| No | Para | Date | Topic | Action/Paper | Owner | Due Date | Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | 28/09/2016 | Counter Terrorism – Firearms capability | The Audit and Risk Committee to monitor challenges in the Force's ability to recruit firearms officers, examine effectiveness of incentives. | PC | 5 December 2016 | Remitted to the A&RAC |
| 2 | 22.1. | 28/09/2016 | Airwave Replacement | Members received full report on Airwave at September meeting, highlighting that costs might treble under ESMCP proposals - strong disadvantage by being a Tier 2 organisation. Some progress by driving cost-per-device down. DfT has had greater involvement in discussions lately, now seeking granularity from HO on long-term savings following initial investment. DfT have warned that they have no contingency as there was no SR15 bid.  Further update in November, particularly covering any slippages in timetable. | PC / AF / DM (DfT) | 10 November 2016. | A paper to be tabled if there is an update to be given. |
| 3 | | 28/09/2016 | Airwave Replacement | To discuss Highways Agency position re use of ESMCP should IPP progress further. | AF/ PC | 10 November 2016. | The Chief Executive has sent a letter to the Chief Executive of the Highways Agency. |
| 4 | 19.1. | 28/09/2016 | Infrastructure Policing project | The Authority agreed that representations should be made to the UK Government setting out the BTPA's position that a case for change has not been made. Subject to the Government direction on this, a small sub-group of Members could be formed to oversee the development of the proposals. | IF/AF | 10 November 2016 | Letter sent and response received from Mark Sedwill on 24 October noting the issues raised by BTPA and that these have been identified by the project team and will be considered further as required. |
| 5 | - | 28/09/2016 | Crime Review | Further update after consultation closes on 25 November. | PC | 8 December 2016. | Reporting to the 8 December Authority meeting. |
| 7 | 6.1 | 28/09/2016 | Scottish Devolution | DfT provided the Department's policy position but not a legal advice over potential challenges to the use of Police Fund monies to support the Scottish Government plans. Finance Committee to consider the matter further at its meeting in October. | DM (DfT) | 21 October 2016 | |
| 8 | 6.1 | 28/09/2016 | Scottish | Project Manager in place by October – | DM (DfT) | 10 November | Leigh Bura started in post on 31 |

| | | | Devolution | approvals from DfT pending. | | 2016 | October. Approvals from the DfT have been received. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | | 28/09/2016 | Demand and Resource | Members asked to see success criteria for the Demand and Resource Changes, to measure improvements on rest-day cancellations, overtime, abstractions etc. Team to put together a 1-page summary of KPI or Success measures. | MD | 10 November 2016 | This is attached below as Appendix A to this document. |
| 10 | | 28/09/2016 | Governance - Culture | Liz France and Mark Phillips to visit Kent OPCC to see Governance arrangements and report back to the Authority. | JN | 10 November 2016 | Jon is speaking to the OPCC office to make arrangements for a delegation from the Authority to visit |
| 11 | | 28/09/2016 | Member recruitment | DfT approvals pending – new Members to be in post by November meeting. | DM (DfT) | 10 November 2016 | Offer letters have been sent to the preferred candidates who have now all been approved. It is anticipated that the new members will be in place by the beginning of December and there will be an induction event on 8 December. |

**Key:**

AF      Andrew Figgures
EMc    Esther McVey
PC      Paul Crowther
SD      Simon Downey
MD      Marie Daniels
IF       Iggi Falcon
DM      Dan Moore (DfT)
JN      Jonathon Newton

## Appendix A: Demand, Resources and Deployment Programme - Benefits Realisation Plan

| Benefit Description | Category | Measurement Methodology | Outcomes/Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reduction in planned lone working (lone working may still occur due to abstraction) | Effectiveness - duty of care to employees | Number of shifts where officers are rostered to work stations alone before and after implementation | Reduction in the number of stations with planned lone working |
| Reduction in rest day cancellations with a particular focus on weekends (process of protection) | Efficiency | Number of rest day working cancellations before and after implementation with weekends being recorded distinctly | Reduction in the number of cancelled rest days per month |
| Reduction in short notice duty changes | Efficiency | Number of short notice duty changes before and after implementation | Reduction in the number of short notice duty changes per month |
| Reduction in planned and casual overtime | Efficiency | Number of hours of planned and hours of casual overtime before and after implementation. | Reduction in planned and casual overtime completed by frontline PCs and PCSOs |
| Improved ability to maximise the organisational benefits of flexible working arrangements (FWA) | Effectiveness - improved use of FWAs to cover gaps in resilience | Information on application of FWAs available including their alignment to demand | Availability of standardised information on FWAs, and the rate of compliance with the demand profile at stations with FWAs |
| Reduced night working | Efficiency | Number of night time hours worked before and after implementation. | Reduction in hours of night work undertaken by frontline PCs and PCSOs. |
| Reduced numbers of rosters leading to a fairer distribution of unsocial hours working and an improved integration of rosters across locations. | Efficiency | Number of rosters before and after implementation | Reduction in the number of rosters in use across BTP |
| Improved governance over roster patterns | Effectiveness - governance in place and reduction in volume of shift patterns, shift patterns aligned to demand | Number of rosters after post implementation compared to those at the end of the project to show additional rosters have not crept in. | Maintain number of rosters within agreed tolerance levels (TBC) |

| Improved management information on deployment | Effectiveness | Percentage of planned duties actually realised on DMS before and after implementation | (TBC)% compliance of actual duties with planned duties as reported on the Workforce Live application |
|---|---|---|---|
| Increased numbers of officers on at times of peak demand | Efficiency | Reduced number of under resourced hours in the demand model | Increased number of resources available at agreed peak demand times |
| Improved ability to move resources onto and off the 'Go Critical' rosters during major or critical incidents. | Effectiveness | Performance in critical incident trials, availability of go critical plans for rosters | Performance appraisals following critical incident trials |

## Programme Review and Evaluation

1.	The project will make regular progress reports to the Service Improvement Board (SIB) via the DRD Programme Board, as well as updating the Service Excellence Board as required.

2.	The resource allocation and core roster proposals will be subject to formal consultation with affected employees and relevant trade unions, as well as a final review and approval by the Force Executive Board before implementation.

3.	Formal review stages for the core rosters and resource allocation will be set at three, six, nine and twelve months after implementation.  These reviews will look at benefits realisation, whether the rosters and resource allocations support operational policing as required and whether further imporvements can be made.

4.	The reason for stipulating these review stages is that the organisation will need to ensure cultural and business change is properly and sustainably embedded into business as usual and the impact of seasonal demand and longer term patterns in crimes and incidents are taken into account.

5.	A project level Post Implementation Review will be carried out one month after implementation to assess the delivery methodology and identify lessons for future changes.

6.	All reviews and evalutions will be supported by the Learning Exploitation Centre to ensure their quality and objectiveness.