



## **Governance and Scrutiny Board Minutes – 14 April 2026 11:00-12:30 and 13:00-14:30**

**Venue: Conference Room, Police HQ**

**Chair: Karl Parfitt**

### **Attendees:**

Clare Moody, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)  
Sarah Crew, Chief Constable (CC)  
Jon Reilly, Deputy Chief Constable (DCC)  
Karl Parfitt, OPCC Chief Executive  
Sally Fox, OPCC Director of Performance and Accountability  
Paul Butler, OPCC Chief Finance Officer (CFO)  
James Davis, ASP Delivery Manager – Portfolio  
Vicky Ellis, OPCC Secretariat Manager (Minutes)

### **Partial meeting attendance:**

Nick Adams, Chief Officer – Finance, Resources and Innovation  
Nick Lilley, Director of Information Technology  
Richard Marsh, Detective Superintendent – Planning and Change  
Rachel Shields, Assistant Chief Constable

## **1 Apologies**

Kevin Slocombe, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC)  
Ben Valentine, OPCC Senior Performance and Governance Manager

## **2 Minutes and Action Updates**

Following one minor amend, the Minutes of the March Board were confirmed as an accurate record for publication.

Updates had been provided in relation to most open actions in advance of the meeting and those actions closed as a result. A summary of those carried over for additional work is provided:

- The PCC, DPCC, CC and DCC will discuss ways to increase awareness of the Police and Crime Plan and the Strategic Objectives across the workforce at a separate meeting in May.
- ASP continued to develop robust metrics for vetting processes.
- ASP would add narrative to a current report around the use of external counsel before providing it to the PCC.
- Further work was requested on the Comms plan for the work at the Yeovil Police site.
- A separate meeting had been booked to discuss potential work experience placements with ASP for children aged 14-18 years from minoritised communities.

## **3 Constabulary Change Portfolio**

## **a) ERP**

The Board received an oral update following the implementation of go-live for Phase 2 which had taken place over the Bank Holiday weekend. The implementation had been successful and there had been no significant concerns or issues reported and it was now considered a stable service.

The PCC and her team noted the significant work that had gone into the project and expressed their thanks to all involved.

The Director of IT and his team were preparing for Phase 3 and taking learnings from Phase 2. It was noted that there would be a need to supplement resources and strengthen the resilience in the team as Phase 3 was larger with more interdependencies.

Following questions from the PCC and her team, the Director of IT confirmed he had good confidence in the implementation partners to support the work. The risks with SAP were also in sight and there was a meeting later in the month to address the hardware related issues.

## **b) Operating Model (Oral)**

The PCC had provided questions in advance of the meeting, and these provided the basis for discussions in the meeting.

The Board noted that the programme was approximately five months into implementation and progressing positively. Early feedback suggested improved collaboration, coherence and consistency across teams, although outcomes were described as partially achieved at this early stage. Formal assessment would be supported by forthcoming pulse surveys and the next People Survey. The follow up project closure was scheduled for January 2027.

There was reported improvement in local visibility and identity, with positive feedback from partners and stakeholders noted by the PCC. The revised structure had highlighted differences in resourcing across areas, supporting work towards greater equity, and had strengthened focus on team contributions.

Despite significant workforce and structural change, no reduction in operational performance had been identified. Interfaces between BCUs and investigative teams were generally functioning as expected, with manageable tensions primarily related to case allocation rather than tasking. Mitigating actions were in place. Issues in allocation were recognised as pre-existing and were being addressed through refinement of tasking processes.

The Board noted improved oversight through consistent performance metrics, daily management meetings and clearer escalation routes, enhancing visibility of critical incidents and performance. High-risk issues were more readily identified, although assurance was sought that locally managed risks remained visible at a strategic level.

Greater line leadership accountability was emerging, though further clarity was required on roles and responsibilities within the revised governance and accountability framework. It was acknowledged that some leaders required additional support due to limited prior experience of the BCU model.

The work completed by Leapwise was being worked through by the People and Organisational Development Team.

The Board discussed the allocated programme budget for Op Model Phase 2 (Mosaic), noting the figures for known additional roles had been discussed at the Portfolio Steering Board in January. The budget for the changes was not yet known and would emerge as the Business Cases for the changes were developed. A preliminary solution was expected in June/July which would then progress through to a validated detailed proposal, expected to be implemented with the new financial year.

The Board discussed timelines for the implementation of phase two and noted that these would vary by programme element. It was reported that *Families First* was subject to a legislative timetable and was required to be operational by Spring of the following year.

The Board noted that a digital project, including the deployment of new kiosks, was expected to go live in the new year. Timelines for the wider operating model were less defined, as the scope of required changes was still being developed. It was confirmed that the current change freeze was due to end in November, at which point detailed solution design would inform the start of implementation. Some elements, such as risk and needs assessments, would sit outside the core operating model and follow separate timelines, dependent on decisions relating to Salesforce. Existing structures would remain in place in the interim.

It was also noted that the delivery of Pronto in the Autumn would provide enabling capability to support implementation of other elements of phase two.

It was confirmed there were sufficient and appropriate resources in the central team to deliver on the expectations.

### **c) Portfolio Highlight Report**

The PCC and her team welcomed the new format for the report.

The Board discussed the work at Yeovil, noting the positive feedback from the local community and stakeholders on the chosen location. The Board agreed the importance of managing expectations, updating stakeholders, and agreeing on proactive messaging regarding project timelines and potential delays.

The PCC requested additional information on the implementation of the upgrade to the physical access system, in particular around how ASP intended to maintain security throughout the roll out.

The DPCC thanked ASP for the work that had gone in to reviewing the detail of the SOZE contract prior to signing; the OPCC CX and ASP CFO agreed that a lessons process would also follow.

## **4 Chief Constable's Update**

The Chief Constable reflected on the four key issues that were uppermost in her mind.

- External context – this felt more uncertain than ever with international events, which threatened community cohesion, had increased hate crimes and protests. She acknowledged there had been some mitigation – through the improved community engagement model, CID now overseeing the hate crimes with significant community impact and preparations for response to protests. The emerging developing Anti-Racism work and a number of strands being brought together through that would also feed in.
- Police Reform – the pace and momentum of the national changes was beginning to feel like it was increasing, but also felt like ASP were influencing the direction a bit more, particularly the message about local work on collaboration.

- Exceptional police work – in the last month ASP had experienced a period of intense operational and non-operational demands, including the significant trauma of the unexpected death of a colleague. The Chief was proud of how her colleagues had risen to the demands, both officers and staff.
- Finally, the Chief acknowledged the learnings being shared from the incident in Southport and confirmed ASP would be considering any opportunities to improve their approach to counter-terrorism work.

The PCC acknowledged and shared many of the Chief's concerns. Starting with the report from Southport, the Board discussed the concern around the lack of diversionary activities for young people, noting this was an area of research by the Bath P-ACE were exploring, explicitly the social media impacts. Work was underway to research triggers for escalation and the extent to which online environments may be exacerbating harmful behaviours.

A potential fifth risk area was introduced, relating to emerging consequences of events in the Middle East. It was noted that these impacts were beginning to manifest in various ways, including protest activity in Ireland related to the cost and availability of fuels. Concerns were also raised by farming communities, with the potential for impacts at locations such as Avonmouth if similar protests occurred in England.

It was reported that there were no clear indications of government messaging regarding possible measures such as fuel rationing. It was noted that, while policing was likely to remain prioritised, other public sector services might be affected, including the possible closure of schools. It was observed that several European countries were planning more proactively for these eventualities. ASP confirmed their involvement in the national Gold Group meetings and would provide updates to the PCC's office.

The PCC noted examples of exceptionally strong policing performance. Positive feedback was recorded regarding local media briefings in particular.

## **5 Police and Crime Plan**

### **a) Crime Recording**

The PCC noted there had been anecdotal concerns raised that ASP were over-recording certain crimes, which appeared to be borne out in the data. The PCC sought to understand the issues identified and what ASP were doing to address them.

It was noted that, following earlier work to address under-recording, practice in some areas had shifted towards over-recording. While overall progress was positive, recent review indicated that some incidents were being recorded as crimes unnecessarily, with implications for outcome rates and public confidence.

The importance of achieving an accurate and balanced approach was emphasised, without reverting to past under-recording and ASP had work underway to address this. The Board highlighted the need for strong governance, oversight, and alignment with national standards. It was acknowledged that Avon and Somerset was currently an outlier nationally in relation to the interpretation of some offences.

The PCC noted the long-standing difficulty of achieving accurate comparisons of crime trends over time. It was observed that the most significant impacts of changes to crime recording would be seen in lower-volume offence types, rather than in high-volume crimes such as burglary.

The Chief identified an action to consider how frequently the governance arrangements for crime recording were reviewed, to ensure that practice remained ethical, accurate, and subject to appropriate challenge.

It was noted a new crime recording process had been implemented the day prior.

## **b) Unallocated Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (RASSO) cases**

The PCC noted that the Integrated Performance and Quality Report stated ASP were “at risk of ENGAGE” if the level of unallocated RASSO case wasn’t resolved.

It was noted that allocation had not been occurring consistently, partly due to supervisory concerns about detective capacity amid a national shortage. Some cases, often historic, had been retained by supervisors rather than allocated, a practice not supported by HMICFRS.

While the median time to allocation was improving, the majority of unallocated cases were new. An ACC was overseeing work to reduce unallocated cases to zero, with an expectation that cases would be allocated within seven days going forward. Improved experience levels among detectives and increased consistency at Senior Investigating Officer (SIO) level were expected to support this progress.

The Chief had stated her expectation of significant improvement by the end of June, with clear evidence of direction of travel, and noted that intervention would follow if progress was insufficient.

The Board discussed potential cultural issues around supervisory ownership of cases, noting that specialist detectives should be empowered to set their investigative strategy. The impact on victims was emphasised by the PCC, particularly the risk of harm caused by delayed allocation and insufficient escalation routes. Supervisors were confirmed as retaining responsibility for safeguarding and victim support, but the importance of timely engagement was reinforced.

## **c) Cuckooing**

The Board discussed assurance on ASP’s approach to tackling cuckooing and its consistency across the force. It was noted that this issue disproportionately affected vulnerable people and was closely linked to organised crime groups and drug supply.

An update was provided on Operation Trespass, which was being taken forward within ASP. While specific assurance metrics were not available at the meeting, it was confirmed that the force was actively addressing the issue. Examples were provided of preventative activity, including work in BANES undertaken in late 2024 employing best practice from a national initiative, where offenders targeted specific locations such as food banks. Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) were identified as leading the initial response once concerns were identified.

It was reported that operational processes had been strengthened, including the use of a Niche template for Operation Trespass and BRAG assessments, which triggered safeguarding responses through Lighthouse when thresholds were met. A partnership approach was in place involving NPTs, Lighthouse, and local authorities, recognising that victims may initially engage and later withdraw complaints. A range of tactical options were available, with an emphasis on wrap-around safeguarding.

Regional work under Operation Scorpion was also noted, including activity to identify and disrupt offending and visits to vulnerable individuals. Data from recent operations was being collated to assess impact, with an NPT-led plan in place. An offer was made to provide supporting data, which was welcomed by the PCC, with interest expressed in analysis at both BCU and regional levels.

Members noted links to the wider anti-social behaviour plan, including the use of closure orders alongside safeguarding measures. Concern was expressed about areas of deprivation and whether there were gaps in visibility of vulnerable individuals living in those communities

## **6 Monthly PEEL question: How good is the force at investigating crime?**

Priority 2

The Board considered performance against ASP's ambition to achieve a 15% positive outcome rate for victim-based crime, noting that the most recent annual rate stood at 9.7%. It was highlighted that meeting this ambition would require a substantial increase in positive outcomes on a monthly basis.

It was acknowledged that national changes to crime recording had affected outcome rates and that performance was closely linked to investigative capability and capacity. It was noted that achieving a 15% rate would place ASP within the top ten nationally. Increased use of community resolutions and a new operating model were identified as key enablers to improve performance.

The Chief advised that current activity was targeted at closing the gap, including work to increase investigative capacity, improve technology and tools, and strengthen priority response. Early improvements were being seen, and there was confidence that progress would continue.

The potential use of AI to support investigations was discussed, particularly in relation to statement-taking and quality assurance. It was emphasised that AI should support, rather than replace, professional judgement and human interaction with victims. Work was underway to explore appropriate and ethical use, including collaboration with academic partners and careful engagement with the CPS. It was noted that this approach could improve efficiency, capacity, and staff morale if implemented correctly.

A request was made for a demonstration of the Quality Assurance Tool, which was agreed, and it was noted that AI integration would be considered once the tool was fully embedded and understood by the workforce.

**Date of the next Governance and Scrutiny Board: 12 May 2026 11:00 - 12:30 and 13:00 - 14:30**