



## Minutes

### Policing Plan Working Group

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> September 2010

**Venue:** Friends Meeting House, Euston

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](mailto:general.enquiries@btpa.police.uk)

[www.btpa.police.uk](http://www.btpa.police.uk)

---

#### Present:

Sir David O'Dowd (Chair)

Mr Lew Adams

Mr James King (part)

Mrs Elizabeth France

Mr Michael Holden

#### In attendance:

Mr Andrew Trotter, Chief Constable

Mr P Crowther, Deputy Chief Constable

Mr Alan Pacey, Assistant Chief Constable Territorial Policing

Mr M Furness, Senior Advisor, Corporate Support Group

Mr S Peel, Temporary Head Strategic Services

Mr Andrew Figgures, Chief Executive BTPA

Mrs S Elvy, Research & Policy Manager (Minutes)

## 01/2010 INTRODUCTION

### Non Agenda

The Chair opened the meeting by thanking all attendees for their support in relation to the preceding stakeholder workshop; an event which had been attended by over 30 Police Service Agreement (PSA) holders and other industry partners. The Chair then explained that he was seeking to achieve two outcomes from the meeting, first to agree the basic principles and direction of travel for future work on the 2011/12 BTP Policing Plan; second that the group agreed the principles and issues to be taken forward from those raised at the stakeholder consultation event on 28<sup>th</sup> September (copy of note in file).

Not protectively marked

Mr Holden recommended that any discussions at this, and subsequent meetings of the Group, take place in the context of an uncertain budget settlement for BTP in 2011/12. While he noted that this was usually the case for this first meeting of the Group, the financial context was materially different this year and this needed to be borne in mind. Mr Adams suggested that broad themes could be discussed now and prioritisation could be done when the financial settlement has been agreed.

The Chair asked what impact these headline themes would have on the number and types of targets emerging. Given that stakeholders were also content with the current plan he asked whether there was an ambition to reduce the size of the overall list or remain static.

Mr King suggested that continuity of focus would be valued by stakeholders; Mrs France proposed that consolidation of issues would also be needed to minimise scattering of priorities. She asked for clarification on how the Policing Plan process articulated with the rest of BTPA's business cycle; Mrs Elvy explained that this was set out in BTPA's annual Plan. The Chair noted that the timings of various aspects of the business cycle did create some tensions.

**Action: Mrs Elvy to circulate an extract of the BTPA business cycle to illustrate where the Policing Plan Group work articulates with work of the rest of the Authority's Committees and Groups.**

The Deputy Chief Constable suggested that discussions around the themes could continue whilst early stage debates about the budget settlements were ongoing. Ambitions could then be scaled up or down depending on the size of the budget; the Chair acknowledged that this was broadly the process followed in the past.

## **02/2010 ISSUES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS IN 2010/11**

Agenda Item 1

These were noted.

## **03/2010 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Agenda Item 2

Noting the issues raised in the introductory discussion the proposed terms of reference for the Group were **agreed**.

## **04/2010 FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP 28.09.10**

Agenda Item 3

Not protectively marked

The Chair invited the Group to reflect on the discussions at the stakeholder workshop session on 28<sup>th</sup> September; and to then propose a way to take forward the feedback received. Members reported that all attendees were of the view that recent performance, and delivery against the current plan, was good and still improving. However, there was also a general concern about the ongoing costs of these improvements and whether these represented value for money. The clear message emerging for the future was the same standard of delivery was required at reduced cost. Mr Adams recommended that all future assessments about value for money from BTP must be considered in terms of the likely rates of rail passenger growth; if performance was maintained for less cost against a background of greater passenger numbers then this demonstrated increasing value for money.

There was a consensus that stakeholders were in broad agreement with the four proposed 'headline' themes which were as follows;

- Reducing crime
- Reducing disruption - key priority in the future
- Improving value for money
- Increasing confidence

It was noted that most stakeholders did not formally want to prioritise one set of issues over another; however overall, reducing disruption seemed to have emerged as the most pressing issue. Mr Adams added that there was a role for all partners around reducing disruption, for example Network Rail could support the processes by working to open up rail lines earlier but in a way that didn't compromise BTP's safe and thorough investigation of incident scenes. Mr Holden agreed with this assessment, adding that all partners had to work together more effectively to identify and manage all causes of disruption.

Mrs France suggested that the 90mins fatality disruption target was now engrained within BTP and that a similar position should be sought for other causes of disruption. The Chair noted that much of the stakeholder discussion around disruption related to a possible move to an overall delay minutes target rather than the current average hand back time. Mrs France urged the force not to measure a range of separate incident types against the disruption theme, but to take a holistic approach to this area of work. Mr Peel noted the need to identify and exploit existing data sets in support of this work; for example the current Network Rail database. Mr Holden emphasised that this area of work was a further example of BTP's USP as a national and dedicated resource for the railways.

Not protectively marked

Mrs France asked whether there was any value in BTPA knowing about when delays were caused by the attendance of non-BTP resources. Mr King suggested that the ideal was to develop a single tasking process and to get the nearest available resource there as quickly as possible regardless of where this had come from. The Deputy Chief Constable confirmed that this was the existing approach and was delivered via the central call management system.

He further noted that the main challenge for BTP around disruption at this stage was accessing accurate and appropriate data from a range of sources. For example on BTP's London Underground Area; BTP and partner data was used to carry out a detailed debrief after incidents where there had been a significant delay. The Chair noted that BTP needed to maintain pressure on partners to provide and scrutinise this information with BTP.

Mr Figgures added that a theme of increasing transparency around value for money and efficiency had also emerged. Mr Peel noted that while this was raised as a topic no steer was given around what possible targets might actually arise under this heading. The Deputy Chief Constable queried whether the annual Policing Plan was an appropriate place for value for money targets; he also wondered what meaningful annual KPIs could be constructed around this but acknowledged that some further thought could be given to this. Mr King suggested that there could perhaps be scope to relate this to something qualitative, for example measures of partner satisfaction with local plans.

The Deputy Chief Constable proposed that this might best sit within the overarching rolling three year plan in the form of some commitment to maintain or improve service against a reducing cost base and rail passenger growth. Alternatively, some work could be done around possible indicators of resource utilisation rates. The Group collectively noted that the message emerging from stakeholders was to at least maintain delivery but at reduced cost. Mrs France noted that careful thought would need to be given to developing an appropriate and meaningful indicator for this. More generally she added that there was a clear indication that future plans should be outcome focused.

[Mr King left the meeting].

Mr Adams noted that a further emerging theme from stakeholders was a desire for improved communications, both in terms of telling them what BTP planned to do but also in relation to updating them on progress. Mr Peel queried whether this view might be in relation to communications on the three year Strategy rather than the annual plan which most operators seemed to be well sighted on.

The Chair asked what might logically evolve from the headline theme of 'increasing confidence'. Mrs France noted a discussion she'd been

Not protectively marked

involved in which suggested that this could be around increasing visibility; for example some indicator around number of officer train patrols carried out per per Area month. The Deputy Chief Constable highlighted the need for any survey work around confidence to be carried out in partnership with stakeholders; this needed in order to generate the right range of supporting information at the lowest possible cost.

The Chair summarised the discussion so far.

The four high level themes were supported and within these disruption and crime reduction were emerging as particularly important. Within the crime reduction theme there was a need to prioritise efforts and crimes against the person appeared to be the main focus. In relation to property crime, organised crime and crimes against railway assets should be the top priority. All types of disruption should be addressed, not just that relating to fatalities or cable theft, but again within this area of work some way of prioritising action should be developed – perhaps in relation to identifying key locations.

The Chief Constable suggested that a weighting mechanism be explored to allow the force to identify both local priority issues and locations within each overarching theme. In this way a national focus could be delivered locally and at the same time local priorities could be addressed and aggregated up to provide a national picture of performance in relation to each of the four headline themes. However, in doing so the Group would need to think carefully about what performance indicators were meaningful to the force, the Authority and to stakeholders. He also noted that he wanted to caution against local drift within these themes; for this reason emerging local plans would need to be challenged and tested by both BTP and the Group for their ability to support the higher level aims.

The Chief Constable asked for some guidance about what the magnitude of any crime reduction target might look like; or was this just a simple overall reduction? ACC Pacey suggested that within a static or reduced funding envelope, any ambitions to achieve further reductions in crime would actually be challenging to achieve. Mrs France suggested that for this reason, whatever target was set, the accompanying narrative was key and should clearly demonstrate the combined challenges of improving performance, for a reduced budget at a time of continuing passenger growth.

**Agreed: BTP to continue work on the development of draft common/national Plan with a set of targets framed against the following themes;**

Not protectively marked

- **Reducing crime**
- **Reducing disruption – key priority in the future**
- **Improving value for money**
- **Increasing confidence**

**A draft of the national Plan to be presented to the next meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2010; any further queries arising from BTP or BTPA to be picked up by the Group offline in the interim.**

**An update on progress with development of the local Area plans to also be provided at the next meeting.**

### **05/2009 AOB**

Agenda Item 4

There was no AOB.

The date of the next meeting is **December 10<sup>th</sup> 2010, 2-4pm.**