

The Mayor's Police and Crime Plan 2013 – 2016: Impact of the Police and Crime Committee's consultation response

MOPAC's consultation on the draft Police and Crime Plan and Estate Strategy closed on 6 March 2013. The Committee submitted a response to the consultation in March. MOPAC is required to "have regard to any report or recommendations made by the [Police and Crime Committee] in relation to the draft plan".¹ The Committee's response made 19 recommendations regarding the Plan and associated Estate Strategy and budget.

An initial response to the Committee's recommendations was provided by the Mayor at the time of publishing the final Police and Crime Plan on 25 March 2013. A further response was requested from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. This was provided in May 2013. The table below provides a summary of the impact of each of the recommendations and the extent to which they have been accepted by MOPAC and the MPS using RAG (red, amber or green) status. RAG status provides a performance judgment: in this instance, red means the recommendation has not been accepted; amber means there has been some progress against the recommendation; and green means the recommendation has been implemented or substantively accepted.

The Committee's recommendations had considerable impact on the changes being implemented, notably:

- The final Plan included more information on how MOPAC will work with partners to deliver criminal justice priorities. MOPAC has since committed to developing a detailed action plan with partners that can be shared with the Committee.
- The MPS has committed that all neighbourhood officers will be allocated to a ward and identifiable to the public, addressing the Committee's concerns about locally known officers.
- The Mayor has agreed to bring an annual report on progress against the Plan to the Committee.
- The final Plan included greater consideration of other priority crimes, such as sexual violence and dangerous driving. MOPAC is developing a 'performance dashboard' to measure progress against these crimes that are not part of their headline 20.20.20 Challenge.
- MOPAC has recognised the need to work with independent experts to develop evidence-based policy.
- MOPAC is implementing more rigorous processes to interrogate the data presented by the MPS and ensure it is accurate.
- The final Plan includes a high level commitment to ensuring that officer supervision arrangements are adequate and MOPAC will hold the MPS to account for delivery against its People Strategy.
- There is acknowledgement of the police's role in safeguarding vulnerable children and young people.
- The final Plan recognises the importance of tackling health issues and substance misuse in preventing reoffending.

¹ Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011

Committee's recommendation	Summary of impact
<p>1. In the final Plan, MOPAC must set out the evidence base used to develop the targets to demonstrate that they are appropriate – i.e. stretching but achievable. MOPAC should also demonstrate how it believes the targets can be met by including interim targets it expects the MPS to reach throughout the Plan period. MOPAC should provide the Police and Crime Committee with an annual report (by the end of March each year) on progress against this trajectory on each of the key performance targets, and an assessment of the impact of the Plan.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>The Mayor has declined to set interim targets, saying in his response: “I have chosen not to be overly prescriptive about interim targets. I believe it is my role to set the outcome I am seeking, and to challenge the Commissioner and others to deliver by 2016. I will of course be monitoring progress on a regular basis”.</p> <p>MOPAC has agreed to provide an annual report regarding progress against the Police and Crime Plan, and has suggested this could be delivered in June each year “so that full year figures can be included.”</p> <p>The Plan acknowledges the importance of evidence for future policy development, suggesting MOPAC will establish a London Crime Prevention Council, which “would be made up of a core group of key academics and practitioners in the field and ‘visiting experts’ who would be called upon depending on the subject matter”. Proposals appear to be under development but it is suggested the body would operate as an independent advisory body sitting at arm’s length.</p>
<p>2. To ensure that the figures being reported by the MPS accurately reflect Londoners’ experiences of crime and disorder, within the next six months MOPAC should work with independent experts to develop quality assurance mechanisms that can interrogate the information being provided by the MPS. It should report back to the Committee on this work by the end of September 2013.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>The final Plan sets out “the aim to establish a robust performance framework for the whole criminal justice system and not just for policing.”</p> <p>MOPAC has also recognised the need to ensure data accuracy, and has tasked the Directorate of Audit Risk and Assurance on an annual basis with reviewing this on an annual basis. The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has also asked MOPAC’s Audit Committee to look at crime recording in their plan, including levels of ‘no criming’.</p> <p>MOPAC is also in discussion with HMIC about its role.</p>
<p>3. The final Plan must explain how MOPAC believes it addresses the issues that matter to Londoners and the priorities that are reported in the MPS’s public surveys. It must include reassurance that significant public concerns that have not been included in the headline targets – including sexual violence and gangs – remain a priority. The final Plan should demonstrate that they will be adequately resourced and include the latest thinking on how performance will be assessed. The final Plan should also address the MPS’s role in prevention of crime.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>The final Plan does not set targets for these areas (e.g. gangs, violence against women) but makes clear that they are priorities for the Mayor and the MPS. It repeatedly states that the ‘MOPAC 7’ are not the only mayoral crime reduction priorities.</p> <p>MOPAC and the MPS are developing a performance dashboard “that will enable an assessment of performance in each area” suggesting that they will remain topics for scrutiny.</p>
<p>4. The Committee welcomes the role that local forums currently play in determining local priorities and holding the MPS to account for performance. The final Plan should include a commitment to how these local engagement mechanisms will be supported in future and details of how they will be used to understand local concerns.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>High level commitments to local engagement are made in the Plan. The Deputy Mayor has confirmed that local ward panels will retain their role in determining local priorities and will bring proposals for SNBs to the Committee.</p>

Committee's recommendation	Summary of impact
<p>5. In advance of implementing changes to neighbourhood policing, the MPS should publish details of how borough allocations were determined. This should include assessments of relevant pilots and explain how the lessons were used to develop London-wide plans for neighbourhood policing changes.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>The Mayor provided details about the allocation of resources across boroughs in his response to the Committee. However, it does not specifically address how the pilots informed the development of the model:</p> <p>“The MPS used a demand and resource model to set the police officer posts for each of the main service functions within the borough. This drew on learning from other forces, used both quantitative and qualitative data and was tested with independent experts. Current call demand for emergency calls and local factors such as average travelling time, abstraction rates and decisions about single and double crewing at a local level, as well as consideration of the need for additional capacity for patrol and resilience, provided the basis for the modelling of the Emergency Response and Patrol Teams. Two PCs were provided for every ward (one to be named and dedicated, the other to work more flexibly across the Local Policing Area). Additional officers were allocated to Boroughs for SNTs based on demand and risk factors (for example crime levels, confidence and satisfaction levels and demanding venues). This weighting was used to allocate resources for Borough Tasking Teams and other proactive functions. Investigation resources were based on volume, type, complexity and hard factors or a borough’s investigations.”</p> <p>MOPAC has acknowledged that while the information may be available, it needs to raise awareness at borough level about the formula allocation.</p>
<p>6. To manage some of the risks we highlight, the final Plan needs to:</p> <p>a) explain how the MPS believes the new model will strengthen neighbourhood policing;</p> <p>b) provide clarity on where additional resources will come from; and</p> <p>c) respond to concerns about the importance of locally known officers. The Commissioner should consider increasing the number of named and/or dedicated officers allocated to local areas.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>At the Committee’s Q&A in March, the Commissioner explained that there had been some changes on the issue of named officers. All neighbourhood officers will now be allocated to a ward and identifiable to the public, with an honest explanation about how often they will be deployed in other areas. One officer, as previously proposed, will still be dedicated to each ward and never abstracted.</p> <p>The Deputy Mayor’s response said “neighbourhood teams will be more visible than before, with more coverage in the evenings and at weekends”.</p>
<p>7. MOPAC and the MPS should look again at the proposal to cut PCSO numbers. The final Plan should demonstrate that this is the best option for dealing with the MPS’s budgetary constraints and that there are no other less damaging areas for savings. Figures about borough allocations of PCSOs should be included in the final Plan along with details of police officer numbers.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>The Deputy Mayor’s letter provides clarity on the number of PCSOs being planned for by 2015/16: “MOPAC and the MPS recognise the value provided by PCSOs. However, a clear policy decision has been made to focus finite resources on police officers, based on the professional judgement of the Commissioner. In the new model, 2 PCSOs have been allocated per ward (i.e. 1260 in total), one of whom will be dedicated to the ward, with the other being part of the wider team working across the Local Police Area. In total, the police and crime plan aims to retain 2,310 PCSOs by 2015/16.”</p> <p>This information was not included in the final Plan and there has been limited discussion of why this approach is the ‘best option’ for dealing with budgetary constraints.</p>

Committee's recommendation	Summary of impact
<p>8. Within six months of the implementation of the new neighbourhood policing model, MOPAC should report to the Committee on its impact. This report should assess the impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness in tackling crime • Tackling anti-social behaviour • Community engagement • Public confidence 	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>The Mayor and Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime have accepted the need to report back to the Committee. MOPAC will provide this report in March 2014 "to allow sufficient time to assess the impact of the new model."</p>
<p>9. MOPAC should ensure that the MPS honour its commitment to provide regular Operation Policing Measure analysis to the Assembly. This analysis would demonstrate the effect of changes to the police workforce – i.e. areas where civilian staff and supervisors are being lost.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>MOPAC had reiterated that it is willing to provide this information regularly although it is still not clear when this information will be made available. The Budget and Performance Committee also intends to monitor this data.</p>
<p>10. MOPAC needs to be able to assure itself and demonstrate to the public that supervision is adequate, not least to avoid high-profile damaging cases of officer misconduct. The final Plan should include a statement on the Mayor's oversight of MPS supervision and reassurance that the proposed models are adequate.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>The significance of supervision and leadership has been recognised in the final Plan. It includes commitments that MOPAC will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the remodelled MPS workforce to ensure that supervision ratios are adequate and that the quality of supervision at all ranks is upheld. • Encourage the MPS to have stable local leadership by retaining borough commanders in post for at least two years and where new postings take place, to ensure that the protocol with boroughs and local partners is respected. • Require that the MPS provides assurance through regular reporting and the MOPAC Challenge process, that professional standards procedures are in place, are implemented and monitored, that procedures are improved where necessary and that the MPS is learning lessons from the reports produced by its professional standards departments, the IPCC and the new College of Policing.
<p>11. In its final Estates Strategy, MOPAC should publish the criteria used to assess which front counters have been earmarked for closure. This will help to build confidence in the process.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>The final Estates Strategy and associated local plans provide some information on how accessibility and consultation findings have informed closure decisions, but detail about the criteria used to inform decisions (e.g. details of footfall data/ access issues at specific locations) is still lacking.</p>
<p>12. In advance of closing any front counters, MOPAC should conduct and publish a formal assessment of the impact of each closure and the adequacy of agreed alternatives. This will help to reassure communities that all implications have been identified and mitigated as appropriate.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>Impact statements for each borough have been published, but not at the level of each individual front counter closure.</p>

Committee's recommendation	Summary of impact
<p>13. MOPAC should ensure there is a period of reflection between the publication of the detailed proposals and changes beginning to be made on the ground. This would allow further local discussions - taking into account all of the changes e.g. to SNT bases - to ensure that any concerns are mitigated before changes are implemented.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>There has been no formal period of reflection. In his response, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime refers to a schedule for closures and disposals, although this has not been published. Decisions to market for sale are published as decision notices on MOPAC's website.</p> <p>The final Strategy states that it is the intention that the locations listed for front counters and contact points will remain for the life of the plan, although "if demand changes we will be flexible enough to reflect the needs of London".</p> <p>Local plans include information on deployment bases for SNTs and other SNT locations.</p>
<p>14. The final Plan should address officer training and explain how MOPAC and the MPS will ensure that the training package adequately equips officers to deal with different needs of communities and individuals.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>The Plan does recognise the importance of training, but does not contain much additional detail on how the police will be prepared to respond to diverse community needs.</p> <p>MOPAC suggests the detail will follow in the forthcoming MPS People Strategy and the Commissioner will be held to account for delivery against this.</p>
<p>15. The final Plan should include far greater detail on the MPS's efforts to address community concerns around stop and search. This is a potentially positive opportunity for the MPS to demonstrate how it is responding to community concerns and yet none of this detail is included in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>The Mayor agreed with the Committee's findings on stop and search being a key issue for Londoners. There is considerably more detail in the final plan about how MOPAC will hold the Commissioner to account for the properly targeted use of stop and search.</p> <p>The Committee will investigate this issue in autumn 2013.</p>
<p>16. The final Plan should give details of the Commissioner's plans for recruitment of London residents, expectations of the impact of this scheme on diversity and a sense of what more will need to be done.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Green]</p> <p>This section has been strengthened in the final Plan and progress has been linked to the MPS's People Strategy. The final Plan says that MOPAC will "support and challenge the MPS to ensure Londoners from every background are encouraged and supported to join the MPS..." and the Plan recognises the potential barrier that living costs can present to potential recruits.</p> <p>MOPAC has offered to provide more information about these proposals to the Committee in the summer.</p>
<p>17. The final Plan should set out how MOPAC intends to recruit a diverse membership to Safer Neighbourhood Boards that is representative of the local community and its diversity. It must provide greater clarity on the specific remit of the Boards and rethink their role as an intelligence gathering mechanisms for the MPS.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>There remains a lack of clarity about how SNBs will function or plans for recruitment. However, in the final Plan there is no reference to them having a role as an intelligence gathering mechanism, as the Committee recommended.</p> <p>The Committee will investigate this issue in June 2013.</p>

Committee's recommendation	Summary of impact
<p>18. The final Plan should include a more comprehensive picture of the relative roles and responsibilities of partners in achieving the aims [regarding the criminal justice system] – i.e. an outline of who will do what and when to bring about improvements – developed through proper consultation with partners. Additional consideration needs to be given to the role of the voluntary sector and partners outside the criminal system, in particular. There are also serious questions regarding the justice and resettlement targets. MOPAC should therefore review the justice and resettlement section of the draft Plan.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>MOPAC has agreed that a more comprehensive action plan is required and is developing one with the London Crime Reduction Board. Once agreed, it will be shared with the Committee.</p> <p>This section has been strengthened in the final Plan. Many of the issues highlighted in the Committee's submission have been recognised: there is a clearer focus on crime prevention; greater consideration of the health issues of offenders; and greater recognition of the role of partners.</p>
<p>19. The final Plan should provide much-needed clarity and details of the funding available to deliver the Mayor's priorities for community safety. MOPAC should address the concerns of local partners about the lack of information about MOPAC's strategic approach and how it will assess bids for funding.</p>	<p>[RAG status: Amber]</p> <p>There is little additional detail about the role of the London Crime Prevention Fund in the Plan. MOPAC has published details about the fund on its website including some information about its assessment criteria. (www.london.gov.uk/priorities/policing-crime/how-we-work/funding)</p> <p>These reflect some of the expectations outlined in the Plan, including anti-gangs initiatives, young people, early intervention and reducing reoffending.</p>