

Minutes

Policing Plan working group

Thursday 04 October 2012, 10.00am
at The Forum, 74-80 Camden Street

The Forum
5th Floor North
74-80 Camden Street
London NW1 0EG

T: 020 7383 0259
F: 020 7383 2655
E: general.enquiries
@btpa.police.uk

www.btpa.police.uk

Present:

Mr Michael Holden (Chair)
Mr David Franks
Ms Liz France

Apologies:

Mr Lew Adams
Mr Brian Phillpott

In attendance:

Mr Paul Crowther, Deputy Chief Constable BTP
Mr Alan Pacey, Assistant Chief Constable Territorial Policing
BTP
Mr Mike Furness, Head of Strategic Development BTP
Mr Jamie McDougall, Performance and Analysis Manager BTP
Mr Andrew Figgures, Chief Executive BTPA
Mrs Sam Elvy, Research and Policy Manager BTPA
Mr Jon Newton, Performance Analyst BTPA (Minutes)

06/2012 Welcome and apologies

Non Agenda

The Chair welcomed all colleagues to the Policing Plan Working Group (PPWG) meeting. Apologies were received for Lew Adams and Brian Phillpott.

07/2012 Terms of Reference

Agenda Item 1

Mr Holden invited comments on the proposed Terms of Reference for the Policing Plan Group in 2013/14. Mr Figgures informed the Group of the context around the Policing Plan and Strategy process. He stated that the new Police Service Agreement (PSA) will be signed by 31st March 2013 and that, so far, the process followed has been sufficient. He stated, however, that the Authority and BTP need to ensure that they are totally compliant with the current legislation. It is necessary to ensure that we can demonstrate that the outputs of the Policing Plan Group are compliant with Sections 50 and 52 of the Railways and Transport Safety

Act 2003. There was discussion about these Sections of this Act and about the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

The Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003, Section 50 (Policing objectives: Authority) states that

- (1) Before the beginning of each financial year the Authority shall set objectives for policing the railways during that year.*
- (2) The objectives—*
 - (a) may relate to a matter addressed by objectives set by the Secretary of State under section 51, and*
 - (b) must be consistent with those objectives.*
- (3) In setting the objectives for a year the Authority shall—*
 - (a) consult the Chief Constable, and*
 - (b) have regard to opinions expressed in accordance with section 62.*

Section 52 (Railways policing plan) of the same Act states that

- (1) Before the beginning of each financial year the Authority shall issue a plan setting out the proposed arrangements for policing the railways during that year.*
- (2) The plan for a year must include a statement of—*
 - (a) the Authority's priorities for the year,*
 - (b) the financial resources which the Authority expects to be available, and*
 - (c) the proposed allocation of resources.*
- (3) The plan for a year must specify—*
 - (a) any objective set by the Authority for that year under section 50,*
 - (b) any objective by the Secretary of State for the year under section 51, and*
 - (c) any performance target set by the Authority in relation to the achievement of an objective for that year (whether set under section 53 or otherwise).*
- (4) A plan for a year must be consistent with the relevant three-year strategy plan issued by the Authority under section 55.*
- (5) The Chief Constable shall submit to the Authority a draft plan for each financial year.*
- (6) Before issuing a plan which differs from the Chief Constable's draft the Authority shall consult him.*
- (7) In preparing a plan the Chief Constable and the Authority shall have regard to any guidance given by the Secretary of State about railways policing plans.*
- (7A) Before issuing or revising any guidance under subsection (7) the Secretary of State shall consult—*
 - (a) the Authority,*
 - (b) the Chief Constable, and*
 - (c) such other persons as the Secretary of State thinks fit."*
- (8) The Authority shall—*

- (a) publish each plan under this section, and*
- (b) send a copy of each plan under this section to the Secretary of State.*

Action: The Group agreed that the Terms of Reference should be updated to include Sections 50 and 52 of the Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003; the Terms of Reference to then be approved in the next Policing Plan Group meeting.

08/2012 Issues raised by stakeholders in 2012/13

Agenda Item 2

Mrs Elvy provided an overview of the Planning Workshop Summary Report. She informed the Group that there was broad agreement with the scale and position of the policing landscape. Issues highlighted by stakeholders included cyber-crime and fraud, although these may be more relevant for the forthcoming strategy rather than the Policing Plan.

There was also a strong message at the workshop indicating a desire for greater partnership working. The stakeholders felt that crime reductions had been very successful, but that there was now a need to think about where to focus these efforts. Ms France stated that this should be reflected in the balancing of local and national targets.

There was support and thanks for the disruption reduction work, and it was accepted that this needed a partnership response. It was suggested that response times be made more visible, albeit without setting an improvement target. The force performs well in this regard and is well within the national standards.

Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), and whether it should be included as a national or local target, was discussed at the workshop. There was also discussion about whether to focus on crime reduction or detections.

The stakeholders supported the current year's value for money targets but gave no obvious suggestions for how to follow these up. They felt that the force had been successful at reducing sickness and questioned whether there were any more gains to be had, unless there was a specific focus that could be considered. The stakeholders would welcome benchmarking work; there was mention of work by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA).

The stakeholders felt that overall last year the force was close to where it should be. They would like to see, in the forthcoming year, fewer more meaningful, national targets and more of an emphasis at a local level, such as with the current year's disruption reduction targets.

Ms France informed the Group that, on her table, at the Workshop the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC) wanted BTP to accept that it did not have to assume responsibility for doing everything. She questioned whether the force could make clear that it has access to specialist advice, and reflect in national plans that it could explore other providers. DCC Crowther stated that this had been a recurring theme, and that the force currently works with security and safer travel teams. The question is whether people would want them to do more and BTP to do less. This would require some sort of binding contractual agreement that they cannot back out of. Ms France suggested some sort of local policing plan target to reflect maximising all resources.

DCC Crowther informed the Group that he was keen to do more on reducing disruption and proposed a high level agreement between Network Rail and ATOC to sign-up to reducing disruption. This would be an alliance to reduce crime and disruption rather than just having BTP as a supplier.

Mr Holden proposed a joint objective be included within the policing plan. This could have a collective focus based at area level; the force would lead and if Network Rail or the Train Operating Companies (TOCs) do not contribute the required effort then issues could be escalated. There was discussion in the Group about how to get sign-up to such a plan and how the force could escalate issues. Mr Franks suggested that BTP become part of the Rail Delivery Group (RDG). He suggested that BTP focuses locally, getting all areas to agree route plans; if a plan is deviated from then this could be raised at the RDG. DCC Crowther agreed that, with the correct emphasis, this could potentially be useful but that he would not want this to be a forum for BTP to be challenged on performance against the Policing Plan. It would be useful if BTP could become an integral part of finding and delivering solutions involving the RDG.

Mr Holden and DCC Crowther suggested that the objective here could be to achieve a percentage reduction for a performance metric and to integrate BTP into the national planning and monitoring performance framework. There was general agreement that it would make sense for the BTP to be involved with the RDG.

Action: Mr Holden to propose BTP attendance at future RDG meetings.

Mr Franks queried how cyber-crime and policing should be addressed. Mrs Elvy suggested that this be reflected in the new strategy rather than the Policing Plan as, although this was discussed at the Stakeholder Workshop, the stakeholders were unsure as to how to deal with it. DCC Crowther informed the Group that, as they don't yet fully understand the nature of the problem, the force would be commissioning a problem profile type assessment on fraud/ticketing/technology issues.

DCC Crowther stated that he broadly endorsed the content of the Summary Report but that, although it was not discussed at his table, he felt that increased passenger and freight traffic would almost certainly result in increased demand; even if there is not an increase in crime there would likely be an increase in the number of incidents and requests for service. Mr Figgures informed the Group that this was an important point to reflect in the forthcoming strategy. There may not be an increase in crime, but there would be an increased impact and this would be reflected in increased value.

Action: Mrs Elvy to reword the relevant section of the Planning Workshop Summary Report and to send a copy to DCC Crowther for comment.

09/2012 BTP Strategic Assessment and other inputs

Agenda Item 3

DCC Crowther informed the Group that BTP's Strategic Assessment was very comprehensive but that there was some feedback, at the Stakeholder Workshop, suggesting there was not enough emphasis on Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs).

The only other addition is with regard to the current context; that is the general acceptance that funding is broadly set out in the MTFP and that it does not change dramatically, it would be useful for the force to get a prediction of the financial position. The planning assumes a certainty of budget, no major terrorist incidents and an emerging strategy that does not throw up any major changes in which the force operates.

There was a discussion about the timing of the forthcoming strategic plan and aligning its dates with industry. The forthcoming strategic plan should not affect the 2013/14 Policing Plan, as this will be based on the currently published strategy. Year one of the new plan will not affect the Policing Plan until 2014.

10/2012 Agreed next steps

Agenda Item 4

Mr Holden informed the Group that there are currently four high level objectives aligned with the current strategic plan. There has been a general view to retain these but rationalise the national targets that sit under them, supported by detailed local plans.

DCC Crowther stated that the disruption objective would have two or three targets. The first target would focus on fatalities; there would be a move from a target on non-suspicious fatalities to one that also

encompasses unexplained fatalities. Mr Franks stated that, from an industry perspective, the 90 minutes target is fairly well ingrained into people's knowledge and that if there was an increase on this time then it may be difficult to sell. ACC Pacey informed the Group that there was currently an 83 minutes average clearance time for unexplained and non-suspicious incidents, but that this does not include suspicious fatalities. Previously it was unexplained fatalities causing the outliers for average clearance times, there were very few suspicious fatalities.

There was a discussion about whether or not to include suspicious fatalities within the target time and whether doing this would have an effect on the overall average delay minutes. ACC Pacey highlighted the need for care when considering the inclusion of suspicious fatalities, also raising ethical questions about doing this. Mr Figgures reiterated the 90 minutes clearance time and stated that a new target should not be an increase on this number. There was agreement with this proposal and that there could possibly be a footnote with the target to say that suspicious fatalities were excluded.

The second disruption related target would be to reduce overall police-related delay minutes. Mr Holden queried whether this would include on-train disruption. There was some discussion about how possible it would be to get this data, as it would be buried within the force's crime records, and how it would be measured. Mr Furness informed the Group that a pilot had previously taken place in the London South area. This may have addressed some of the accessibility questions. ACC Pacey asked Mr Holden whether it would be possible to get hold of some East Coast Mainline disruption data for these incidents, for a period of approximately one month, in order to get an indication of the probable size of this type of issue. DCC Crowther stated that he would not want to progress with including this category unless it is a significant problem, as it is unclear as to how the issue could be addressed.

Action: Mr Furness to provide an overview of the London South pilot to the next Policing Police Group.

Action: Mr Holden to provide the requested disruption data to BTP.

The third target under the disruption objective would be to increase detections for level crossing offences; this could be a local target.

Mr Holden stated that it would be difficult to not have a target under the second objective, helping to make the railway safer and more secure, which did not focus on the number of crimes and detections. DCC Crowther informed the Group that overall crime reduction and detection rate maintenance targets are well suited to local policing targets.

Mr Holden informed the Group that the stakeholders he spoke to, at the Stakeholder Workshop, struggled to find something relevant for third objective, delivering value for money through continuous improvement. He proposed a value for money target that was based around a ratio of front-line costs compared to back-office costs. DCC Crowther proposed a target along the lines of increasing the percentage of overall resources devoted to front-line policing. Mr Furness had done some work to define these roles based on HMIC data. Mr Franks stated that the industry generally just wants to pay less, however, they do need to know what the force is trying to achieve. The Policing Plan contribution to the MTFP is to ensure the greatest possible percentage is devoted to the front-line. Internally, the force does not want to lose focus on sickness, but there could be a focus on availability. Mr Holden queried whether this target could be defined with a metric and whether there should possibly be two targets.

DCC Crowther informed the Group that, with regard to the fourth objective, to promote confidence in the use of the railways, there was a drive to further improve late-night visibility. There could be a focus on late night and football related disorder rather than just ASB. There was a desire to not criminalise people for minor byelaw infringements, but to focus on Disorder Act type offences.

To conclude, Mr Holden stated that there should be a first draft of these objectives by the next Policing Plan meeting, on 4th December. They would then go to the Authority meeting on 13th December. This would be followed by consultation before going to the Policing Plan Group meeting on 21st February 2013.

11/2012 AOB

Agenda Item 5

There was no other business.

12/2012 Date of next meetings: 4th December 2012, 2-4pm

Agenda Item 6