

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 1 July 2026.

PRESENT: Mr R G Streatfeild, MBE (Chair), Mr A Brady (Vice-Chair), Mr J Eustace, Mr J Finch (Substitute for Mr J Defriend), Mr A J Hook, Mr M A J Hood, Mrs M Lawes (Substitute for Dr G Sturley), Mr T Mallon, Mr T Mole, Mr H Rayner (Substitute for Mrs S Hudson), Mr T L Shonk, Mr P Thomas and Mr D Truder

ALSO PRESENT: Mr R Palmer

IN ATTENDANCE: Ch Isp O Changizi (Kent Police), Mr S Fowler (Road Safety Intelligence Team Leader), Ms J Hanna (Domestic Abuse Projects and Partnerships Manager), Ms J Harman (Prevent and Channel Manager), Ms C Harris (Kent Fire and Rescue Service), Hartwell (Serious Organised Crime Manager), Supt R Marsh (Kent Police - Head of the Force Strategic Prevention Command), Ms J Mookherjee (Consultant in Public Health), Mr S Perez (Kent Fire and Rescue Service), Mr S Peerbux (Head of Community Safety), Mr M Rolfe (Head of Community Protection), Insp J Ross (Community Safety Inspector, Strategic Prevention Command (Kent Police)) and Mrs A Taylor (Assistant Democratic Services Manager (Scrutiny))

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

55. Apologies and Substitutes (Item A1)

Apologies were received by Mrs Hudson for whom Mr Rayner was substituting, Dr Sturley for whom Mrs Lawes was substituting and Mr Defriend for whom Mr Finch was substituting.

56. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting (Item A2)

1. Mr Hook declared that was a barrister and often worked with the Crown Prosecution Service and the Metropolitan Police. He also declared that his wife was a probation officer.
2. Mr Mallon declared that he was the Chairman of the Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority (KMFRA).
3. It was acknowledged that many Members of the Committee were also Members of the KMFRA.
4. Mr Rayner declared that he was married to a woman and had two adult daughters.

57. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2026

(Item A3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2026 were a correct record and they be signed by the Chair.

58. Kent Community Safety Agreement

(Item B1)

1. The item was introduced by Richard Palmer, Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services, who explained that refreshed Kent Community Safety Agreement was a statutory county- wide partnership document required under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. He explained that the April 2026 refresh replaced the previous 8 priorities with 3 strategic aims to guide community safety work in Kent.
2. The report was introduced by Shafick Peerbux, Head of Community Safety, and Superintendent Rob Marsh, Kent Police Head of the Force Strategic Prevention Command, who jointly delivered a PowerPoint presentation, the slides for which can be found [HERE](#).
3. The Chair praised the report for addressing the Committee's previous requests and providing a clear and detailed overview of community safety across Kent. He also requested it be circulated to all Members as a valuable source of information on the work of Kent Police and partner agencies. Finally, the Chairman reminded Members to focus on the strategic aspects of the Community Safety Agreement and advised that the discussion would be structured around each of the priorities set out in the report.
4. The Chair welcomed questions from the Committee on Priority 1: Neighbourhood /Environmental Crime and Anti- social Behaviour. Discussion included the following:
 - a) Supt Marsh explained that while Kent Police could not monitor all social media platforms, intelligence received from communities and other sources helped identify planned gatherings. He highlighted proactive policing measures, including dispersal orders and enforcement powers, and emphasised that neighbourhood policing teams worked closely with local businesses and communities to minimise the impact of antisocial incidents in coastal areas.
 - b) Supt Marsh explained that Kent Police had undertaken a range of pre-planning meetings ahead of the summer period with key partners. He advised that policing plans focused on working with those organisations best placed to help prevent and respond to anticipated issues, although he could not comment on the extent of local councillor involvement in those arrangements.
 - c) Supt Marsh advised that partners had planned jointly for the summer period in Thanet, with resources allocated based on previous demand patterns. He emphasised that anti-social behaviour (ASB) was taken seriously and confirmed that proactive measures and robust enforcement powers, including dispersal and arrest where necessary, would be used to address issues.

- d) Supt Marsh outlined the graduated approach taken to tackling ASB, beginning with community protection warnings and escalating to formal notices and, where appropriate, Criminal Behaviour Orders. He reassured Members that the full range of available powers was used where necessary to address persistent offending.
- e) Mr Peerbux explained that, although rail operators were not statutory partners to the Community Safety Agreement, they worked closely with community safety partners, including through local Community Safety Units and tactical meetings. He stated that their inclusion in the Agreement was a matter for the statutory framework rather than local partnership arrangements.
- f) It was added that the partnership agreement was between the statutory partners, but wider organisations were involved in delivering specific work streams. For ASB, Kent Police worked closely with Southeastern Trains and British Transport Police through an information-sharing agreement, enabling joint action to prevent and respond to issues, supported locally by Community Safety Units and neighbourhood teams.
- g) Mr Peerbux acknowledged that ASB was likely to be underreported. Partners continued to encourage reporting through a range of channels, including Kent Police and community networks. Supt Marsh added that while recorded data provided an indication of trends, it was required to be viewed in context, as single incidents could generate multiple reports. The importance of local intelligence from residents, councillors and parish councils were also highlighted as helping agencies identify and respond to issues.
- h) Mr Palmer explained that Members, community wardens and Parish councils played an important role in gathering and sharing local intelligence. Residents were encouraged to report concerns through appropriate channels, as information from communities helped agencies build a fuller picture of local issues and respond effectively. He also emphasised that tackling crime and ASB relied on a two-way flow of information between the public and partner agencies.
- i) Stephen Perez, Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Service (KMFRS) Community Intelligence and Partnership Lead, highlighted that Independent Advisory Groups operated in each district and provided a mechanism for communities, including councillors, to engage directly with police. He added that these groups acted as a critical friend, helped communities better understand policing, raised local issues, and provided feedback and reassurance on matters of concern.
- j) Mr Peerbux advised that Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) was being considered as part of future planning, and work was underway to understand how partnership and reporting arrangements may be needed to adapt. However, he stated that until Government confirmed the future structure, it would be difficult to determine the precise impact and current arrangements were intended to provide a strong foundation for continued partnership and collaboration.

- k) Supt Marsh explained the increase in ASB was attributed to changes in recording practices rather than a significant rise in incidents. There was no evidence of a correlation between hate crime and ASB across the county, including during periods of high-profile national events and protests, which generated very little associated ASB or crime. While it was not possible to confirm whether individual offenders were involved in both hate crime and ASB, Kent Police regularly reviewed hate crime reports to identify patterns and emerging issues, with any identified links addressed through local policing and problem-solving processes.
- l) James Ross, Community Safety Inspector, Strategic Prevention Command at Kent Police, added that a new centralised approach now ensured that all calls were reviewed and ASB identified was formally recorded. This had resulted in higher recording figures and provided a more accurate understanding of ASB across the county.
- m) Supt Marsh confirmed that online content that promoted, encouraged or glorified criminality, disorder or violence would be investigated and acted upon by the police. Whilst there could be challenges in determining intent where content was shared online, concerns about the promotion and sensationalising of criminal behaviour were recognised, and consideration was given to whether offences or other enforcement options may apply.
- n) It was outlined that while the Police would not routinely police local authority meetings, any concerns or intelligence about planned disruption could be shared in advance through local Community Safety Units so that appropriate plans could be put in place. Police officers received training on public order powers and had access to specialist advice and support where required, ensuring that incidents of protest or disruption could be managed appropriately.
- o) It was advised that a more reliable picture of ASB levels were expected in 2026/27, once the revised recording process had fully embedded, although some underreporting and duplicate reports could still affect the data.
- p) Supt Marsh stated that Kent Police took a proportionate approach to groups gathering in public spaces and did not seek to criminalise young people socialising. Enforcement was focused on the small minority responsible for antisocial behaviour. He explained that the police may contribute to discussions about changes to local services, but decisions on service provision were made by the relevant agencies. He also highlighted the work of Kent Police's child-centred policing team and programmes such as Young Futures, which supported engagement, diversion and positive opportunities for young people.
- q) Supt Marsh stated that Kent Police's neighbourhood policing model supported close partnership working with community wardens and other organisations involved in preventing crime and ASB. He stated that the police were keen to work jointly with such partners, recognising that these arrangements could provide valuable local intelligence and strengthen community engagement.

- r) Supt Marsh advised that Kent Police already worked closely with the Environment Agency, particularly through its Rural Task Force, which shared intelligence and helped tackle fly-tipping and illegal waste activity. He explained that responsibility for investigating environmental offences primarily rested with the Environment Agency, while Kent Police led on cases involving organised criminality. He added that there were ongoing investigations into organised crime groups linked to illegal waste activity.
- s) Supt Marsh explained that all reported crimes were assessed and allocated for investigation based on a solvability assessment. He advised that Kent Police was required to provide victims with information about available support services under the Victims' Code. He acknowledged that communication with victims was not always as timely as it should be and agreed that keeping victims informed of significant developments, such as arrests, charges or case closures, was important. He stated that feedback regarding victim updates would be shared with investigative teams. Kent Police did not hold information on how many victims took up support services, as these were delivered by partner agencies.
- t) Supt Marsh advised that Kent Police worked closely with Trading Standards to tackle illegal retail activity, including through operations targeting illegal vape and tobacco sales. He explained that the police also targeted organised crime groups involved in retail crime, using national intelligence and local partnership work. He added that increased neighbourhood policing resources in town centres supported engagement with businesses and help address issues affecting retailers. Mark Rolfe, Head of Community Protection, added that Trading Standards worked closely with Kent Police to tackle unlawfully operated premises. He highlighted challenges where offenders moved between premises to avoid enforcement, and stated that work was underway across Kent, including closer collaboration with landlords to address the issue.
- u) Supt Marsh stated that drug dealing remained a focus for Kent Police. He highlighted the link between substance misuse and wider criminality, adding that partnership working helped ensure those affected by substance misuse can access appropriate support while enforcement action was taken against offenders.
- v) Mr Peerbux explained that progress against the three strategic aims of the Kent Community Safety Agreement would be measured through a performance framework focused on assessing the impact of activities and interventions. He said that further evidence of outcomes and contributions to the aims would be developed over time, supported by dedicated analytical capacity.
- w) Supt Marsh explained that resource allocation was informed by the Cambridge Harm Index, which assessed the level of harm within communities and supports an intelligence-led approach to targeting resources where they were most needed.
- x) Kent Police officer numbers were being maintained at the current baseline level, with no plans to reduce those numbers in the foreseeable future. While budget pressures would require efficiencies to be made, resources would

continue to be managed to support delivery of priorities. The partnership was also developing a strategic and performance framework to help target limited resources where they could have the greatest impact on shared priorities, with data used to monitor the effectiveness of actions taken and their impact on outcomes.

- y) Supt Marsh explained that decisions were informed by local context and impact, not solely by the volume of incidents reported. Neighbourhood policing teams were expected to understand issues affecting their communities, and resources could be deployed flexibly to support longer- term problem- solving where necessary, particularly where issues had a significant impact on residents' quality of life.
 - z) Mr Peerbux advised that local Community Safety Partnership strategic assessments were reviewed by the Community Safety Team and used to identify common priorities and themes across Kent, helping to inform county- wide strategic aims and support coordinated delivery between local partnerships.
5. The Chair welcomed questions from the Committee on Priority 2: Road Safety. Discussion included the following:
- a) Stewart Fowler, Road Safety Intelligence Team Leader, advised that speed limits were reviewed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with national guidance and in consultation with the Police and other partners. Whilst changes to rural speed limits were being explored nationally and by some local authorities, there was currently no blanket policy to reduce speed limits on rural roads.
 - b) Mr Fowler reported that decisions on the installation of fixed and average speed cameras were the responsibility of the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership, which operated within national guidance and threshold criteria. He explained that the Safety Camera Partnership formed part of the Kent and Medway Safer Roads Partnership, which was responsible for road safety across the county and worked alongside Community Safety Partnerships to ensure efforts were coordinated and not duplicated.
 - c) 20mph speed limits were technically enforceable but were not routinely enforced due to limited Police resources. Supt Marsh confirmed that resident associations, as well as Parish Councils, could raise speeding and road safety concerns to the Police, and encouraged communities to participate in the Community Speed Watch scheme.
 - d) Mr Palmer highlighted that, while Community Speed Watch warning letters were issued after repeated offences, the scheme helped identify speeding trends and enabled the police to target resources more effectively. Mr Peerbux added that, although Community Wardens were not present across all areas, there were other channels for sharing local intelligence, and highlighted ongoing work to expand warden numbers through Parish and community sponsorship schemes.

- e) Supt Marsh explained that targeted police operations were carried out to address nuisance vehicles and racing, involving a variety of organisations, and that new legislation would provide additional enforcement powers to tackle the issue. Inspector Ross added that the Crime and Policing Bill included powers to seize vehicles more quickly, which would assist officers in dealing with nuisance vehicles.
 - f) In relation to concerns regarding the use of e- bikes, Inspector Ross outlined that enforcement could be challenging but confirmed that individual districts were assessing the issue locally. He also reminded Members that e- bikes were not permitted on public roads unless part of an authorised rent scheme or being used on private land.
 - g) Mr Fowler advised that concerns relating to the replacement of vehicle-activated warning signs would be referred back to the relevant officer for consideration.
 - h) It was explained that the responsibility for parking enforcement rested with District Councils, but the police could become involved where an obstruction affected the highway.
6. The Chair welcomed questions from the Committee on Priority 8: Preventing Extremism and Hate. Discussion covered the following:
- a) Jess Harman, Prevent and Channel Manager, acknowledged the impact of the funding cut on Prevent but advised that KCC had funded one Prevent Education Officer post. She explained that training and engagement with education settings would continue through a combination of online training, regular communications and partnership working. Members were reassured that existing processes and engagement with the education sector would remain in place.
 - b) Ms Harman explained that Prevent activity in Kent focused on ensuring that statutory partners, including elected Members, had due regard to the Prevent Duty. She highlighted the importance of community awareness, engagement and appropriate referrals in identifying and preventing radicalisation. Training was available to help partners recognise signs of both Islamist and extreme right-wing extremism, and close partnership working with Kent Police supported the monitoring of radicalisation activity.
 - c) Ms Harman advised that Prevent Threshold Guidance had recently been published in the public domain, providing information on the types of behaviours that may warrant a Prevent referral. She offered to share the guidance and other supporting resources with Members and confirmed further briefings could be provided if required.
 - d) Ms Harman explained that the decision to raise the national threat level to severe was made at a national level. She advised that, locally, partners undertook ongoing risk assessments, monitored community tensions and considered the impact of national events on Kent and Medway. She highlighted the importance of community engagement and stated that Kent

had not experienced a significant increase in local tensions following recent national events.

- i) Supt Marsh advised that where there were concerns about potential disorder at meetings, Kent Police should be informed in advance so that an appropriate response could be considered. He added that regular partnership briefings were held to share intelligence relating to protests and events, enabling partners to assess risks and respond accordingly.
 - j) Ms Harman outlined that local Prevent priorities were informed by the Counter-Terrorism Local Profile, which considered intelligence to a range of threats, including Islamist terrorism and extreme right-wing extremism. She reassured Members that Islamist terrorism remained one of the five Prevent priorities for Kent and Medway. However, local referral rates and intelligence indicated that the current focus in Kent was on extreme right-wing activity.
 - k) Kent Police had not seen a particular increase in reported anti-Semitic crime in recent months, despite national events that might have been expected to influence community tensions. Police maintained close engagement with affected communities, offering reassurance and encouraging the reporting of any concerns.
 - l) It was confirmed that the figure of approximately 115,000 recorded hate crime offences included all offences that met the threshold for recording as a hate crime, whether committed online or in person. The importance of educating people about the legal consequences of harmful online behaviour was also acknowledged, particularly in regard to young people.
 - m) Ms Harman agreed to give further consideration on how to improve awareness of Prevent among parents, including through enhanced communication and engagement. She also highlighted the Prevent Advisory Group as a key channel for sharing information and support across communities.
 - n) Supt Marsh agreed to consider whether a more granular breakdown of extremism-related offences could be provided, including the nature and location of incidents, subject to the level of detail available within existing recording systems.
 - o) Ms Harman advised that the Phase One Southport Inquiry had identified recommendations for Prevent and confirmed that partners were already considering how these would be taken forward locally, pending the Home Office response. It was requested that further Prevent training take place and for the Southport Inquiry be shared with Members.
7. The Chair welcomed questions from the Committee on Priority 3: Violence Against Women and Girls. Discussion covered the following:
- a) Supt Marsh confirmed that Kent Police had strategic oversight of its Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) work and advised that local concerns could be raised through Community Safety Units, with specialist Designing Out Crime Officers able to assess sites and recommend improvement measures.

- b) In response to concerns about whether appropriate links existed between Kent Police and KCC Highways to support requests for street lighting, Mr Fowler agreed to take the matter away and discuss it with the relevant officers.
 - c) It was advised that the White Ribbon in Schools programme had been successfully delivered using the Police and Crime Commissioner crime reduction grant funding. However, the available funding was limited and could not currently support a wider rollout. It was agreed to consider how the programme could be shared more broadly across the county.
 - d) Jenny Hanna, Domestic Abuse Projects and Partnerships Manager, explained that the Know See Speak Out campaign was delivered in partnership with domestic abuse services and various partners. The team worked with partners including Kent Football Association (FA) and had shared campaign information with local football clubs to encourage participation. Engagement varied between clubs, but efforts continued to promote the campaign through existing networks and partnerships.
 - e) Ms Hanna reported that the male refuge provision was currently operating as a pilot. The outcomes would be reviewed later in the year, and any decision on expanding the service would depend on the funding available following that evaluation.
 - f) Supt Marsh confirmed that Project Vigilant operated across Kent, with trained officers using its perpetrator-focused prevention tactics regularly within the county's night-time economy.
 - g) Mr Palmer advised that any changes relating to CCTV provision and licensing would need to be considered through the relevant policy framework and agreed to take the matter away for further investigation.
 - h) Supt Marsh stated that the reduction in offences in Kent were attributed to sustained partnership work, including Project Vigilant, strengthened work on domestic abuse, and increased use of protective orders to target persistent offenders.
 - i) Kent Police's central VAWG team have provided guidance and community engagement sessions to support appropriate messaging on violence against women and girls. These sessions were delivered to schools, local authorities and other community stakeholders, and a contact for the team could be provided if required.
 - j) Supt Marsh explained that Kent Police focused on violence against all victims. However, the VAWG strategy was developed in response to specific concerns and events and did not detract from the wider work undertaken to tackle violence affecting anyone.
8. The Chair welcomed questions from the Committee on Priority 5: Serious Violence and Organised Crime and Priority 7: Substance Misuse. Discussion covered the following:

- a) Dr Jessica Mookherjee, Assistant Director of Public Health, outlined that addressing unmet need required greater investment in prevention as well as treatment. While current drug and alcohol budgets were largely focused on supporting people with established substance misuse problems, she highlighted the importance of early intervention and improving identification of high-risk behaviours to prevent problems from escalating. Supt Marsh added that Kent Police routinely used drug testing on arrest and had one of the highest referral rates nationally from custody into treatment services, helping to direct offenders into support and recovery programmes.
 - b) Mr Rolfe stated that tackling the hidden economy and organised crime relied on partnership working with a range of agencies, including district and borough councils and Border Force. He added that it was too early to measure the overall impact of this work, given its relatively recent introduction, and that a timeline for evidencing outcomes could not yet be identified as the measures of success had not been clearly defined.
 - c) Dr Mookherjee explained that adult drug and alcohol treatment services were provided by two organisations, with hubs located across East and West Kent and additional support delivered through community partners. A separate service was available for children and young people, working flexibly through schools and other local settings.
 - d) Supt Marsh explained that Kent Police had teams dedicated to tackling County Lines, monitoring intelligence, identifying emerging threats and investigating organised drug-dealing networks, while local neighbourhood officers addressed street-level drug dealing and concerns within their communities.
 - e) Supt Marsh outlined that decisions on the installation of CCTV rested with local authorities. However, where police environmental surveys or audits identified improved CCTV or lighting as beneficial, recommendations would be fed into the relevant Community Safety Partnership (CSP) for consideration.
 - f) Mr Rolfe reported that the Local Vape Action initiative was operating in Tunbridge Wells, Ashford and Maidstone and was likely to be extended to other districts where it was supported by local partnerships. He added that while the disposable vape ban had reduced young people's access to vapes, the issue remained significant and required both enforcement and education, with additional engagement from a District and Borough level welcomed.
 - g) It was suggested that the CSP consider concerns regarding levels of hate crime and the disruption of local authority meetings and provide a future update on any actions taken to address these issues.
9. Following the questions, the Chair welcomed recommendations from the Committee, which included the following:
- a) A briefing be provided to Members on Prevent, including the current threat level and where the thresholds lay on extremism.
 - b) For the next meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel to receive reporting on the impact of LGR moving forward.

- c) More detailed information and statistics on serious and organised crime, specifically on the hidden economy, to be included in future reporting.
 - d) A coordinator be made available to interface with elected Members, stakeholders and the CSP to support the policies presented in Appendix D of the report relating to VAWG initiatives.
 - e) Consideration be given to the use and coordination of CCTV to support crime prevention and detection.
 - f) Issues relating to pavement parking causing obstruction be considered.
 - g) Mechanisms be explored to improve Member engagement, including opportunities for Members to provide feedback and receive information on significant community incidents and policing activity.
 - h) A review of countywide speeding measures, including current and potential changes to road safety policies, particularly camera enforcement policies, and their effectiveness in tackling speeding.
 - i) A future update to be given on the role of social media and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in community safety, including how AI is being used to identify risks, support prevention work, and address emerging threats.
10. The Chair thanked officers for the report and their attendance at the meeting. He recognised the need for a future discussion on resourcing and requested that future reports provide a clearer indication of the relative impact of each priority area to assist Members in understanding their significance across the county. It was advised that a new analyst within the team has access to the relevant data and will use this to inform future reporting.
11. It was acknowledged that once the minutes were finalised, partners would be requested to take into account the comments and concerns raised by the Committee.
12. The Chair proposed that the Scrutiny Committee note the report and make the following recommendations to the CSP:
- a) A briefing be provided to Members on Prevent, including the current threat level and where the thresholds lay on extremism.
 - b) For the next meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel to receive reporting on the impact of LGR moving forward.
 - c) More detailed information and statistics on serious and organised crime, specifically on the hidden economy, to be included in future reporting.
 - d) A coordinator be made available to interface with elected Members, stakeholders and the CSP to support the policies presented in Appendix D of the report relating to VAWG initiatives.

- e) Consideration be given to the use and coordination of CCTV to support crime prevention and detection.
- f) Issues relating to pavement parking causing obstruction be considered.
- g) Mechanisms be explored to improve Member engagement, including opportunities for Members to provide feedback and receive information on significant community incidents and policing activity.
- h) A review of countywide speeding measures, including current and potential changes to road safety policies, particularly camera enforcement policies, and their effectiveness in tackling speeding.
- i) A future update to be given on the role of social media and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in community safety, including how AI is being used to identify risks, support prevention work, and address emerging threats.

13. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the report and make the following recommendations to the CSP:

- a) A briefing be provided to Members on Prevent, including the current threat level and where the thresholds lay on extremism.
- b) For the next meeting of the Crime and Disorder Panel to receive reporting on the impact of LGR moving forward.
- c) More detailed information and statistics on serious and organised crime, specifically on the hidden economy, to be included in future reporting.
- d) A coordinator be made available to interface with elected Members, stakeholders and the CSP to support the policies presented in Appendix D of the report relating to VAWG initiatives.
- e) Consideration be given to the use and coordination of CCTV to support crime prevention and detection.
- f) Issues relating to pavement parking causing obstruction be considered.
- g) Mechanisms be explored to improve Member engagement, including opportunities for Members to provide feedback and receive information on significant community incidents and policing activity.
- h) A review of countywide speeding measures, including current and potential changes to road safety policies, particularly camera enforcement policies, and their effectiveness in tackling speeding.
- i) A future update to be given on the role of social media and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in community safety, including how AI is being used to identify risks, support prevention work, and address emerging threats.

59. Work Programme
(Item C1)

RESOLVED to note the Work Programme.