



PAPER AP23/21

ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL

A meeting of the Accountability and Performance Panel was held at Police Headquarters Martlesham, and via Microsoft Teams at 09:30 on Friday 17 March 2023.

PRESENT:

Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Colette Batson (Chief Finance Officer), Kate Boswell (Executive Assistant to the PCC and Chief Executive), Sandra Graffham (Head of Communications and Engagement), Elisabeth Hollingworth (Head of Commissioning and Governance), Christopher Jackson (Chief Executive), Tim Passmore (Police and Crime Commissioner), Vanessa Scott (Head of Policy and Performance).

Suffolk Constabulary

Rob Jones (Deputy Chief Constable), Rachel Kearton (Chief Constable), Kenneth Kilpatrick (Assistant Chief Officer), Alice Scott (Temporary Chief Superintendent) joined via Teams.

In attendance for the Public Agenda in person

Mark Jepson (Chair of the Police and Crime Panel), James Sheridan (Member of the Public), Andy Stevenson (Member of the Police and Crime Panel).

In attendance for the Public Agenda via Teams

John Burns (Member of the Police and Crime Panel), Peter Gardiner (Member of the Police and Crime Panel), Adriana Stapleton (Senior Democratic Services Officer, Suffolk County Council).

Apologies

Eamonn Bridger (Temporary Assistant Chief Constable), Julie Dean (Temporary Assistant Chief Constable).

PUBLIC AGENDA

1 Public Question Time

- 1.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced those attending the meeting in person.
- 1.2 The PCC advised that two questions had been received from members of the public in advance of the meeting. The PCC issued a reminder that questions received should be in

relation to APP business or matters of a general policing nature. Questions should not relate to a specific case involving individual matters of detail.

- 1.3 A question was received from Ms Louise Sargeant, submitted on 10 March 23. The question was “I would like to ask the question of the Panel who decides on cut-off dates for the PCC review of Suffolk Constabulary complaints and who if either can change that cut-off date if Suffolk Constabulary have not provided the requested documents/footage to challenge the complaints outcome.”
- 1.4 The PCC gave the following answer: “Our public question processes for APP require that questions should relate to either items on the agenda or be of a general policing nature. Questions that relate to a specific case involving individual matters of detail will not be taken at the meeting and will be responded to outside the meeting. Therefore the question will be answered as a general policing issue without going into matters of detail relating to the question which may or may not refer to an individual case. It is worth observing that a written response was provided in response to the question earlier this week on 10 March. In essence the answer to the question is: The deadline for requesting a review is provided for by the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020. Notification of that deadline will be set out in the notification of outcome to a complaint by the PSD. The review body will, depending on the circumstances either be the IOPC or the OPCC. Ordinarily applications for review must be made within 28 days starting with the day after notification of the complaint outcome. However, the relevant review body, be that the IOPC or the OPCC, may extend the period for making an application for a review, where it is satisfied that because of the special circumstances of a case it is just to do so. This issue is decided on a case-by-case basis and there is, within IOPC Guidance, a non-exhaustive list of matters that should be taken into account in considering extensions of time. The OPCC has offered to talk to Ms Sargeant to advise her about the review process and the next steps – that offer remains open.”
- 1.5 A question was also received from Mr Dale Craven, submitted on 15 March 23. The question was “Could either the PCC or CE explain the reason that over 2000 respondents (4500 respondents but over 2000 comments made) to a recent survey initiated by the SPCC regarding whether to implement a higher or lower precept were ignored, their responses being cast aside as they ran over 100 sides of A4. It seems both a waste of time effort and resources collecting these responses and more importantly a waste of time for respondents who took the time to explain their thoughts and made comment as invited. No comments were circulated prior to the SPCC meeting at Suffolk County Council despite the committee being made up of people who represent local residents and the PCC themselves claiming to be the "voice for the people. The PCC (or CE) response to this question will be welcomed and again the response noted, recorded and used in a future media article relating to the handling of the increase in Suffolk PCC precept.”
- 1.6 The PCC gave the following answer: “Setting the budget is one of the most important responsibilities of a Police and Crime Commissioner, and I take this responsibility very seriously. However, it is not a decision I make alone. I base my proposal on the professional advice of the Chief Constable, her Chief Finance Officer and my team in the

OPCC. Once we decide what level of precept we need - which this year was to increase it by 6% - we put this proposal to the people of Suffolk. This took the form of a simple YES/NO survey so I could gauge the level of support for an increase.

It is a survey; it is not a referendum. It is conducted to inform my decision-making.

It is not a vehicle for the Panel's decision-making. The panel bases its decision on the evidence the Chief Constable and I present at the meeting, and the financial information presented in the papers.

There were 2,116 respondents to the survey this year and 1,335 chose to leave an additional comment to support their Yes/No answer. The comments are very useful for me to understand the issues concerning local communities. The comments were not, and never purported to be, instrumental in the decision-making process.

For transparency, the results of the survey and all the comments – both positive and negative - are available on the PCC website.”

2 Open minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2023 (Paper AP23/11)

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2023 were agreed as an accurate record and approved by the PCC.

2.2 All actions were noted as complete, or in hand and being followed up outside of the meeting.

3 Financial Monitoring (Paper AP23/12)

3.1 Assistant Chief Officer (ACO) Kenneth Kilpatrick presented this report.

3.2 The summary of the revenue and capital monitoring report, as at 31 January 23, shows the Constabulary forecasting a revenue underspend of just under £1.2M, and a capital underspend figure of just over £800K at the end of the financial year.

3.3 The recent Government budget announcement raised some points that may be relevant to the Constabulary, including the ORB forecast for inflation for 2023/24 which now provides a positive looking forecast, and secondly the extension of the energy price scheme for a further 12months which again helps with the volatility and increases in energy costs.

3.4 The PCC commented regarding the recent budget that it is welcome that inflation is coming down. He also noted the comments as reported regarding the pay award, and expressed concern that there is still a pressure regarding the pay award as this has not been fully funded by the government.

3.5 In response to a question from the PCC the ACO advised that issues relating to slippage arise mostly within the IT Department in respect of their capacity to delivery and continuing delays with the supply chain.

- 3.6 The PCC commented that he was very pleased the Officer Uplift figures have met the Home Office targets, and that there will not be any financial penalties. The Chief Constable commented in terms of officers the Force has exceeded the target figure by an additional 25 heads.
- 3.7 DCC Jones advised that at present the CCR was not fully staffed, and there were vacancies. The PCC reinforced that the precept funding has paid for these roles, and there is a pressing need to ensure they are filled. He asked if the CCR is being over recruited to ensure there aren't vacancies. DCC Jones confirmed that currently the CCR is not overrecruiting but there are more people working in the CCR than was the case 12 months ago.
- 3.8 The PCC asked for assurance around using overseas banks. The CFO confirmed that all banks used would meet the treasury management criteria as documented with the policy.

4 Supporting Vulnerable Victims (Paper AP23/03)

- 4.1 The Chief Constable invited Temporary Chief Superintendent Scott (T/Ch Supt) to present this report.
- 4.2 T/Ch Supt Scott flagged the main areas of challenge within the report as follows. The courts backlog was causing victims lengthy delays for cases to be heard. This is being monitored closely and is a national problem. Additional problems have been caused by last minute changes to court listings. Additionally there are issues around data quality but work in ongoing to make improvements.
- 4.3 T/Ch Supt Scott reported that positives within the report include the successful roll out of the VCOP dashboard, the successful delivery of the Section 28 training, and all front-line officers having received the domestic abuse (DA) training via DARA. The Special Measures Advisor pilot scheme has been positively received, and the continuation and expansion of this role is being explored.
- 4.4 The Head of Policy and Performance queried the table at 3.8 regarding the numbers of victims offered a victim personal statement, questioning if the numbers represented unique victims. Within the same table the PCC noted the high number reported as a 'no' and asked when can we expect improvement in this figure. T/Ch Supt Scott responded that the data is in its infancy and work is underway to unpick these figures, some of it is data, some of it is the complexity of the crime, and will provide a further update on these figures in 3 months' time.
- ACTION – T/Ch Supt Scott to provide a follow up on the numbers for Victim Personal Statement data in 3 months to the PCC.**
- 4.5 The Head of Policy and Performance questioned whether there was further information to explain the difference in the percentages between the audit data and Athena data for the letters sent. T/Ch Supt Scott replied that this is a data quality issue, where inspection audits give a different narrative to Athena. Within Athena there is a very small tick box which may not be completed, instead a comment is added to the general text box resulting in the figure difference. This relates back to the issues being experienced with data quality and work is ongoing to address this.

- 4.6 **ACTION – T/Ch Supt Scott to check the figures received for the Special Advisor role and confirm the amount to the PCC.**
- 4.7 The PCC asked how Operation Soteria helps regarding rape and serious sexual offences (RASSO). T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed this operation proactively tackles repeat RASSO offenders. It will take time to embed to see if it is working. The Chief Constable added that nationally Operation Soteria has been supported by the University of Suffolk and although Suffolk Constabulary have not been successful in securing Home Office funding for this pilot scheme we are looking to find resources locally for this work.
- 4.8 The PCC requested clarity on the role of the Hate Crime Delivery Board, and how it tried to prevent Hate Crime. DCC Jones advised the Board had been in place for some time and looked at the changing nature of hate crime reporting. This Board also covered hate crimes received against members of Constabulary staff and ensures that Hate Crime is dealt with professionally. DCC Jones confirmed that the Board worked to educate via schools, and will work in specific areas through the use of the local inspectors’ networks to solve problems before they become acute.
ACTION – DCC Jones to provide the PCC with further details on the role of the Hate Crime Board, including detailed figures for Hate Crime, and confirmation as to what the Board is delivering and the difference made.
- 4.9 The PCC queried where do the 23 Suffolk Liaison Officers within Modern Slavery fitted within Suffolk Constabulary. The Chief Constable commented that this would be confirmed to the PCC in due course.
ACTION – The Chief Constable to confirm back to the PCC regarding the role of the 23 Modern Slavery Liaison Officers and where they fit within Suffolk Constabulary.
- 5 Managing Offenders and Reducing Reoffending (Paper AP23/14)**
- 5.1 Temporary Chief Superintendent Scott (T/Ch Supt) to present this report.
- 5.2 Current challenges within this area include the waiting times for both the Crown and Magistrates Courts. Lack of bed availability within Suffolk Foundation Trust remains an issue resulting in a proportion of people being held in custody who should not be held there. The use of the bail app as developed by Essex Police has caused some technological challenges in terms of integration to the platform used by Suffolk. However a workaround is being developed.
- 5.3 The custody throughput figures have now returned to pre-Covid levels. The numbers for drug testing on arrest continue to grow, which is undertaken at all of the Police Investigation Centre’s (PICs). There is also a focus on juvenile detainees moving through the PICs, with work ongoing not to criminalise young people. There are dedicated cells for children and young people with specific space in the exercise yards within the PICs.
- 5.4 The Head of Policy and Performance questioned regarding the use of out-of-court disposals and whether there was a view as to why the usage of Red Snapper is much lower for Suffolk compared to Norfolk. T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed that the difference has been noted, which was being investigated by the DCC in Norfolk via the Force Performance Meeting.

ACTION – T/Ch Supt Scott to report back the results to Vanessa Scott from the OPCC regarding the levels of Red Snapper use in Suffolk compared to Norfolk.

5.5 The Head of Policy and Performance commended that the work being undertaken to link conditional cautions cases to the RJ Hub to ensure that where an RJ intervention might support the victim and offender, the opportunity is offered. However given the lack of usage outlined above in Suffolk, it is important there is equality of opportunity for victims across both counties. The Head of Policy and Performance asked to be reassured that the use of conditional cautions and the option to offer RJ, is being understood and utilised by Suffolk officers. T/Ch Supt Scott to feedback further details and figures on this service.

ACTION – T/Ch Supt Scott to provide reassurance regarding understanding and usage of conditional cautions and links to RJ in Suffolk to ensure equality of opportunity for victims and offenders in both counties.

5.6 The PCC queried whether there was data to support the impact that Operation Harbinger has delivered. T/Ch Supt Scott to follow up and report back to the PCC.

ACTION – T/Ch Supt Scott to report back to the PCC on the impact of Operation Harbinger.

5.7 The PCC asked, what impact will drug testing on arrest have on criminality in the long term. T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed that the testing helps to identify where drug users have committed crimes, which then may lead to an increased propensity to commit further crimes. Once drug usage is identified, this then facilitates access to diversionary pathways and opportunities for intervention.

5.8 The PCC asked for a brief definition of nudge theory. T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed nudge theory is used successfully in marketing. Work is ongoing with the University of Suffolk to deliver this within the custody setting. The idea behind this work is via the use of subliminal messaging, resulting in people who are in the cells and the custody block then engaging with the services being offered, and confessing to further crimes. T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed that drug testing on arrest, and nudge theory are already closely linked in with Public Health and local NHS providers, who are working with the Constabulary and transformational activities ongoing within the PICs.

5.9 The PCC asked if there was a reason for the high proportion of white people in the graph at figure 4.14 of the report. T/Ch Supt Scott responded that this is a new way of modelling data, as presently there isn't the background data from 12 months ago to make the comparison. Future reports should allow a more detailed look at disproportionality and more context to the data, but it takes time to gain quality temporal data.

5.10 The PCC asked about the issues regarding the use of the bail app are as developed by Essex and Kent, and how can this be overcome. T/Ch Supt Scott confirmed that short term human workarounds are in place, with several options being offered from Essex and Kent where they are assisting to make it more compatible.

6 Update on the work of the Rural Crime and Wildlife Team (Paper AP23/15)

6.1 Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Jones presented this report.

6.2 The Rural Crime and Wildlife team are small but fully resourced. In terms of crime figures it is good news, with a small increase in the numbers of hunts, but the team are working at

policing these fairly and firmly. There are also reports of thefts of GPS trackers, along with strong intelligence of organised crime.

- 6.3 The PCC congratulated the team on the work they are delivering, and asked what else needs to be covered in terms of organised crime within a rural setting, such as machinery theft, agricultural theft, forced labour issues, illegal immigration etc. DCC Jones confirmed that the team is active through local networks, which include local media and support from the local farmers union. Through intelligence received and the team's structure, they understand what causes these problems, which in turn allows them to be addressed. There are good tactics and resources, and where required the team are supported by ERSOU, with enforcement leading to positive results.
- 6.4 The PCC asked what has happened regarding birds of prey, particularly raptor persecution. DCC Jones confirmed the team have made good progress over the past few years, and by increasing public awareness around this crime, it has helped to create an environment where not only is it illegal, but it is also socially unacceptable and gets reported to the police.
- 6.5 The PCC suggested that regarding the volunteers on horseback, are we making enough use of them and the feedback they provide, and feels this could be an area of improvement for the Constabulary to work on. The DCC Jones commented that the Force were pioneers of the scheme to have volunteers on horseback and intelligence is regularly received through them.
ACTION – DCC Jones to report back to the PCC regarding further usage and engagement of the volunteers on horseback.
- 6.6 DCC Jones commented that that the Rural team have been building many different ways expand their network beyond being face-to-face, via the use of WhatsApp and social media, plus supporting the use of email for reporting crimes. The team have worked with the Contact and Control Room (CCR) to raise awareness of rural crimes with them and having a dedicated resource within the CCR allows a quick response to incidents. The PCC added that he looks forward to seeing the impact the new digital desk will have on the rural communities.
ACTION – DCC Jones to provide an update on implications for rural crime through use of the digital desk.
- 6.7 The PCC asked regarding the newly proposed rural crime strategy, what was the purpose of its update. DCC Jones commented that the aim with all of the Constabulary's strategies is to have them as live documents, and changes will reflect seasonality as well as the use of technology and continuous innovation. The PCC added that the one thing missing from the strategy is the definition and this needs to be included.
ACTION – DCC Jones to ensure the definition of the Rural Crime team is included within the revamped rural crime strategy.

7 HMICFRS Child Protection Inspection (Paper AP23/16)

- 7.1 Temporary Deputy Chief Constable (T/DCC) Jones took questions on this report.
- 7.2 The Head of Policy and Performance commented that the role of the PCC is to hold the police to account, therefore recommendations 1 and 10 within the HMICFRS report seem to be out of the control of the force to change. Therefore is there a way to address this with

the Inspectorate? DCC Jones responded that overall, this was a very strong report, and the recommendations are based on areas we can improve. He felt that all of the recommendations are within the Forces' gift to implement, and that the partnership working across Suffolk is strong enough to do so.

- 7.3 The PCC asked what actions are being taken by partners, rather than putting an unfair burden on the Constabulary. DCC Jones answered that some of the children's homes are run very well, and don't cause issues for the Constabulary, but there are some which present more of a challenge. Part of the Philomena protocol details the amount of work that has to be done by partner agencies before it is passed to the police. The PCC requested further information around the time taken to receive handover reports in relation to missing children as part of the Philomena protocol.

ACTION – DCC Jones to provide details of the times taken for handover reports to be received for missing children.

- 7.4 The Chief Executive noted that regarding recommendation 10, the Force was reliant on other partners and agencies, and that therefore this recommendation was not in the control of the police to deliver. The Chief Constable agreed regarding recommendation 10 and noted that is worth bearing in mind that HMICFRS work alongside other inspectorate bodies, with the recommendations being shared and included within other inspections.

8 Collaboration Report (AP23/17)

- 8.1 The Chief Constable presented this report.
- 8.2 The report highlights include that through local collaboration between Norfolk and Suffolk, savings of £22.6M have been identified for Suffolk. The Blue Light collaboration with Fire and Rescue has resulted in 13 joint premises across the county, which will conclude with the official Royal Opening of Princes Street in Ipswich on 28 March 2023. The collaboration work between Norfolk and Suffolk is held up as one of the best examples of collaborations between police forces in the Country.
- 8.3 The Chief Executive commented that the paper undersells the amount of collaboration that takes place successfully within Suffolk, and the additional collaboration with Fire and Rescue has been testament to the success story.
- 8.4 The PCC added that for the next report it may be useful to include a short report on the work and savings completed by ERSOU.
ACTION – The Chief Constable to include a report from ERSOU on their work and savings within the next collaboration report.

9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 There was no other business.

The open part of the meeting closed at 1149 and members of the public left the meeting.

PRIVATE AGENDA

[A detailed account of the discussions and decision on the following items is contained in the confidential minutes]

10 Closed minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2023 (Paper AP23/18)

10.1 The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2023 were agreed as an accurate record and approved by the PCC.

11 Protective Services Command Update (Paper AP23/19)

11.1 The Chief Constable presented this report.

12 Risk Register / Chief Officer Risk Report (Paper AP23/20)

12.1 The Chief Constable presented this report.

The meeting closed at 1201.

Summary of Actions

Item / Paper	Action	Owner
4.4 Supporting Vulnerable Victims	T/Ch Supt Scott to provide a follow up on the numbers for Victim Personal Statement data in 3 months to the PCC.	T/Ch Supt Scott
4.6 Supporting Vulnerable Victims	T/Ch Supt Scott to check the figures received for the Special Advisor role and confirm the amount to the PCC.	T/Ch Supt Scott
4.8 Supporting Vulnerable Victims	DCC Jones to provide the PCC with further details on the role of the Hate Crime Board, including detailed figures for Hate Crime, and confirmation as to what the Board is delivering and the difference made.	DCC Jones
4.9 Supporting Vulnerable Victims	The Chief Constable to confirm back to the PCC regarding the role of the 23 Modern Slavery Liaison Officers and where they fit within Suffolk Constabulary.	Chief Constable
5.4 Managing Offenders	T/Ch Supt Scott to report back the results to Vanessa Scott from the OPCC regarding the levels of Red Snapper use in Suffolk compared to Norfolk.	T/Ch Supt Scott
5.5 Managing Offenders	T/Ch Supt Scott to provide reassurance regarding understanding and usage of conditional cautions and links to RJ in Suffolk to ensure equality of opportunity for victims and offenders in both counties.	T/Ch Supt Scott

5.6 Managing Offenders	T/Ch Supt Scott to report back to the PCC on the impact of Operation Harbinger.	T/Ch Supt Scott
6.5 Rural Crime	DCC Jones to report back to the PCC regarding further usage and engagement of the volunteers on horseback.	DCC Jones
6.6 Rural Crime	DCC Jones to provide an update on implications for rural crime through use of the digital desk.	DCC Jones
6.7 Rural Crime	DCC Jones to ensure the definition of the Rural Crime team is included within the revamped rural crime strategy.	DCC Jones
7.3 Child Protection Inspection	DCC Jones to provide details of the times taken for handover reports to be received for missing children.	DCC Jones
8.4 Collaboration Report	The Chief Constable to include a report from ERSOU on their work and savings within the next collaboration report.	Chief Constable