

PAPER NS14/16

NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK COLLABORATION PANEL

A meeting of the Panel was held in the Gymnasium, OCC, Police Headquarters, Wymondham, Norfolk on Wednesday 30 April 2014 at 10.30 am.

Present:

Norfolk

PCC's Office: Stephen Bett (PCC), John Hummersone (Chief Finance Officer), Jenny McKibben (Deputy PCC) and Mark Stokes (Chief Executive).

Constabulary: Simon Bailey (Chief Constable), Rupert Birtles (Assistant Chief Officer), Charlie Hall (Deputy Chief Constable) and Sarah Hamlin (Temporary Assistant Chief Constable).

Suffolk

PCC's Office: Chris Bland (Chief Finance Officer), Liz Hollingworth (Business Administration and Policy Officer), Christopher Jackson (Chief Executive), Sarah McNulty (Business Co-ordinator), Tim Passmore (PCC), and Claire Swallow (Deputy Chief Executive).

Constabulary: Phillip Clayton (Assistant Chief Officer), Paul Marshall (Deputy Chief Constable) and Douglas Paxton (Chief Constable).

Stephen Bett chaired the meeting.

PUBLIC AGENDA

Stephen Bett welcomed the attendees to the meeting and said that 45 minutes would be allocated after item 1 for comments and questions from the audience on the Contact and Control Room (CCR) and Shared Services Partnership (SSP). An appendix to the minutes has been produced summarising the comments and questions raised. Around 100 people were in attendance.

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Paper NS14/12]
 - 1.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2014 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

2. MANAGING THE CONSTABULARIES CHANGE PROGRAMMES 2014/15 to 2018/19
[Paper NS14/13]

- 2.1 This report was introduced by T/ACC Hamlin who outlined the collaborative working across 25 joint Department Heads.
- 2.2 There is still £36.7million of savings to find by 2018 and 16 areas have already been explored including CCR and SSP.
- 2.3 Overall, 77 projects are being considered and prioritised. The planned changes will be presented to the Collaboration Panel at the start of each calendar year.

3. SUMMARY POSITION OF CONTACT AND CONTROL ROOM AND SHARED SERVICES PARTNERSHIP [Paper NS14/14]

- 3.1 Chief Constable Simon Bailey (Norfolk) introduced the item saying the Collaboration Panel members had requested further work on the business cases that had been presented at the meeting on 27 February 2014. DCC Hall was asked to undertake the work with a joint team and more information on HR, ICT and Finance had been incorporated into the business cases. This additional information had been produced using a 'worst case' scenario approach and therefore the benefits could be greater.
- 3.2 DCC Hall outlined the work undertaken and reported that papers now in the public domain included:
- The original CCR and SSP business cases;
 - Target Operating Model;
 - Additional Information CCR;
 - Additional Information SSP.
- 3.3 The revised business cases had been considered by Chief Constables, Constabulary Chief Finance Officers and the PCC Chief Finance Officers. DCC Hall reminded the Panel that the recommendation is for the CCR to be in Wymondham and for SSP to be located in Suffolk.

Shared Services Partnership

- 3.4 DCC Hall outlined the Shared Services Partnership model, saying it would change how services are delivered in Norfolk and Suffolk. Shared Services Partnerships are underpinned by good ICT systems and the current move to the 'T-Police' system would underpin SSP. The work undertaken showed there would be opportunities to bring in efficiencies in future through extending SSP to other organisations.
- 3.5 The location costing concluded that Police Headquarters in Martlesham would be the best location for SSP providing savings of £2.3million per annum.
- 3.6 Should SSP not be approved savings of £1.3million may be possible through Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and ICT but these solutions alone would not bring the same level of change as SSP.
- 3.7 DCC Hall reported that the impact on staff of the proposed SSP would be felt most by the business support function in Norfolk but that this could be addressed through measures such as incentive packages. If the CCR and SSP changes were introduced together, there are opportunities for redeployment and reskilling staff.

Contact and Control Room

- 3.8 DCC Hall reported that currently the two CCRs work independently although both use STORM which has cross-border benefits.
- 3.9 The proposed merger, with a single CCR based in Norfolk, would bring benefits (savings) of £1.4million per annum and better response times to calls than currently. DCC Hall said that there was a possibility of creating an additional £1million saving per annum benefit through continuous improvement (although this has not been factored into the business model).
- 3.10 The concerns that had been expressed about loss of local knowledge could be mitigated by technology, desk arrangement by local area and through staff continuity and training.
- 3.11 Cost reduction from two separate CCRs had been looked at but although some savings could be achieved, there would be a degradation in service levels/call response. In terms of fall-back facilities, Suffolk does not have as comprehensive a system as Wymondham in case of partial or full loss, and it was suggested in the business case that an upgrade in Suffolk would be needed.
- 3.12 Further assurance was given that the impact on staff of a single CCR would be reduced if it were introduced alongside the SSP.
- 3.13 The Chairman asked Steven Rice, Director T-Police, Cap Gemini to explain ERP. Steven outlined that the T-Police ERP system is currently being implemented in Norfolk and Suffolk and enables collaboration on all aspects of business support services. ERP is most effective when it is combined with real organisational change.
- 3.14 The Chairman asked the Chief Constables whether they were both still fully supportive of the business cases.
- 3.15 Chief Constable Simon Bailey (Norfolk) responded that he was supportive of the business cases from a financial point of view and that he supported the proposal to bring in ERP and SSP in tandem as advised by Capita and CapGemini. He was confident that the CCR could be delivered from a single site. He recommended the PCCs support both proposals given the need to close the budget gap and maintain levels of front line policing.
- 3.16 Chief Constable Douglas Paxton (Suffolk) said he agreed the financial case was sound and, from an operational point of view, was content the proposals were safe. He noted that CCR and SSP comprised just two of 77 pieces of cost saving work. He said a strong indication of direction from the PCCs would be welcomed, as staff were anxious to know.
- 3.17 The Chairman asked for more explanation on the £1million savings that could be made with continuous improvement. Simon Bailey said there are continuous improvement experts in the Norfolk CCR and whilst he didn't know the detail of the £1m potential savings these experts could clarify.
- 3.18 The Chairman asked the Chief Constables if there were any concerns with the proposals. Simon Bailey responded he had no concerns. Douglas Paxton said that any transition would need to be carefully managed and noted that the risk register is in place to assist in that process.
- 3.19 The Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk, Tim Passmore, suggested that the Chief Finance Officers (CFOs) should be heard from. The Chairman asked the CFOs

from the PCC offices and Constabularies to confirm they were happy with the business cases. Chris Bland (the Chief Finance Officer, OPCC Suffolk) spoke on behalf of the CFOs for the PCC and Chief Constables. They had considered and scrutinised the business cases and he confirmed that they had checked the financial aspects and all the CFOs were satisfied that they were sufficiently robust to assist in the decision making process.

- 3.20 The Panel was advised that the CFOs had responsibilities as provided for in CIPFA guidance (March, 2014) and the Financial Management Code of Practice (October, 2013) as follows:
- i) To provide unfettered strategic financial advice to the PCCs and Chief Constables;
 - ii) To ensure that appropriate financial processes are in place;
 - iii) That the joint financial department is adequately staffed, trained and resourced.
- 3.21 The Chief Finance Officers considered there were a number of risks should the business cases be adopted, particularly in regard to the implementation of SSP in tandem with ERP. They considered there were considerable risks in moving to the Target Operating Model (TOM) immediately. They had concluded that the ERP changes should be embedded as planned before making other significant changes. This would not preclude other collaboration in future.
- 3.22 In light of this, the recommendation from the CFOs was to implement ERP and subsequently consider other proposals for savings and efficiencies. Whilst they were content that the financial information in the business case was robust there were other non-financial risks such as the timing of changes, capacity and capability that needed to be considered.
- 3.23 The Chairman asked Steven Rice (Cap Gemini) to comment on the impact that staggering the changes could have. Steven Rice agreed it was right to consider the risks of implementation as ERP is a significant change. However, he considered there was opportunity as well to improve the service and ERP is designed to mitigate risks. If SSP were delayed until after ERP implementation he suggested there would be an additional cost and the impact of further change would need to be considered.
- 3.24 Tim Passmore said that he was concerned about risk of implementing CCR and SSP in addition to ERP and other projects, particularly as STORM is still relatively new in Suffolk and there is considerable change attached to the ATHENA programme. He said that he was committed to ERP implementation which is expected to make significant savings.
- 3.25 Simon Bailey noted that collaboration was at an advanced stage (as also recognised by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) and others were looking at Norfolk and Suffolk collaboration as a good example. He was confident the programmes could be implemented at the same time and asked for a clear steer to do this in order to make the additional savings. He said that STORM was purchased with a single, joint CCR in mind.
- 3.26 Douglas Paxton said the discussion was now focused on timing and risk appetite and that both PCCs and both Chief Constables needed to be in agreement to move forward. In response to the Chairman's question as to whether he still agreed with the proposals, the Chief Constable said he did, but recognised there were risks.
- 3.27 Referring to the statement made by the Chief Finance Officer (OPCC Suffolk), the Chairman asked what the risks were with the CCR. Simon Bailey said that risks could

be managed and mitigation plans would be in place. Douglas Paxton said there were documented issues with transition, for example with moving staff but referred again to the risk register for mitigating actions.

- 3.28 Tim Passmore reiterated that the Chief Finance Officers comments made at this meeting had been made with the agreement of the CFOs for the PCCs and Chief Constables. He recognised the financial challenge, expressed full support for ERP and acknowledged the role of collaboration.
- 3.29 Having looked at the business cases and consulted widely over recent months, Tim Passmore said that whilst the financial case was sound there was clearly a huge concern over the level of risk and timing. He said that public trust and confidence was crucial to effective and efficient policing and this carried significant weight. In addition he said he needed to consider the economic and social impact. Finally he said he had to listen to the concerns that the CFOs had expressed. In light of all these factors Tim Passmore confirmed that he would not agree to proceed with the joint CCR with Norfolk. He said that the decision was the most significant decision he had ever had to make but was sure it was the right decision for Suffolk.
- 3.30 Tim Passmore said that the Suffolk Police and Crime Plan had stated that all plans would be considered in an open and transparent way and he reiterated that the business case exercise had been worthwhile, but once the Contact and Control Room was gone from Suffolk it was gone for good. He noted that the SSP and CCR plans only accounted for 5% of the potential savings needed and of the 77 projects identified, CCR is only one. He thanked the CCR staff, other staff and police for their input on ways to save money. He reiterated his support for Zero Based Budgeting and ERP. Tim Passmore stated that he, as the PCC, and the Chief Constable would work together to identify savings and move forwards.
- 3.31 In response to the Chairman, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk, Tim Passmore clarified he would not enter into collaboration with Norfolk in respect of the joint CCR and SSP as set out in the business cases.
- 3.32 The Chairman acknowledged there was now clarity on the position and closed the public part of the meeting.

PRIVATE AGENDA

[Further detail of the discussions under the following items is included in the closed minutes.]

4. ZERO BASED BUDGETING (ZBB) PROPOSAL
- 4.1 The confidential report from the meeting in February was re-presented.
- 4.2 There was no agreement to progress jointly with ZBB.
5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
- 5.1 The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2014 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting closed at 12.35 pm