

MOPAC Strategy and Oversight

Oversight Framework Explanatory Note

March 2025

Overview

1. In support of the Police and Crime Plan MOPAC routinely publishes an outcomes framework which sets out the key indicators for measuring implementation. It also sets the structure for quarterly reporting.
2. The framework contains a range of indicators which will be updated as data becomes available. Our aim is, as far as possible, to begin publication of data at the end of financial quarter 1 2025/26 (the first quarter data will be available for the new Police and Crime Plan).
3. Detailed descriptions of the indicators are set out in the attached Appendix A. An overview of the general approach is set out below.

Outcome Framework Approach

4. MOPACs outcome framework is based around four priority areas which form the structure of the plan:
 - Reducing violence and criminal exploitation.
 - Building safer, more confident communities.
 - Supporting and overseeing reform of the MPS.
 - Improving the Criminal Justice System and supporting victims.
5. Sitting above these is an overarching objective to make London safer. The framework itself is therefore structured in three 'tiers', with increasing levels of detail in terms of indicators.
6. It is important to note that, while MOPAC has a statutory responsibility to oversee the Metropolitan Police, the Police and Crime Plan is a wider plan for London and reflects the partnerships needed to deliver a safe city. As such a high proportion of the measures in the framework are not police-specific but reflect this wider approach. Examples include feelings of safety, criminal justice system effectiveness and reoffending rates.

Making London Safer

7. Tier 1 reflects the Mayor's manifesto commitment of "Making London Safer". This comprises 2 measures which are indicative of the overall levels of crime in London. These are Total Notifiable Offences derived from Police Recorded Crime and the victimisation rate derived from the MOPAC Public Attitude Survey (PAS). While both measures are indicators of overall crime they are derived using different approaches, both have weaknesses but offer complementary strengths.
8. Total Notifiable Offences is a measure of all crimes reported to and recorded by the police. It is the best measure of the total demand on the Metropolitan Police covering both crimes against individuals and crimes against the state. The weakness of recorded crime is that not all crimes are reported and as such it does not necessarily accurately reflect victimisation. Further, many of the crimes recorded are influenced by proactive policing and as such crime could increase, in certain categories, as a result of an increase in police activity (an example being drugs possession offences).
9. Victimisation rates are derived from the Public Attitude Survey, in which respondents are asked about their experiences of crime. Rates are therefore based on the experiences of respondents, independent of whether the incidents were reported. This uses a very similar methodology to the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) and, like the

CSEW, provides an understanding of crimes which go unreported. The weakness of this approach is that it only relates to crimes against the individual, so is a partial picture of the crime the police deal with.

10. By considering these two different measures together we hope to generate a better understanding of the overall crime picture in London.

PCP Priorities

11. Tier 2 is structured around the PCP Priorities. For each priority are a maximum of two indicators, chosen to be the most representative high-level measure/s. These are as follows:
 - Reducing violence and criminal exploitation – Violence with injury (Police Recorded Crime).
 - Building safer, more confident communities – Proportion of Londoners worried about crime (Public Attitude Survey)
 - Supporting and overseeing reform of the MPS – Proportion of Londoners who trust the MPS (Public Attitude Survey)
 - Improving the Criminal Justice System and supporting victims – Proven reoffending rate (Ministry of Justice) and victim satisfaction (User Satisfaction Survey)

Detailed Measures

12. Tier 3 of the framework represents a set of more detailed supporting measures, 43 in total. These are arranged under PCP priorities and provide further insight on delivery in each of the priority areas.
13. These measures include more detail information on crime, including additional crime categories, 'outcomes' of police investigation and greater granularity from the Public Attitude Survey.

Approach

14. The indicators in the framework have a variety of sources, but the majority are derived from MOPAC surveys and Police Recorded Crime (further detail at appendix b).
15. The Public Attitude Survey is the longest running and most robust local/regional survey of its type in the country, with an annual sample size of 19,200. This allows detailed analysis of demographic breakdowns, including intersectionality. It also provides for analysis to a borough level.
16. MOPAC's User Satisfaction Survey is a victim survey that asks a sample of individuals who have reported a crime to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to an officer or at a front counter about their experience during this process.
17. MOPAC's TDIU Survey is a victim survey which asks individuals who have reported a crime to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) either via telephone or online, and were dealt with by the MPS's central Telephone Digital Investigation Unit (TDIU), about their experience of the crime reporting process.
18. Where data are derived from MOPAC's Public Attitude Survey the same, or similar questions generally exist in the national Crime Survey for England and Wales. Data from the PAS can therefore be supplemented with analysis of the CSEW, which has the advantage of providing national comparisons.

19. Where we use survey data (PAS, USS and TDIU) we will track both direction of travel and differences in response by demographic.
20. Where we use Police Recorded Crime we will report on changes over time as well as crime levels relative to the national position and other similar forces. Comparative data are taken from Office for National Statistics publications and will therefore lag approximately 3 months behind the initial reporting of MPS crime levels.

Gaps

21. The proposed framework contains gaps in areas we would like to measure, but where data do not currently exist. In these cases, we are considering options for how we address this. They are as follows.
 - High-harm victims – the User Satisfaction Survey currently speaks with a sample of victims of residential burglary, assault, personal robbery and hate crime. It does not cover victims of more serious violence and sexual offending. MOPAC did attempt to develop a high harm survey to support the 22-25 PCP (Victim Voice) however the response rate was low and, as such, results were not sufficiently robust to be reported. Work is ongoing regarding improvements to distribution of this survey to allow measurement in this period and it will be used if reliability of results improves.
 - End-to-end Criminal Justice System satisfaction – MOPAC has long held an ambition to measure satisfaction across to the criminal justice system (our current measure, the USS, is limited to the police). A suitable method for obtaining a sample of victims to conduct this survey has not been found, and as such the data have not been collected. MOPAC is continuing to explore options with both service providers and criminal justice partners for how such a survey could be developed.
 - Criminal justice effectiveness – we are conscious that the framework lacks a strategic measure of criminal justice system effectiveness. MOPAC is keen to increase the data and performance measures available to us relating to the work of the wider criminal justice system and we will engage with justice partners towards achieving this goal. We will review our outcomes framework as and when any such additional measures become available.

Targets and Comparisons

22. As with the previous Police and Crime Plan, MOPAC will not set specific annual targets for any measure, however we are committed to contributing to the government missions to halve knife crime and VAWG. For each measure we will be seeking an increase or decrease in volume, rate or proportion, or a narrowing in gaps in the case of disproportionality measures.
23. To provide a clear indication of change we will use two comparisons in our reporting:
 - Rolling 12 month to date compared to the previous 12 months
 - Most recent quarter compared to the same quarter in the previous year.
24. For more information on our approach please email enquiries@mopac.london.gov.uk.

Appendix B – Data Sources

Police Recorded Crime

1. Police Recorded Crime refers to those crimes reported to and recorded by the police. The Office for National Statistics notes¹,

Police recorded crime figures are an important indicator of police workload. They can be used for local crime pattern analysis and provide a good measure of trends in well-reported crimes, like homicide, which is not covered by the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW). There are also some categories of crime (such as drug possession offences) where the volume of offences recorded is heavily influenced by police activities and priorities; in such cases, recorded crime figures may not provide an accurate picture of the true extent of criminality.

2. Police Recorded Crime numbers are impacted by changes in recording policy and by police activity, meaning that changes in force approach and policy can impact crime levels. The Gov.UK website² points out that,

in the wake of a critical national inspection of crime recording by HM Inspectorate of Police [sic], Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) in 2014, there have been significant improvements in the accuracy of crime recording which has led to a discontinuity in several crime types including violence against the person, sexual offences and public order offences.

3. In other words, we know that changes in approach (including improvements in recording practices) impact the levels of recording. For this reason, Police Recorded Crime provides a useful indicative, but not definitive, picture of crime levels.

Public Attitude Survey

4. The Public Attitude Survey is the longest running and most robust local/regional survey of its type in the country. The survey has taken place since 1983 and speaks to around 19,200 London residents each year.
5. The Public Attitude Survey³ (PAS) aims to gauge what Londoners think about policing and crime in the capital, and to provide greater understand of the issues that matter to Londoners. The survey measures Londoners' perceptions of the police, identifies local policing priorities, and captures views and experiences across a range of crime and safety issues.
6. Data sets and analysis from the PAS can be found here [MOPAC Surveys | London Datastore](#).

User Satisfaction Survey (USS)

7. The User Satisfaction Survey (USS), is a victim survey that asks a sample of individuals who have reported a crime to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to an officer or at a front counter about their experience during this process. Currently the USS speaks to

¹ [User guide to crime statistics for England and Wales: March 2024 - Office for National Statistics](#)

² [Police recorded crime and outcomes open data tables user guide - GOV.UK](#)

³ [Taking part in MOPAC's surveys | London City Hall](#)

around 9,600 victims a year who have reported either a residential burglary, an assault, a personal robbery or a hate crime within the preceding three months.

8. When contacted victims are asked a series of questions about how the police performed but are not asked any details about the incident itself. The aim of the USS is to understand the victim's experience so that improvements can be made for other victims in the future.
9. The User Satisfaction Survey (USS) contacts a number of victims from each of the MPS's Basic Command Units (BCUs) to ensure that a geographical spread of data is available. Within each BCU all victims of crime within the preceding three months are potential candidates for survey and a random selection is made. Some exclusion criteria are used based on age and specific crime features in order to safeguard the wellbeing of certain types of victim. Due to the random selection and exclusions not every victim is surveyed by the USS.

Crime Survey for England and Wales

10. The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) is a face-to-face survey which asks respondents about both victimisation and attitudes to policing.
11. The 2023 to 2024 sample had just under 31,000 respondents nationally. This included a boost of 5,900 interviews in high-crime areas. The Survey asks people in England and Wales about their experiences of a range of crimes as well as their attitudes towards different crime-related issues, the police, the criminal justice system, and their perceptions of anti-social behaviour.
12. The ONS website notes that "the main aim of the CSEW is to provide robust trends for the crime types and population it covers; the survey does not aim to provide an absolute count of crime and has notable exclusions". As with the PAS, the CSEW excludes crimes where there is not a victim (for example, possession of drugs) and cannot include homicide. In addition, it does not cover group residences (for example, care homes or student halls of residence) or crime against commercial or public sector bodies.