for an investigation, although this should be proportionate to the matter being investigated. While it is reasonable (and consistent with Home Office guidance) for the PCC’s Monitoring Officer to undertake the initial role of deciding whether or not the Regulations should be applied to a complaint, it is recommended that the Panel take the view that it does not consider it would be appropriate for him/her to investigate or to commission an investigation. There could be a public perception of a lack of impartiality and the PCC’s Monitoring Officer would be in a very difficult position in investigating his/her PCC while still reporting to him/her. It is recommended that the Panel endorse the proposal that an investigator appointed by the Monitoring Officer in one of the local authorities in the area covered by the Panel would provide the necessary degree of independence.

4. Informal Resolution

- 4.1 Panels only have the power to undertake “informal resolution” of any complaint. The Government say that some Panels have interpreted this to mean that any resolution has to be agreed by both the PCC and the complainant, although the Regulations do not expressly prevent a Panel from making a recommendation. The Government propose to issue guidance to make clear that an agreed outcome is not essential and that Panels can recommend a resolution which they think appropriate, regardless of whether the PCC agrees with it.
- 4.2 It is recommended that the Panel support the idea that, wherever possible, a complaint should be resolved informally in a way that is satisfactory to both the complainant and the PCC. However, when agreed resolution is not possible, it is recommended that the Panel support the existence of clear guidance that a Panel may recommend an outcome and a power to require the PCC to give a written response to the Panel and the complainant if he/she is not prepared to implement the recommendation.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Panel approve the comments in this report as its response to the Government’s consultation on the procedure for complaints against Police and Crime Commissioners.

Contact: Anna Taylor/Joel Cook
Mike Campbell

Tel: 03000 416478 / 416892

Tel: 03000 413346

This page is intentionally left blank



Home Office

Complaints about Police and Crime Commissioners

Public Consultation

December 2015

Complaints about Police and Crime Commissioners

Public Consultation

December 2015



© Crown copyright 2015

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Contents

Scope of the consultation	2
Basic information	2
Responses: Confidentiality & Disclaimer	3
Introduction	4
Scrutiny of PCCs	4
The Government's proposed changes for PCC complaints	6
Clarity on what constitutes a complaint	6
Powers to Investigate	7
Informal Resolution	7
Consultation questions	9
Complaint definition and guidance	9
Complaint investigation	9
Informal resolution guidance	11

Scope of the consultation

Topic of the Consultation: This consultation seeks views on proposed changes to the complaints about the conduct of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs).

Scope of the consultation: This consultation focuses on the complaints process for Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) when seeking to resolve non-serious (i.e. non-criminal) complaints made against a PCC. Legislative changes would be required to implement some of the proposals identified below.

Geographical scope: England and Wales.

Financial assessment: Attached at Annex A.

Basic information

To: This consultation is open to the public.

Duration: This consultation closes on 10 March 2016.

Enquiries: PCCComplaintsConsultation@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

How to Respond: Information on how to respond to this consultation can be found on www.gov.uk/home-office

Responses can be submitted online through www.gov.uk or by post by sending responses to:

Police and Crime Commissioner Complaints consultation
Home Office
Police Strategy and Reform Unit
6th Floor Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Additional ways to become involved: Please contact the Home Office (as above) if you require information in any other format, such as Braille, large font or audio.

After the consultation: Responses will be analysed and a 'response to consultation' document will be published.

Responses: Confidentiality & Disclaimer

The information you send us may be passed to colleagues within the Home Office, other Government departments and related agencies for use in connection with this consultation.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with applicable access to information frameworks (primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want certain information you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this you should explain to us why you regard any information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take due account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality will be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

The department will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and, in the majority of circumstances; this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Introduction

The Government's response to the consultation on Improving Police Integrity¹ identifies the need to expand PCCs role within the Police complaints system. The Government acknowledges that PCCs, as directly elected individuals, are best placed to respond to the needs of their electorate about the changes they should make to the complaints system. The Government intends to bring forward legislation to enable PCCs to take on responsibility for key parts of the complaints system.

In tandem with the reform to police complaints the Government proposes making changes to the system for complaints made against a PCC, creating a more transparent and easily understood complaints system. These changes would relate to non-serious complaints (i.e. non-criminal), serious complaints (those which relate to, or may relate to, criminal matters) will continue to be considered by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), with no changes in that area. The proposed changes will require amendments to the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (PRSR Act 2011), and the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012.

Scrutiny of PCCs

Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) perform a scrutiny function for PCCs, providing both support and challenge to PCCs on the exercise of their functions, and acting as a critical friend. As set out in the PRSR Act 2011, and further explained in the Policing Protocol Order 2011, the role of the Panel is to provide checks and balances in relation to the performance of the PCC.²

PCPs are currently responsible for handling non-serious complaints made about a PCC, and resolving these through the process for "informal resolution", as set out in the PRSR Act 2011 and the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012.³

The Government is committed to reforming the police complaints system, making that process more transparent and easier to navigate. The PCC role is also continuing to develop – within the criminal justice system, PCCs have already taken on responsibility for the commissioning of local victims' services, and across the country are working with local partners to bring drive and focus to the delivery of shared agendas to meet local needs and priorities. The Government is committed to building on the success of the PCC model by further strengthening their role; for example, the government is proposing to enable PCCs to take on the governance of fire and rescue services as part of driving greater collaboration between emergency services.⁴ With PCCs taking on a greater role in the

¹ Improving Police Integrity Consultation - reforming the police complaints and disciplinary systems: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/411970/improving_police_integrity_reforming_the_police_complaints_and_disciplinary_systems.pdf

² The Policing Protocol: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/117474/policing-protocol-order.pdf

³ Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012, section 28 of Part 4: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/62/pdfs/ukxi_20120062_en.pdf

⁴ Consultation on emergency services collaboration: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/enabling-closer-working-between-the-emergency-services>

handling of complaints made against their police force, and with the responsibilities held by a PCC increasing, the time is right to amend the system for complaints made against a PCC. The Government proposes changes in three broad areas:

1. Clarifying, through non-statutory guidance, what constitutes a complaint, ensuring PCPs take forward complaints about a PCC's conduct rather than their policy decisions.
2. Providing PCPs with greater investigatory powers to seek evidence pertinent to a complaint.
3. Clarifying, through non-statutory guidance, the parameters of "informal resolution" and setting out that, where agreement cannot be reached, it is open to PCPs to make recommendations on the expected level of behaviour of a PCC, and that they have powers to require the PCC to respond.

The Government's proposed changes for PCC complaints

The proposed changes to the complaints system ensure the fundamental principle of the PCC policy that of accountability to the electorate is not undermined. The proposals will improve the transparency of the complaints procedure and deliver more satisfactory outcomes for complainants.

Clarity on what constitutes a complaint

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 and the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 define that a complaint to be handled by the PCP should relate to the conduct of the PCC. There is some scope for interpretation of this whereby the complaint could be made regarding the conduct of a PCC in making a policy decision. This creates difficulties in determining whether a complaint should or should not be taken forward and regularly results in complaints relating to policy decisions being taken forward.

The Government intends to provide PCPs with further guidance on what constitutes a complaint. This will supplement the regulations and set a clear marker for what should and should not be classed as a complaint. This will ensure complaints about conduct rather than policy decisions are taken forward. The Government believes, as the PCC is a directly elected public office holder, the guidance for conduct should be framed around the Nolan principles.⁵ The seven Nolan principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership set the ethical standards expected of public office holders and will robustly tie the procedures of informal resolution as mentioned in the regulations to matters of conduct rather than policy.

The Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 also refer to a PCP's handling of vexatious complaints. Those working on complaints have indicated that a disproportionate amount of time can be spent in managing vexatious complaints which will in part be minimised in defining what is meant by a complaint. In the Government's response to its 'Improving Police Integrity' consultation, there was a commitment to look into reforms that would make it easier for forces to handle persistent and vexatious complainants. **We propose to consider whether any measures to make it easier for forces and PCCs to handle vexatious complaints should be extended to PCPs, so as to give PCPs greater flexibility to manage these complaints and to ensure a consistent policy across complaints systems.**

⁵ Nolan Principles - The 7 Principles of Public Life:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2>

Powers to Investigate

Through the Police Reform and Social Responsibility (PRSR) Act 2011, PCPs are explicitly prohibited from “investigating” complaints. Due to this PCPs may lack the opportunity to gather evidence and facts pertinent to a complaint and provide a satisfactory outcome for the complainant and PCC. In contrast greater investigatory actions may be limited due to the lack of time and resources available to a PCP. **The Government proposes to amend the PRSR Act 2011 to remove the restriction on the PCPs’ ability to investigate.** This will provide PCPs greater flexibility to establish evidence and provide a satisfactory outcome for both the complainant and PCC.

If PCPs intend to use investigatory powers, **the Government proposes to amend the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 to allow for investigation through the appointment (by the PCP) of an independent individual to gather evidence relating to the specific complaint, and the conduct of the PCC, and present a recommendation report to the PCP.**

The Government believes that the majority of complaints should continue to be resolved without independent investigation, but recognises that in some cases this may restrict the PCP to an undesirable extent. It is important to separate the investigatory aspects of complaint handling from the PCP, to ensure that any political differences between the Panel and the PCC are not used as a basis for complaint investigation. The Government recognises the need to restrict the investigations to the terms of the individual complaint to ensure evidence gathering is proportionate and necessary. The guidance, referred to above, should ensure that only complaints regarding the conduct of a PCC could reach the stage of independent investigation. The regulations would include duties for PCPs to ensure proportionality and necessity of evidence gathering.

The Government believes that a monitoring officer would be best placed to perform the role of the independent investigator to establish evidence for a complaint. Under regulation 7 of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012, a PCP may delegate any of its functions (other than arrangements set out in Part 4 of those Regulations; informal resolution and those where it is appropriate to apply the requirements of the regulations) to the chief executive of the PCC. Expanding this role would seem the most natural step, and would fit with the Chief Executive’s monitoring officer responsibilities for ensuring the PCC meets legislative requirements. Having said this, the Government recognises that different opinions exist in this area, with some parties indicating that such a responsibility could place the chief executive in an unenviable position as they would, in effect, be investigating their employer. We therefore propose that it would also be open to the PCP to appoint a monitoring officer from one of the local authorities within the police force area to act as an independent investigator. The costs associated with any investigation would be born, either by the Office of the PCC (in the event of the PCC’s chief executive being appointed), or the PCP if they chose to appoint a monitoring officer from a local authority.

Informal Resolution

Through Schedule 7, paragraph 3(2) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 a PCP is restricted to informal resolution of any non-serious complaint made against a PCC. Paragraph 3(5) of Schedule 7 defines informal resolution as “encouraging, facilitating, or otherwise assisting in, the resolution of the complaint otherwise than by legal proceedings...”

The Government understands that some aspects of the informal resolution procedure, when considering the PRSR Act 2011 alongside the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012, have been misinterpreted, and that on some occasions PCPs have felt that the regulations have restricted them from resolving complaints as they would have wished. In particular some PCPs have expressed the belief that their options were restricted if the PCC and the complainant could not agree on a method of informal resolution.

The Government proposes introducing non-statutory guidance clarifying that informal resolution is not reliant on the agreement of both parties, though this should remain the preferred outcome. Where a PCP is unable to reach an informal resolution which is agreeable to both parties it remains open to PCPs to use their powers as set out in sections 28(6) and 29(3) of the PRSR Act 2011, which set out that PCPs have a free standing power to make recommendations and may require a PCC to respond in writing to any recommendations made by them. The guidance will make clear that in relation to complaints any recommendations should be based on the conduct of the PCC and aimed at preventing future complaints from arising, there is an obvious link here to the definition of what constitutes a complaint. Recommendations on conduct should be based on the Nolan principles.

The Government believes that the ability to make recommendations, rather than impose sanctions, is an appropriate power for PCPs as, ultimately, the accountability of the PCC lies with the public, and not with the PCP.

Consultation questions

Complaint definition and guidance

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the seven Nolan principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership should frame the concept of conduct of a PCC:
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Government should extend **measures being developed to make it easier for forces and PCCs to handle vexatious complaints to PCPs**:
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree

Complaint investigation

3. Question for PCPs only:

How many complaints about a PCC did you receive in the financial year 2014-15?

- 0 – 10
- 11 – 20
- 21 – 50
- 50 - 100
- 100 +

4. Question for PCPs only:

Of those complaints, how many have you considered where you would have benefited from the ability to investigate the complaint?

5. Question for PCPs and PCC Chief Executives only:

How much investigation, in terms of hours worked, would you expect it to take to investigate a complaint?

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that PCPs should be given greater investigatory powers to investigate a complaint (either directly or through the appointment of an independent investigator)?
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that PCPs should be given the power to investigate complaints themselves, rather than appoint someone to do it:
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
8. Please explain your answer to question 7.
9. What do you think the benefits are of PCPs investigating complaints themselves, rather than appointing someone else to do it?
10. What do you think the disadvantages are of PCPs investigating complaints themselves, rather than appointing someone to do it?
11. To what extent do you agree or disagree that PCPs should be able to appoint an independent investigator?
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
12. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the choice of monitoring officer (either from a local authority, or from the Office of the PCC) should fall to the Panel?
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
13. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the monitoring officer for the investigation of a complaint should be appointed from the Local Authority?
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree

14. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the monitoring officer for the investigation of a complaint should be the chief executive of the PCCs office?
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
15. Do you feel that the role of independent investigator should be fulfilled by someone other than the PCC's monitoring officer, or a monitoring officer from a local authority within the police force area? If so please indicate who you think should perform this role:

Informal resolution guidance

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree that PCPs' existing powers to make recommendations on the expected level of behaviour of a PCC are sufficient?
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
17. To what extent do you agree that, when making recommendations as part of the informal resolution of a complaint, PCPs should tie these recommendations to the expected level of conduct based on the seven Nolan Principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership?
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree

This page is intentionally left blank

Police and Crime Panel Forward work programme (as at 2nd February)

12th April 2016 (agenda content and appropriateness of meeting to be reviewed once PCC candidates are known)

Review of PCC term of office	Requested by Chairman Nov 2015
------------------------------	--------------------------------

14th June 2016 (to be reviewed after PCC election)

Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman	Annual requirement
Complaints against the PCC and policy review	Report by Panel officers
PCC's Annual report 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Agree procedure for selecting Independent Members by Nov. 2016	Statutory requirement
Hate Crime	Requested by Panel Nov 2015

8th September 2016

Accounts 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Review of Panel Communications Protocol	Review agreed by Panel (report by Panel officers)
Impact of PCC's work with the business community (update)	Requested by Panel Sept 2015

15th November 2016

Budget planning for 2017/18	Requested by Panel
-----------------------------	--------------------

February 2017

Draft Police and Crime plan 2017/18	Statutory requirement
Budget and precept proposal 2017/18	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

On a date to be determined

Update on rural crime (offered by PCC Sept 2015)

Update on cyber-crime (offered by PCC Sept 2015)

Meeting Notes

Kent Police and Crime Commissioner's Governance Board – 11 November 2015

Venue: Clift Room, Kent Police Headquarters, Sutton Road, Maidstone, 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 and Action Updates – 11 August 2015

The Meeting Notes from the Governance Board on 11 August were noted as a true and accurate record and the following action updates provided:

- A report to be provided to the Commissioner at a Governance Board in early 2016 on the contribution of SCD in tackling OCGs.
 - Discharged - report added to forward agenda for consideration at a future meeting.
- The Commissioner requested a report outside of the meeting on the effectiveness of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) for the 234 offenders currently on the scheme.
 - Discharged – the requested report had been received.
 - The Commissioner stated that she may request a further update at a future meeting.
- The Commissioner requested the Chief Constable to update her on the proportion of the 35 individuals Stop and Searched in Thanet and whether they were residents of Kent.
 - Discharged – the requested update had been received.

PART A – Specifically requested items:

Item 3. Engaging with Communities

How does Kent Police engage with the public?

- The Chief Constable shared his recent experience of visiting Folkestone and patrolling with local officers, seeing first-hand the excellent level of community engagement.
- Mobile Police Stations are now visiting high-crime areas such as those identified through PredPol. The Chief Constable said the Folkestone Mobile Police Station regularly visited areas with high levels of shoplifting.
- During the 20 minute period the Chief Constable observed the Mobile Police Station, there were 36 engagements with the public, resulting in intelligence reports and provision of crime prevention advice.
- The Chief Constable was mindful that from a public perspective the Mobile Police Stations should reassure and extend engagement, rather than being seen as a response to a particular threat.
- In addition to officers holding public surgeries, they also attend Parish Council meetings and other local community events. These are advertised through various means, including social media, the Kent Police website and leaflets distributed in high footfall areas.

- This year, almost 10,000 members of the public attended the Kent Police Open Day, providing a free and interactive event for the community to engage with officers and staff.
- The Commissioner asked if PACT meetings were still held. The Chief Constable said the Local District Policing Teams and Community Safety Units focus on understanding local problems and working with partners to address them. PACT meetings have been superseded by the new model of policing in Kent.
- In relation to a question about the 'hyper local' pilot in Ashford, the Chief Constable said this was developed before the model was changed. Whilst the Force had learnt from it, the new model of policing had provided more opportunities for local officers to engage with their communities.

Online engagement

- The Chief Constable said online meetings regularly receive 60 to 70 questions from the public, with many more 'logging' on to view the meeting live or viewing offline after the event.
- Kent Police has 73,000 Twitter followers and 50,000 likes on Facebook. Both proved to be an invaluable tool for providing information to the public when Op Stack was in place over the summer period.
- Engagement through the Kent Police website is not as good as it could be. The new website will address this, not only reducing demand on the Force Control Room (FCR), but allowing the public to access more services and information online. In light of anticipated future savings, reducing demand is a priority for the Force - around 700,000 calls to the Force last year did not require the deployment of an officer.

Community engagement

- The Chief Constable provided an update on Operation Action which involved 45 Special Constables visiting victims whose details were on a 'scammers list'. A third of victims spoken to were unaware they had been the victim of a crime. All victims were provided with advice and guidance, including how to protect themselves against online fraud. This service was extended to vulnerable victims who had moved to other areas of the country, including Devon and Cornwall.
- The Chief Constable provided a further example where PCSOs had gleaned intelligence by speaking to their local communities and via completion of a questionnaire. The results showed concerns about the level of gang activity and violence. As a result, a number of warrants were issued, and a property was closed down. A follow-up questionnaire showed residents felt their community had been 'reclaimed'.
- Kent Police continues to work with partners and the wider policing family, including Trading Standards and KCC Wardens to increase and develop levels of community engagement.

Rural engagement

- The Commissioner asked the Chief Constable about rural communities and what they were telling the Force.
- The Chief Constable said that previously many rural communities didn't bother reporting crime as they felt the police wouldn't be interested. However, through the work of the Rural Crime Task Force, this has changed and rural communities are now much more engaged with the Force and willing to report crime.
- Rural communities now believe that the Force will do something about the crimes they report. For example, through excellent partnership working, an offender was recently convicted and sentenced for fly-tipping.

Engagement with young people

- The Force works closely with the Commissioner's Youth Advisory Group and is focused on ensuring those involved in crime from a young age have the appropriate support to divert them from a future in the criminal justice system.
- The Force continues to work with the County Independent Police Advisory Group (IPAG), and at a local level district IPAG's to engage with harder to reach groups within communities.

Sgt Johnson (Shepway Community Safety Unit) was invited to talk about engagement in Folkestone

- He described how local community engagement is conducted through face-to-face interaction, as well as social media and the Kent Police website. He said officers engage with local stakeholders, community groups and elected members to gain intelligence, provide advice and promote key policing messages.
- The meeting was provided with an example of how local officers had overcome difficulties engaging with farmers. Sgt Johnson explained that an email system has been set-up to provide information, but this simple solution enables busy farmers to retrieve information at a time most convenient to them.
- The meeting was told about the Dover Community Hub which is working to gain the trust and confidence of the local Roma community, breaking down cultural barriers so they feel more comfortable engaging with the police. In addition, he said police leaflets are translated into native languages to increase access and availability of information.
- Sgt Johnson also described how officers work with the local Ghurkha community and Muslim community to build relationships and develop an understanding of different cultures and faiths.
- The Commissioner thanked Sgt Johnson for attending the meeting and for his very helpful input. The Commissioner also stated that she would like to visit Shepway Community Safety Unit in the future.
- **Actions**
 - **The OPCC to arrange for the Commissioner to visit Shepway Community Safety Unit.**

Item 4. Developments in IT

- The Chief Constable reiterated that everyone in the Force is extremely busy and so it is imperative to ensure the Force's IT is up to standard. This will not only maximise the productivity of officers and staff, but also ensure the service provided to victims and witnesses is first class.

Athena

- The Force decision to transfer information from Genesis onto the new Athena system was supported by the Commissioner who recognised the importance of having historical information available to officers and staff within one integrated system. It was also acknowledged that whilst this has delayed implementation, a decision not to do undertake this work would have posed a significant operational risk.
- The delay in implementation is not a huge concern, the current Genesis system works well, meets Force needs and is actually better than some systems used by other forces.
- As other forces go-live with Athena, the implementation process develops enabling Kent Police to learn lessons and distil best practice.

Mobile policing

- The Force is piloting 100 handheld devices, a mix of tablets and phones. To date, they have been well received by those officers and staff testing them, with positive feedback. Currently, they only offer limited functionality, but with every week, more is being added making them increasingly versatile.
- In the future, Athena Mobile will provide significant functionality as it will reduce bureaucracy and enable frontline officers and staff to stay on the streets.
- Security of the devices and the information held on them is a fundamental part of current IT developments. All information needs to be encrypted to a high national standard and the Force must be able to remotely control the devices should they be lost or stolen.

Force website

- The redesign of the Kent Police website is intended to reduce FCR demand by allowing the public to access more policing services and information online.

- It is anticipated that the contract for the new website will be awarded at the end of November 2015.

Emergency Services Airwave

- Airwave, the primary voice communication system used by the police and other emergency services is to be upgraded. As well as improving the technical infrastructure, the upgrade will facilitate both voice and data communications between emergency services. Whilst expensive, the upgrade is a national requirement.
- The Chief Constable said that as Kent Police and Essex Police have a shared IT directorate, this is a joint project. The Force is confident that it will be delivered on time.

Body Worn Cameras

- Whilst there had been some adverse publicity around the cost of the cameras, both the Chief Constable and the Commissioner stated they were satisfied that the procurement process had been thorough and rigorous.
- Decision as to which camera to buy was based on specifications unique to operational policing, including:
 - Encrypted hard drive
 - Software that can be verified for evidential value
 - GPS capability
 - Waterproof
 - Weatherproof
 - Ability to upload files
 - Fully automated search function
- The Body Worn Camera pilot saw 400 cameras out on the frontline, and this resulted in moderated offender behaviour, reduction in vexatious complaints and increase in first time guilty pleas.
- Further 1600 cameras purchased and have arrived, but following testing found some unexpected problems. The supplier has now resolved almost all the issues and re-testing taking place. No money has been paid to the supplier as yet.
- Hampshire is piloting the use of Body Worn Cameras to record victim and witness statements for evidential purposes. However, more work is required to ensure compatibility with processes throughout the Criminal Justice system.

Virtual Courts and Live Link

- These are having a very positive impact on the service victims receive. An example was given where a crime victim had been too frightened to leave their home to give evidence. However, through the use of an iPad, the victim was able to appear in court and give evidence from the safety of their own home. The Commissioner said the fact that the judge had accepted evidence in this way was a huge step forward for vulnerable victims.
- With its own Live Link suites, the Commissioner and Chief Constable agreed that Compass House continues to fulfil its intended purpose, supporting and signposting victims of crime across the county. The Commissioner said she was aware of two young victims of sexual assault having recently given evidence via video from Compass House.

Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras

- The Chief Constable explained that ANPR cameras are a well tried and tested enforcement and investigative tool, and as such an important IT development. The equipment is expensive and so it's paramount the Force makes best use of mobile and fixed ANPR cameras.
- The Commissioner asked how ANPR camera locations are selected. The Chief Constable said they are selected through the ANPR Strategy Board, each one being assessed based on necessity and proportionality.

Item 5. Child Sexual Exploitation – A Partnership Approach

- The Commissioner said when a victim of CSE comes into contact with police, it's too late for intervention and the police and/or partners have failed. This was reinforced by the Chief Constable who stated early CSE intervention is a national priority and must incorporate work with schools and youth projects.
- Funding from the Commissioner of £200,000 as well as £400,000 from the Force in each of the next three years (£600,000 per year), has enabled the creation of a joint CSE team. This is funding 9 police officers and 6 police staff, many of whom are already in post. The Chief Constable also confirmed that the injection of funds from the Commissioner's Office had assisted with the pace of creating the team.
- It was recognised that the team is in its infancy, with some staff still going through the recruitment phase. The importance of partners being committed to the team and providing resources was acknowledged and the Commissioner asked where Health were with their support arrangements.
- The Chief Constable said there is significant commitment from Health and expressed confidence that partners are willing to put resources into the team, though some are not there yet. He said along with CSE Champions, further online training has been delivered to officers and staff, with 4600 staff having completed Stage 1 training and 3500 having completed Stage 2.
- **Actions**
 - **The Commissioner requested an offline update on Health's contribution to the CSE partnership strategy.**
 - **Under Part B of the agenda, add 'CSE Team progress' as a standing item.**

Item 6. Crime Recording & Crime Reduction in Kent

- The Chief Constable confirmed there had been a real reduction in crime across Kent, resulting in fewer victims. However, he also acknowledged there were some areas of improvement including reducing threat risk and harm, specifically around the high volume of missing persons and improvements in case file quality.
- HMIC have announced that they will be conducting a new round of crime recording accuracy inspections. The Chief Constable stated he was happy with this, as a recent internal inspection found the Force continues to have an excellent accuracy rate of 96-97%. The Commissioner said the level of accuracy should act as a 'limiting judgement' within HMIC's inspection programme.
- The Chief Constable explained the accuracy rate in other forces remains unclear making performance comparison impossible. In addition, if data accuracy is low, not only are victims being failed, but it is difficult for forces to plan their resources effectively.
- The Crime Survey of England and Wales had been released, and this had shown a national increase in crime of 5%. This was not the case in Kent.

PART B – Standing / routine update items:

Item 7. Financial Monitoring & Planning for the future

- Despite the financial uncertainty, the Chief Constable said he was focussing on the future of Kent Police to ensure the emphasis is on providing a first class service to the people of Kent.
- The revenue forecast for the financial year shows a predicted £2.7m underspend. The majority of this relates to officer and staff pay. If a vacancy arises, the Chief Constable explained that the Force would rather leave it unfilled than recruit someone and potentially have to make them redundant in the future.

- The Force won't know the funding it will receive from the Home Office until mid-December 2015.
- Kent Police are working to ensure buildings are up to standard and the vehicle fleet is appropriate and proportionate. In addition, key developments within IT will facilitate demand reduction and support frontline officers and staff. The Force is building a legacy for the future that is right, not one that's rushed.
- The Force is also exploring collaborative opportunities beyond Essex, including extending to other forces in the Eastern region. It was recognised that with regards to performance management, the Force was months ahead of most other forces and so to collaborate at this time would be to step back into 'reds and greens' and away from quality of service.
- The Chief Constable stated his priority remains informing those running teams, such as sergeants, and PSE equivalents of any changes, so they are aware of how their teams will be affected.
- The Force has not had to use Regulation A19 to achieve the necessary attrition rate for officers. It also recognises the effect of job losses on police staff, not only in terms of employment, but in terms of families, mortgages and life outside the Force. The Chief Constable stated the decision to make redundancies would not be taken lightly.
- The Force has a plan to deliver savings of around 25%; however anything over this and up to 40% and the plan will require significant revision.
- The Chief Constable reinforced the importance of ensuring officers and staff on the frontline are aware of what is happening, and that they should not be the last to find out what's going on.
- The Commissioner expressed her concern over other forces making a huge number of redundancies and stated that her heart sunk thinking of the effect this will have on morale.

Item 8. HMIC & Related Report(s) since last meeting

- This item was taken as an update and noted by the Commissioner.

Item 9. Update on Significant Operational Matters

Exercise Fort Invicta

- Exercise Fort Invicta was a joint agency counter-terrorism exercise which was designed to replicate a terrorist attack in Ramsgate Port. Based on early feedback, the exercise was a success, but more detailed information won't be known until December when the formal debrief takes place.

Engagement with the Home Office

- The Home Office was impressed with Kent Police's future preparation and planning, along with the Force's operational delivery.

West Kent Organised Crime Group (OCG)

- An operation in West Kent had resulted in an OCG being dismantled. To date, those offenders who have gone through the court process have received a combined sentence of 141 years and 10 months imprisonment, and there are more to follow.