

**Governance and Scrutiny Board – 15 April 2025 11:00-12:30 and 13:00-14:30**

**Venue: Main Conference Room, Police HQ and Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees:**

Clare Moody, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)  
Sarah Crew, Chief Constable (CC)  
Andy Champness, Acting Chief of Staff (CoS)  
Jon Cummins, Assistant Chief Constable (ACC)  
Paul Butler, OPCC Chief Finance Officer (CFO)  
Sally Fox, OPCC Director of Performance and Accountability  
Ben Valentine, OPCC Senior Performance and Governance Manager  
James Davis, ASP Portfolio Delivery Manager  
Vicky Ellis, Secretariat Manager (Minutes)

**Partial meeting attendance:**

Sharon Quantick, Director – Finance and Business Services  
Nick Lilley, Director of Information Technology  
Paul Wiggington, Chief Superintendent, Directorate of the Chief of Staff  
Victoria Caple, Head of Victim Care, Safeguarding and Vulnerability  
Jon Dowey, Head of Performance and Insight  
Jason Shears, Superintendent, Performance and Assurance  
Mark Edgington, Chief Superintendent, Head of Operational Support Directorate  
Jon Jeffery, Deputy Director of Intelligence

**1 Apologies**

Jon Reilly, Deputy Chief Constable (DCC)  
Alice Ripley, OPCC Chief of Staff  
Nick Adams, ASP Chief Finance Officer

**2 Minutes and Action Updates**

The Minutes of the March Governance and Scrutiny Board were broadly agreed as an accurate record for publication, there was one section that needed to be checked before publication.

The Board discussed the actions due for an update at the meeting:

- Action 069/23 – there had been no further issues reported regarding the problem with callers being unable to hear the call handlers. The checking of the network was continuing, and no issues had been identified. Board agreed to close the action.
- Action 41/24 – it was agreed to discuss this later in the meeting under the ERP section.
- Action 57/24 – the peer review of MARAC had been further delayed and was now expected in April. Agreed to revisit in May.
- Action 81/24 – National Aviation strategy remained in progress. Update to be sought in May.
- Action 82/24 – A member of the PCC's team had attended a meeting regarding EBIT to discuss public interest questions. Action closed.

- Action 84/24 – The PCC's team had made enquiries with other PCC offices where the police were using EBIT and were awaiting responses. Action closed.
- Action 86/24 – A late update had been received. Enquiries were underway regarding funding for PCEP. Agreed to revisit in May.
- Action 88/24 – The PCC had written to the CC in relation to Serious Youth Violence. Action closed.

All other actions were carried over to a future meeting.

### **3 Decisions/Business Cases**

#### **a) Neighbourhood Guarantee**

The Neighbourhood Guarantee business case had been formally signed off at the ASP Constabulary Management Board and had been presented to the GSB for noting and discussion, a decision was not required. The business case outlined the change activity related to the repurposing of the Remedy team in order to secure access to the Neighbourhood Guarantee central government funding and address the 5 pillars set out by the government to deliver it.

The ACC highlighted to the Board some areas from the business case, notably the creation of eight Neighbourhood Tasking Teams, the uplift to the Early Intervention Team, the realignment of the drug strategy teams and redeployment of staff. Engagement with the workforce was underway, consultation events had already taken place and more were planned. ASP were working towards a delivery date of 16 June, with shift pattern changes by 18 August.

The PCC highlighted the letters received by PCC's from the government setting out the actions they were expected to undertake as part of this work and noting it was a shared endeavour. The Neighbourhood Guarantee aligned to Priority 1 of the Police and Crime Plan and was therefore seen as a good piece of work, with the right emphasis and focus.

The PCC asked several questions, seeking to understand: the feedback from staff; how ASP would measure the cultural shift and how leadership would effect that; and how it would feel different to members of the public. ASP responded:

- Feedback from staff was largely positive, questions remained around what it would look like day to day.
- Staff acknowledged the move to align to strategic threats.
- ASP leaders were committed to answering questions from staff.
- Remedy had evolved over time to be largely plain clothes officers and non-visible to communities but the Neighbourhood Tasking Teams would be a visible uniformed presence and work closely with communities, this would involve a cultural shift and would come with a leadership requirement.
- ASP would use a range of measures to track the cultural shift, including staff surveys, some would be measured in the outcomes seen and some in relationships with communities.

The PCC highlighted the response to County Lines would be changing from Force wide oversight to local and asked how ASP would balance that with the risk. The CC advised that Remedy had become the default team to respond to this but there were other teams available and other specialisms that would be brought together.

#### **b) Keeping Town Centres Safe this Summer – letter from the Home Secretary**

The Board discussed the letters received by the PCC and the CC and the requirements set out. There had been more clarity and detail provided by the government around the expectations and the performance framework for the initiative. ASP had begun work to respond to the requirements and noted the first deadline of 6 June to respond to the Home Secretary. ASP confirmed they would invite the PCC's team to join the working group once it was established.

ASP were already in a good place to be able to meet some of the requirements set out, such as the performance framework, training for Neighbourhood Teams, having a named officer on the website for neighbourhood areas and responding in 72 hours.

There were some areas that would require some work, such as the summer demand period. ASP would tackle the perception that Neighbourhood work stops in the summer, noting the data does not support this perception.

The PCC highlighted the partnership work that would be needed to meet the requirements set out and the short timescale for responding. The PCC also highlighted areas that were not explicitly detailed in the letter which included victims and how this work would support victims and communication with victims. The CC confirmed there would be work to build expertise and confidence within Neighbourhood teams to communicate with their communities in a more dynamic way than just online, sharing consequences/activity/action taken. It was believed this would help address some of the misinformation and disinformation being seen.

The PCC sought, and received, assurance that ASP would not lose sight of the Areas for Improvement as this work developed. The Board noted there would be a significant amount of intensive joint working over the coming weeks and this was a greater investment than just the summer period.

#### **Additional business**

The PCC and her team sought an update on the temporary uplift of two Custody Inspectors and six Detention Officers, that had been agreed for a temporary period of a year, at the August CMB. ASP confirmed a detailed piece of work was underway and would update the PCC as this progressed.

## **4 Finance**

The Director of Finance and Business Services presented slides to the Board setting out headlines from the MTFP, planned savings and the next steps/further opportunities.

The deficit in the MTFP required savings of £3m per year, each year, for the next 4 years.

Planned savings included the £1.3m already achieved through reductions in PCSO numbers. Some savings in Police Staff Investigators had been achieved through attrition and this had minimised the redundancy needs. The business case for these savings was expected in the summer and would outline the redeployment anticipated. The PCC's team clarified what roles would be suitable for PSIs to redeploy into and were advised there would be Scale 6 roles available in other areas of ASP.

The non-pay related savings were on track and included £1m related to ERP, £500k related to Airwave and some fuel reduction costs.

By 2029/30 ASP's budget was projected to have £12m deficit even with planned savings.

In terms of next steps/further opportunities:

- ASP had been working to analyse and understand and then reduce the overtime spend and improvements had been seen.
- The ASP Strategic Planning Meeting (SPM) had identified savings of £350k across different posts.
- A 1% efficiency mindset had been agreed for all directorate budgets and the first submission from Directorate Heads on their plans for this were due in advance of the May SPM.
- Processes were to be reviewed across ASP to identify any possible savings.
- ASP were exploring collaboration opportunities with Regional colleagues.

The PCC's CFO requested an update on the work undertaken to understand the overtime figures and was advised that analysis of information across different systems continued and ASP expected to include budget planning for overtime in a fairer way going forward, understanding what was normal for different departments and allowing for this in plans.

## **5 Constabulary Change Portfolio**

### **a) Portfolio Highlight Report**

The PCC had requested information in advance of the Board meeting regarding two projects that had been listed as 'Emerging Risk' within the report. Updates had been provided in both cases and there were no concerns raised as a result.

The Portfolio Delivery Manager advised that there would be a tidy up and reset of the approach to the Portfolio and a number of project closures were expected ahead of the next meeting. The portfolio numbers would be more stable as a result of this work.

### **b) Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)**

The PCC highlighted action 41/24, which related to the procurement process for a new physical access system to the Director of Information Technology due to the urgent nature of the request for sign off by the PCC which had subsequently been amended and was no longer urgent. The Director provided an update to the background of the request and confirmed

lessons had been learned to reduce the likelihood of a repeat situation. The PCC agreed the action could be closed.

The Board noted the report and the Director of Information Technology noted 3 additional points since it had been produced:

- ASP were close to being contract ready with the new implementation partner and the assessment phase was expected to begin the following week. This would be the start of the 6 week period with workshops booked across functional areas to consider the architect and design so far. A detailed report of implementation plans and costs would be provided at the end of the 6 week period, expected in the first week of June.
- The Director had met with Chief Executives at Oracle and shared the feedback provided by the PCC previously around their reputation and links to the original implementation partner. Oracle had responded positively and improved ASP's engagement with their senior executive team.
- The SAP contingency risks were monitored through the Confidence and Legitimacy Committee and activities have been identified to mitigate these risks.

### **c) Operating Model**

The Chief Superintendent, Directorate of the Chief of Staff provided a further update on the six Detention Officer posts, noting there may be a need for an interim agreement between the agreed funding coming to an end in August and the implementation of the operating model work.

The Board received an oral update on the Operating Model work:

- ASP had announced the move to the 3 geographical areas operating model. The 3 areas were Bristol; North East and Somerset.
- Due to the number of considerations the full business case was not ready this month and the team were working towards a launch of the model in the autumn. Some technical elements to the change may need to follow later in the year.
- Workshops had been planned for the following week to work through the detailed step by step process.
- The work was drawing resources from HR Planning and Corporate Communications.
- The CC had given a steer to the team around the minimum requirements to deliver by autumn and the need to have visible local leadership at local levels.
- The CC expected the move to the local geographical model to remove the siloed working and deliver performance outcomes rather than process activity.
- It was noted the SAP/ERP structures might not be aligned at the same time as the changes to the operating model.

The PCC asked what the risks were of the all the changes not aligning perfectly. ASP were working to understand that, speaking to other police forces who had delivered quick changes and learning from their lessons.

## **6 Chief Constable's Update**

The Chief Constable provided an oral update to the Board, sharing her areas of concern and focus, which had been discussed at the SPM earlier in the month. The CC has 3 clear priorities for the coming year:

- Improving outcomes for the public
- Shifting their performance framework and management to be outcomes focused
- Service leadership

The CC and her team were looking at all the risks, the SWOT analysis and the Force Management Statement to check whether there were any gaps they were not attending to in their plans and they were assessing these risks to determine whether they needed to be tolerated, terminated or dealt with. 8 or 9 areas had been identified to be reviewed and some were being taken forward such as the gap in Strategic Analysis. The move to service leadership the CC had planned was underway with the support of the People and Organisational Development team.

The CC was exploring collaboration at Local Authority level as part of the Neighbourhood Policing Guarantee work but also to consider any savings that may be possible. The CC wanted to issue a joint position statement with the PCC around collaboration.

The CC had been reassured by the work undertaken that the plan was fit for purpose and had a clear understanding of the gaps to focus on.

The CC noted both the opportunities and the challenges presented by the Neighbourhood Policing Guarantee.

The CC noted the uncertainty caused by global political and economic factors and what that might mean for significant world events that might divert police attention to.

While the PCC recognised the importance of the People and OD Department in moving to a model of service leadership it was much broader than this: internal communication and leadership was essential to making this happen. The focus on service leadership would also be a good story to share with the communities of A&S. The CC acknowledged the work that would be need to get to that stage.

The PCC's CFO provided positive feedback on the SPM, noting the preparation ahead of it and the good structure and chairing at the meeting.

## **7 PEEL Question – How good is the force's service for victims of crime?**

This PEEL question relates to Priority 4 of the Police and Crime Plan.

ASP advised the PCC that Deryck Rees, Temporary Assistant Chief Constable had been appointed as the new Chief Officer lead for Victims.

The Head of Victim Care, Safeguarding and Vulnerability highlighted key points from the report and the PCC and her team asked questions throughout. What follows is a summary of discussion points:

- The Lighthouse Safeguarding Unit (LSU) are responding to victim contact tasks more quickly once they have received them, but there is still work to do on the timeliness of the tasks being sent to LSU in the first place.
- LSU tasks received too early – e.g. where the risk assessment has not yet been added to the system – and the process to ensure these cases are followed-up promptly.
- Bright Light – taking the Soteria/Bluestone approach to Domestic Abuse (DA). The academic findings will be reported in the next couple of months and this will provide insight into how to improve the experience for DA victims.
- It is also expected that the Bright Light work on DA victims may help more broadly with how officers and staff work with victims and the importance of the processes they go through.
- With lower priority incidents, and those that take longer to respond to, ASP are looking at their ongoing risk assessment process for these cases.
- Compliance with Victims' Code of Practice is essential and ASP are building tier 1 assurance (done by departments) that will look at multiple aspects of how a case has been handled and this assurance will be collated centrally by ASP to provide a better insight into how well they are meeting these victim's rights.
- A new Victims Information Pack was launched by ASP this year: it will help provide better information to victims and better compliance with VCOP.
- ASP are piloting Enhanced Video Response and early indications are that this is being received well by victims. It was discussed how video calls could be used more broadly but acknowledge the need to manage any additional risk created by the officer not being physically in the presence of the victim.
- Crime Data Integrity (CDI) issues will be helped by the dedicated teams that deal with CDI – and this has shown to work well in other forces – and an increase in Quality Assurance.
- ASP will soon be launching a new Victim Voice Survey: starting with lower harm offences to understand how this will be received and the uptake of it. The OPCC have been involved in the development of the survey and when the survey is live can play a role in promoting this to victims.

## **8 Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA) and Control Strategy**

The Board noted this was a review/refresh of the STRA from last year rather than a full new product.

The PCC requested more explanation of the table that showed the current threat level, response, and changes to key crime themes and enablers, which showed Youth Harm and VAWG with 'Severe' threat level ratings and 'Moderate' and 'Minimal' responses, which she felt didn't accurately reflect the work ASP undertook in those areas. ASP acknowledged there was an issue with capturing and recording the resource and activity going into these areas and there was a plan to provide strategic coordination to address this. It was noted the method for calculating the threat level is standardised across the country, but the response assessment was more subjective.

The Board discussed the process behind the creation of the table and assessments made to inform the ratings within it, with some reflection on how to bring the process into the governance arrangements. ASP acknowledged the issue and undertook to ensure the process was more reflective of actual resource and activity in future.

The Board discussed the recommendations set out in the Control Strategy, which had all been agreed by ASP. The first of these, an implementation of a Strategic Tasking and Coordination Group was in progress and once established would go some way to addressing the gap identified above.

## **9 Items for Publication**

- Minutes for March GSB

**A.O.B**

**Date of the next Governance and Scrutiny Board: 13 May 2025 11:30-15:00**