

LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND POLICE AND CRIME PANEL COMMENTS ON POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

The Panel, having considered the draft Police and Crime Plan, the Commissioner's additional report on re-commissioning and draft budget proposals, would wish to draw the following views to the attention of the PCC and would ask the PCC to submit a written response addressing the specific issues highlighted below. Whilst the Panel welcome the commitment to work with partners and notes the comments of the PCC that the Plan is two-dimensional and needs to be improved; nonetheless, at this stage, the Panel has concerns about the Plan, which focuses on issues of policing rather than prevention through the wider context of partnership working.

The Panel notes that the consultation on the Police and Crime Plan closes on 10 March and that the PCC will submit a revised draft of his Plan to the Panel in early March, which will address, where appropriate, issues raised during the consultation. Following this second meeting the Panel will submit its final comments on the Plan.

The delivery of the Police and Crime Plan will require the commitment of other statutory agencies and partners. To that end the Panel will invite key partners to share with it any comments they submit to the PCC which it will use to assess how the revised Plan, when produced, has reflected consultation responses.

The Panel was concerned that the Plan did not adequately address issues of equality in relation to all priorities and targets and recommends an Equality Impact Assessment be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

Priorities and Targets

- a) The Panel noted that the priorities in the Plan had not been aligned to specific resources in the budget. Whilst the broad priorities in the Plan are worthy, the PCC does not provide any ranking of his priorities. Given the resource pressures on the Police and partners, this needs to be addressed. **The PCC is therefore asked to rank the priorities within his Plan and identify those which he no longer considers to be a priority.**
- b) Targets and success measures are included in the Plan but there is nothing to show how these have been arrived at by the PCC and whether these have, where necessary, been consulted upon and agreed with partners. The Panel believes that targets cannot be set without effective engagement from partners. **The PCC is asked to provide information on how the performance measures were arrived at and to indicate what consultation has been or will be undertaken with partners in arriving at the suggested targets and success measures.** The Panel will, separately, be seeking the views of key partners to inform its discussions at the next meeting with the PCC.
- c) Whilst priorities have been identified and targets and success measures included, the Plan does not address how those targets are to be achieved. **The Panel asks the PCC to provide an explanation in relation to the targets, indicating the work which will be necessary to achieve them.**

- d) In the part of the Plan headed 'My Vision' reference is made to the PCC being committed to the aim of protecting vulnerable people. However, the priorities and targets in the Plan do not appear to reflect that commitment. **The Panel asks the PCC to consider including appropriate priorities and targets and to make reference to existing good work and the statutory duties and responsibilities of other partners, such as that undertaken by the local Safeguarding Boards and others.**

Partnership Working

- e) The Plan makes reference to the need to work with other agencies and partners and how they will need to work with the PCC/Police to deliver the priorities in the Plan. Although the Panel noted the remarks of the PCC to wish to work with partners, the Plan at this stage appears to have no regard for the fact that partners have their own statutory responsibilities. **The PCC is therefore asked to indicate how he and the Police intend to reciprocate and work with partners to assist them in delivering their statutory responsibilities in relation to crime and disorder, and safeguarding and for that to be addressed in the Plan.**
- f) The Plan makes reference to current partnership activity and evidence gathering already undertaken. However, the references suggest currently a lack of appreciation on the part of the OPCC about the respective roles and responsibilities of partners, including Local Strategic Partnership bodies, and some specific references to data are partial, out of date, or inaccurate. This was reflected in the paper tabled at the meeting setting out the comments received from various chief officers to date. **The Panel therefore asks the PCC to recast the Plan and recognise the statutory and significant roles of key partnerships and to demonstrate how evidence was collected, collated, verified and analysed before being relied on to inform the Plan.**
- g) The Plan, and other communications from the PCC, suggests that the Strategic Partnership Board (SPB), its role and a new sub-structure have been reviewed and determined in agreement with partners. The Panel does not agree. The Panel notes that the PCC has indicated that there will be discussions with partners on targets and priorities through the four "clusters" of the SPB: the Panel has significant concerns about this, in particular, the lack of any governance arrangements for such clusters which need to be agreed by the relevant partners. **The Panel advises the PCC that no formal decisions on partnership working have yet been taken and urges the PCC to convene appropriate meetings as quickly as possible in order to make progress.**
- h) There is little reference in the Plan to engagement by the PCC with the voluntary sector and community groups which make a significant contribution to crime reduction. **The PCC is asked to provide information as to the process of consultation with relevant bodies and to include more information in the Plan on the valuable role they perform.**

Commissioning and Outsourcing

- i) Whilst appreciating the need for flexibility, the Panel is of the view that references in the Plan to commissioning are made in a superficial way with no reference to specifics. Elsewhere in the separate report on re-commissioning of services, the PCC makes reference to adopting a six month period of continuity, subject to his conditions, before re-commissioning drugs, crime and community safety services currently provided by partners. **The Panel is of the view that this timescale is unrealistic and may only serve to damage the quality of current provision and the excellent partnership working arrangements. In particular, the Panel is concerned that:**
- i) **Adequate consideration has not been given to the processes of implementation including staffing and procurement issues, some of which may need to be joint procurement exercises with partners**
 - ii) **There appears to be a lack of appreciation about the complexity of the environment in which partnership bodies operate;**
 - iii) **The short timescale may destabilise important voluntary and community sector projects;**
 - iv) **The period for consultation is likely to be inadequate, particularly for voluntary and community groups, and the Panel would draw to the attention of the PCC the existence of local Compact agreements;**
 - v) **Arrangements for governance of the review and change processes are not in place;**
 - vi) **The difficulties for partner agencies in undertaking effective financial planning, recognising their budgetary cycles, have not been considered;**
 - vii) **Whilst the PCC has stated that, in relation to the funding of the Force and the proposals for the budget, a period of stability with no or little change is considered prudent, this same concern is not reflected as regards partnership working.**
- j) The Panel notes that the transformational change programme envisages 'further outsourcing of service provision where this is appropriate'. **The Panel therefore asks the PCC to inform it, at the earliest opportunity, of the potential areas to be considered for outsourcing.**