



THE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE  
FOURTEENTH REPORT OF THE HOME AFFAIRS  
COMMITTEE SESSION 2010–12 HC 939

# **New Landscape of Policing**

**Presented to Parliament  
by the Secretary of State for the Home Department  
by Command of Her Majesty**

**December 2011**

© Crown copyright 2011

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Strategy, Skills and Planning Unit  
Crime and Policing Group  
Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
SW1P 4DF

This publication is also available for download at [www.official-documents.gov.uk](http://www.official-documents.gov.uk)

ISBN: 9780101822329

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited  
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

ID P002469341 12/11 17391 19585

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

## **GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE COMMITTEE'S FOURTEENTH REPORT OF SESSION 2010 – 2012: *NEW LANDSCAPE OF POLICING***

### **Introduction**

The Government welcomes the Committee's interest in the developing police reform landscape. The Policing and Criminal Justice Minister, Nick Herbert, gave oral evidence to the Committee on 28 June, and a written submission was provided on 31 March.

As the Committee points out, the Government is taking forward far-reaching reform of policing in England and Wales. The most radical change in 50 years will see greater freedom and accountability at the local level, matched by much better national crime fighting capability. Our ultimate aim is to improve the police's ability to fight crime and protect the public.

At the local level, we are restoring accountability for policing to communities through the introduction of directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), the subject of a previous report from the Committee. Legislation to secure PCCs' introduction has now been passed, and elections will take place in November 2012. This will free the service from central government interference, and, together with our drive to reduce bureaucracy, will restore discretion to frontline officers to use their professional judgement. Earlier this month, we placed before Parliament copies of the Protocol, which clarifies the responsibilities of Chief Constables and Police and Crime Commissioners. The draft Protocol makes clear that the operational independence of the police will be safeguarded and builds on the government's commitment that local chief constables will retain the direction and control of their forces' officers and staff.

It is important, therefore, that our reforms to national policing are not viewed in isolation. They are integrally linked to our reforms to policing at local level. That is exactly as it should be – local intelligence, for example, is often crucial for tackling national level crime such as drug dealing. A gun used in a shooting on a high street could have been moved around the country by criminals, and may well have been illegally imported in the first instance. That is why a strong national response goes hand in hand with effectively tackling local issues.

Our reform of the national policing landscape – the focus of the Committee's report – will ensure that national policing issues receive the focused, co-ordinated response they deserve. The National Crime Agency (NCA) is at the heart of this response. As set out in the NCA Plan published on 8 June 2011, the NCA will be a powerful body of operational crime fighters that spearheads the national response to serious and organised crime, strengthens our borders, fights financial and economic crime, and protects vulnerable children and young people. Driven by a unified intelligence picture, it will have the authority to task and co-ordinate the actions of the police and other law enforcement agencies to ensure the right action is taken against criminals, at the right level, by the right law

enforcement agency. We have already put in place the foundations. We have appointed Keith Bristow – a senior Chief Constable with a track record of success in law enforcement – as the Head of the NCA. Keith started formally in the role earlier this month and will play a vital part in developing the new Agency and will become its first operational head in 2013. We have established the Economic Crime Coordination Board – which has met twice since September and will be the forerunner to the Economic Crime Command – to drive better coordination and alignment of resources in tackling economic crime. The Organised Crime Coordination Centre is now up and running, providing, for the first time, a complete map of organised crime groups to drive better national coordination of law enforcement efforts.

We are not waiting until the introduction of the National Crime Agency to drive improvements in the way the police tackle organised crime, or indeed other national threats that cross police force boundaries. That is why this month we issued a shadow Strategic Policing Requirement, setting out the Home Secretary's view of the national threats to which Chief Constables and Police and Crime Commissioners will have to have regard. This will inform police force and police authority planning, and will allow for a period of testing and consultation before issuing the full statutory Strategic Policing Requirement next year.

We are also rationalising the organisations that support policing. We are planning a methodical, phased wind-down of the National Policing Improvement Agency and are taking careful decisions about the future of its functions, working closely with the police service. We have been planning for some time to close down NPIA in 2012; its functions will cease to exist under its current auspices by December 2012. Earlier this year, we announced the creation of an Information Communications Technology (ICT) company to revolutionise the procurement and operation of police ICT. This company will be owned by police authorities and subsequently police crime commissioners, with the police service as its customer. Since this announcement, responsibilities for non-IT police procurement have transferred from the NPIA to the Home Office. The next major phase in our reforms is the establishment of a police professional body which will have responsibility for training, standards and leadership.

As the Committee rightly recognises, though our reforms are not aimed at reducing spending – they are aimed at reducing crime – the need to deal with the deficit forms an important backdrop to our reforms. The police service, like the rest of the public sector, must rise to the challenge of reducing spending, while maintaining and improving the service to the public. That means cutting crime even as the police cut costs. The government is confident that this can be done by reducing bureaucracy, improving procurement, greater collaboration between forces, reducing costs in the back and middle office, and pay reform and restraint.

Our police reforms represent a comprehensive and coherent package. Power over local policing priorities will be placed in the hands of local people, through Police and Crime

Commissioners. Discretion and trust will be placed back with individual police officers, by scrapping bureaucracy and freeing them to fight crime. National level support for the police will be rationalised and improved, through the creation of a Police ICT company and a police professional body to drive up standards and enhance training and leadership. And the fight against national and international level crime will be transformed by the creation of a National Crime Agency to take on and defeat serious and organised criminals.

The Home Office has considered the Committee's recommendations in detail and the Government's response is provided below.

\*\*\*

**1. We agree that police pay and conditions need reforming in order to enable Chief Constables to shape their workforces to respond to the need for a more financially efficient police service that can continue effectively to pursue its mission of reducing crime and disorder in the 21st century. However, neither in his initial report, nor in his evidence to us, did Tom Winsor adequately resolve the issue of how to give police chiefs greater powers to manage without undermining the special role of police officers. We foresee a danger that, in the future, the courts may decide that police officers are employees. We note that Tom Winsor said that he does not see this happening because of the weight of law and history behind the office of constable, but we do not regard this as sufficient assurance. We therefore urge the Home Office to seek legal advice on this point, and in the light of that advice, to decide where the balance of changes to terms and conditions should lie. (Paragraph 17)**

The office of constable is the bedrock of British policing – and this is something that Tom Winsor recognised in the principle he set out in his Part 1 Report. We will consider his recommendations carefully, including their legal implications.

However, it should be noted that the Home Secretary has referred the Winsor recommendations about police officers' pay and conditions to the police negotiating machinery and that process is still ongoing. She will consider the outcome of that process carefully before any decisions are made as to the implementation of Tom Winsor's recommendations.

**2. Tom Winsor's review of pay and conditions is having an inevitable impact on morale in the police service but it is possible to do more to mitigate this. Therefore we recommend that the Home Office set up an interactive website to answer questions from police officers and staff. Such a website would need to be very carefully designed and properly mediated and managed, and would require serious**

**commitment from the Home Office. Many websites which are intended to improve communications with the public—both in the public and the private sector—prove frustrating and fail to provide good interaction, and that can make matters worse rather than better. Some officers felt that Tom Winsor did not take sufficient time to hear directly from them and understand their work. We therefore recommend that, before making any further recommendations, Tom Winsor should spend more time visiting officers and staff. When the second part of the review is published, the Home Office should hold events in local police force areas to explain directly how any proposed fundamental changes will affect officers and staff. (Paragraph 18)**

We understand the concern of officers about the potential changes to their pay and pensions. However, we are facing an unprecedented public sector deficit, and all public sector workers, including the police service, are being asked to take their share of the burden. It is important to provide remuneration that is fair and reasonable for both the police and the taxpayer.

Tom Winsor's review is independent and it is for him to decide how to conduct his review. We note however that engagement with officers and staff took place through seminars and meetings with staff associations and through visits to forces, and also through gathering information via a website consultation to which many contributions were made by police officers, staff and special constables. The Review website also has a 'ready reckoner' that provides officers with an indication of how the Part 1 recommendations could affect them if they are implemented, based on their role and individual circumstances. Further information is available on the Review's website.

However, it is of course important that officers and staff understand proposed reforms. Therefore, we will consider the best way of achieving this in light of the Committee's recommendations.

**3. In a tough economic context, when the budgets of many public sector bodies are being reduced, it is not surprising that there will be less money available to perform the functions currently carried out by the National Policing Improvement Agency in the period up to 2014-15. Some money may be saved through efficiencies, but it is not clear that these are currently being delivered in an environment of very considerable uncertainty, and ultimately this funding gap will have to be met either by stopping some functions altogether or by finding an alternative source of funding. While we do not rule out the possibility that police forces should have to pay for some of the functions that they currently receive from the Agency at no cost to themselves, we are concerned that police forces are already under considerable pressure to cut budgets. The pressure on budgets from this and other sources may ultimately result in further reductions in the size of the police workforce. As has been seen in the past, this can fragment approaches across police forces which need to be co-ordinated and consistent. As we emphasise below, the Home Office must urgently provide clarity to police forces about the financial contribution that will be**

required of them, in order for them to manage any reductions in headcount as effectively as possible. (Paragraph 47)

4. It is unacceptable that, more than a year after the Government announced it was phasing out the National Policing Improvement Agency, it still has not announced any definite decisions about the future of the vast majority of the functions currently performed by the Agency, including vital functions such as Airwave, the DNA database, the Police National Database, and the Police National Missing Persons Bureau. We accept that consultation is important, but so is making and communicating decisions. The continuing uncertainty is damaging not only to the morale of the people who work for the Agency, but also to the efficiency and effectiveness of the police service as a whole: it is difficult for police forces and other policing bodies to plan for the future, both financially and logistically, if they do not know what is happening to the plethora of functions performed by the National Policing Improvement Agency, whether the cost of providing any of these functions will fall on them, and whether anyone is making the savings and efficiencies in respect of these functions which police forces are having to make themselves. In particular, it is difficult for forces to plan effectively for the savings required of them under the Spending Review in these circumstances. If it is the view of the Home Office that some of these functions should be ended altogether—or left as a matter for the police without any ongoing Home Office support—this should be made clear so that chief officers can consider their future approach. (Paragraph 48)

5. Spring 2012, when the National Policing Improvement Agency is due to be phased out, is little more than six months away. We are not persuaded that the Government can now meet this timetable and recommend that it delay the phasing out of the Agency until the end of 2012. It should issue a revised timetable containing not only an ultimate deadline for the phasing out of the Agency, but also interim deadlines for announcements on the future of specific groups of functions and their funding. These should be deadlines that the Home Office is sure—barring events outside its control—it can meet. The police service needs certainty about when decisions will be made. It may be better to take slightly longer and provide this certainty, than to aim for very tight deadlines and fail to meet them. (Paragraph 49)

8. We note also at this point that, from the little that is already known about the likely distribution of the National Policing Improvement Agency's functions, phasing it out is unlikely to lead to fewer bodies in the national policing landscape, as Ministers had hoped. In this sense, the landscape will not be more streamlined as a result of its closure. However, there remains a possibility that the landscape—and thus, more importantly, the police service itself—may operate more effectively once those functions have been redistributed. We explore this possibility further in the rest of the report. (Paragraph 54)



**26. A Professional Body for policing that has Sir Robert Peel’s mission of preventing crime and disorder at its core has the potential to become an effective part of the new landscape, but there are considerable obstacles to its success. The most important challenge will be winning the support of the rank and file of police officers and staff. We urge the Home Secretary to respond to Peter Neyroud’s review, setting out whether she plans to pursue the idea of a Professional Body and, if so, explaining how she would go about the task of making it inclusive right from the start. We urge her to ensure that the Professional Body is separate from the Council of Chief Constables and is a new body with a focus entirely on professional standards and training. The role of the new Professional Body should not be confused by giving it functions or responsibilities which do not relate to professional standards simply because there are functions for which a home has to be found somewhere. A realistic timetable for setting up the Body is essential and given that it is unlikely to be fully functional before the phasing out of the National Policing Improvement Agency, the Home Office should specify what interim arrangements it will put in place for the functions it proposes to transfer from the Agency. If there is a decision to create a new Professional Body for policing, it would make sense for the development of this new body—which will involve consideration of the role and purpose of the police—to inform the development of the new landscape of policing more widely. (Paragraph 133)**

(Response to recommendations 3, 4, 5, 8 and 26)

We are planning a methodical and careful wind down of the NPIA in 2012, which has involved detailed consultation on those functions which should be transferred, and consideration of developments in the policing landscape which are closely linked, such as Police and Crime Commissioners. We have been planning for some time to close down NPIA in 2012; its functions will cease to exist under its current auspices by December 2012.

In particular, the Government has consulted on the future of some of the NPIA’s current functions through Peter Neyroud’s Review of Police Leadership and Training. This did not receive service wide support initially and the Government has given careful consideration to views on this over the summer.

The Government intends to create a new inclusive police professional body. The first part of the Government’s reform agenda focused on structures. The second phase concentrates on people and the professional body will play a key role in this. This is a unique opportunity to professionalise policing further, creating a body that reflects and works for all ranks, staff and officers alike. It will also create an organisation that will give opportunities to open up the closed system of leadership to harness greater diversity and experience at a senior level, and that can equip the service with the skills it needs to deliver policing in a changing, leaner and more accountable environment.

The need for change is pressing.



- Modern day policing is increasingly difficult and demanding. High standards of conduct, especially demonstrated through strong leadership, and clear, professional expertise, underpin police forces' ability to work effectively together to tackle fast moving challenges.
- The financial challenge that the Police Service faces means that we need to ensure that forces are able to make the necessary savings while also improving their ability to fight crime, and improving the service they offer to the public. Police continue to be burdened by bureaucracy, when they can afford it least. We need to ensure that officers are both freed from unnecessary bureaucracy and sufficiently skilled to enable forces to do away with the double and triple checking of work that should have been done correctly first time. Replacing bureaucracy by informed professional discretion unlocks both savings and improved service for the public.
- We need a workforce that is structured, rewarded and motivated to respond to modern demands and produces future generations of able crime fighters. The Home Secretary asked Tom Winsor to undertake a review of police remuneration and conditions, and part two of his review is considering entry to the service, progression and police careers. Conclusions reached in this critical area will provide a framework for a modern police workforce.

### **Purpose of the police professional body**

The mission of the police professional body will be to develop the body of knowledge, standards of conduct, ethical values, skills and leadership and professional standards required by police officers and police staff in England and Wales, supporting them to more effectively fight crime. The professional body must work in the public interest and will include work on the following areas: ensuring police officers and staff have the qualifications and skills to provide a high quality service to the public, maintain their professional competence, keep their skills and knowledge up-to-date and uphold the highest standards of conduct and ethical values.

The police professional body will have responsibility, for example, for setting standards for entry to the Service and for promotion and progression through ranks and into specialist positions, for setting standards for and assuring the provision of training, for ensuring that officers and staff keep their skills and knowledge up-to-date, and for setting standards of conduct and values both for police forces and for individual police officers and police staff. It will be responsible for advancing a body of knowledge for the profession of policing. While some specialist training may need to be delivered directly by the police professional body, it will need to examine how to ensure training achieves value for money. This may include a significant widening in the use of providers. These objects and the mission are under discussion with Police Service and police workforce representatives.

The police professional body should work to a clear set of guiding principles, including, for example, opening the system of leadership, reducing bureaucracy, involving the public in discussions prior to setting standards and, as appropriate, ensuring value for money for the

police service by using external providers of training and the capacity already present in police forces.

Whilst the police professional body will focus on policing in England and Wales, it will be important that it takes into account, and works closely with, forces in Scotland and Northern Ireland, particularly on cross-border issues.

### **Governance of the professional body**

The professional body must act in the public interest and be a catalyst for improvement, not self-interest. So its governance will reflect the importance of openness, transparency, and accountability, consistent with modern best practice for the governance of “public interest” professions.

The police professional body will be led by a Board which broadly balances police service and independent membership. The professional body would have an independent chair, and its members would include Police and Crime Commissioners. The Home Secretary has asked the Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice to discuss with his Developing Professionalism Working Group the best constitution for the Police professional body in order to secure its mission.

The responsibilities for the police professional body’s Board will include setting accreditation qualifications for police officers and staff (for example, for particular policing roles or for promotion). This function of the Board will be underpinned by Police Regulations.

Police officers may only exercise their powers under the direction and control of a chief officer, so the police professional body does not need to duplicate this and maintain a “licence to practise” for each individual officer. Instead, it will set the standards for entry into the police, for promotion, or for a particular specialism.

This body should represent the whole of the police workforce. The new police professional body will develop policing as a profession, speaking with representation from the police service as a whole and in the public interest. Separately, Chief Constables will still need to come together for discussion focusing on key operational issues when it is in the national interest for them to do so.

Peter Neyroud in his review outlined a Policing Professional Body which held chartered status. Chartered status is an issue for the professional body itself to pursue when it has developed a body of evidence demonstrating it reaches the rigorous criteria required.

### **Financing the police professional body**

These reforms are being made within a wider financial context. The requirement to reduce public spending means that transformational changes in the way police forces deliver

services for the public are needed. The police service needs to protect frontline service delivery including by ensuring that necessary back office and operational support functions are provided in new, more cost effective ways. This applies just as much to functions which forces currently rely on the NPIA for, as to forces' own internal support functions.

The NPIA is managing its finances through the changes required by the transition of its functions to successor bodies and taking efficiency measures to effect savings and protect services. Some are in hand and more are planned to safeguard the position in the later years of the Spending Review period.

The police professional body will need to be funded from within the overall, reducing, allocation for this spending round. Funding will follow those functions of NPIA that are transferred to the professional body, with appropriate allocation of overheads. The professional body will also need to assess whether the current mix of provision is correct and whether it could organise funding, training and assessment provision in a more cost effective way.

The Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice will consult with the Developing Professionalism Working Group he is establishing, which includes police staff associations, on the best way forward with regard to whether there should be a form of membership of the police professional body.

### **Chiefs' Council**

The police professional body will develop policing as a profession, speaking with representation from the police service as a whole and in the public interest. Chief Constables also need to come together for discussion focusing on key operational issues when it is in the public interest for them to do so. So, in the new landscape, there will be a Chiefs' Council, and its relationship with the police professional body and precise remit will need to be determined.

Ministers will work with ACPO and key partners on the destination of ACPO's executive functions.

With regard to other NPIA functions, the Government's plans include:

- transferring key national critical operational functions, to the NCA, which naturally fit with its new national crime fighting remit. Those areas already identified include the Central Witness Bureau, Crime Operational Support, the National Missing Persons Bureau, the Serious Crime Analysis team, and the Specialist Operations centre. In the short term, these important functions will move to the Serious Organised Crime Agency, one of the major precursor bodies to the NCA;

- transferring responsibility for the 101 non-emergency phone service, crime mapping, pathology services, forensic and other non-ICT procurement and the programme for implementing Schengen Information System (II) (SIS II), to the Home Office. These moves follow the non-ICT procurement transfers that completed in October 2011; and
- handing over, to a lead force, the hosting of the new National Police Air Service; and
- ending the work the NPIA currently does on advising on value for money by November 2012. In its place, police and crime commissioners will drive value for money in the police service, with further support where necessary.

Functions will be transferred in phases. Non-ICT procurement transferred into the Home Office on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011, with the next transfers being the five functions specified above, that have been agreed should transfer to the National Crime Agency in line with its operational crime-fighting focus. These will be placed in SOCA in the period during the NPIA's phasing out and before the creation of the NCA in law to ensure that there is no gap in provision. We aim to complete these transfers by Spring 2012. The Home Secretary will update Parliament and the Committee with details of further decisions.

The Government continues to undertake a careful analysis of all remaining functions.. We will keep the Committee updated as decisions and progress are made.

The Government judges that its reforms to NPIA functions will streamline the national policing landscape by clarifying responsibilities and remits. This greater coherence will better support the police in their core mission to cut crime, improve accountability of national policing bodies and, through removing unnecessary layers, bureaucracy will be reduced.

**6. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary is one of the few relatively stable elements in the new landscape and at a time of change and upheaval it would be unwise to dilute its focus or burden it with functions unrelated to its purpose. There may be some elements of the National Policing Improvement Agency that could assist the work of the Inspectorate, but we doubt it. If the Home Secretary is considering moving any functions to the Inspectorate, we urge her to make clear proposals and to give us adequate time to consider any such ideas before she reaches a conclusion. We understand the enthusiasm to reduce the number of different bodies that are involved in policing issues, but we also think that it is extremely important for the role of the Inspectorate to be very clear, specific and undiluted at a time of major changes within the landscape of policing. (Paragraph 52)**

The government agrees with the Committee that it is important to retain the clear role for the inspectorate. HMIC will continue to monitor and inspect police performance and publish an annual report on policing, shining a light on behalf of the public so that local communities can better understand the effectiveness of local forces. There are no plans to transfer existing NPIA functions to HMIC.

**7. Given the recent upheaval and uncertainty at the Metropolitan Police, following the resignation of the Commissioner, Paul Stephenson, and Assistant Commissioner John Yates, we do not believe that it would be helpful, either for it or for the police service as a whole, for it to take on any additional national functions at this time. This does not necessarily apply with respect to other forces, although, given their smaller size, they would need to convince others that they have the necessary expertise and ability to take on a national role. (Paragraph 53)**

There are no immediate plans to transfer additional national functions to the Metropolitan Police Service. The Metropolitan Police Service would only take on additional national functions if the Government and the Metropolitan Police were persuaded that doing so would not undermine its operational capabilities.

**9. The Government's plan for the National Crime Agency contains welcome assurances about the future of the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre in the new landscape, particularly in relation to safeguarding its multi-partnership approach to tackling the sexual abuse of children. In the light of these assurances, and the fact that they reflect the principles set out by the Centre's current Chief Executive, we have fewer reservations about the plan for the Centre to become one of the commands within the new National Crime Agency. Some 78% of respondents to our policing poll regarded child protection as a high priority for the police, although we do not suggest that the poll was necessarily representative. Given the vital work that the Centre for Child Exploitation and Online Protection carries out, we will return to this matter once the Agency is operational to assure ourselves that there has been no diminution in the Centre's effectiveness, independence, or ability to work as a partner with child protection agencies and charities in the UK and more widely. If in the future we judged that there had been such a diminution, we would argue for the Centre becoming a stand-alone organisation to ensure that it is in the best possible position to carry out its crucial work. (Paragraph 71)**

We welcome the Committee's recognition that plans for the NCA will ensure that CEOP activity is not diminished but enhanced as part of the new agency and note the Committee's comments about returning to this issue once the NCA has been formally established.

The Government strongly supports CEOP and the work that it does to protect children. We want CEOP to lead law enforcement work to protect children at a national level, and we have therefore decided that the best place for it to do this is in the National Crime Agency, in which the Centre will be able benefit from the intelligence, capabilities, expertise and

assets of the wider Agency. This will put CEOP as a central part of the national policing picture, where it will be a key part of the mainstream of national law enforcement arrangements.

**10. Given the concerns that some of our witnesses raised about the Serious Organised Crime Agency's relationships with local police forces and other law enforcement bodies—it has had to depend upon a coalition of the willing—the National Crime Agency's ability to task police forces and other relevant bodies is welcome in principle and in the long-term may result in the fight against organised crime becoming more effective. However, we still do not have sufficient detail about how this arrangement will work in practice, particularly in relation to Police and Crime Commissioners. We look forward to receiving more information before the publication of the Bill in spring 2012 and to commenting on a draft of the Strategic Policing Requirement. Ultimately, the success of the National Crime Agency will depend on all the bodies involved in the fight against organised crime building good relationships with each other. The Strategic Policing Requirement can contribute towards building those relationships, but it should not be regarded as a substitute for them, or as an easy fix. The recent riots in England emphasise the need for the Strategic Policing Requirement to provide clarity and direction regarding the relationship between local and national policing: for example, the extent to which each force trains officers in public order and makes these available to deploy elsewhere. We will revisit this again shortly in our inquiry into Policing large-scale disorder: lessons from the disturbances of August 2011. (Paragraph 76)**

The NCA's ability to task and coordinate will come primarily from the strength of its intelligence picture, the quality of its relationships and the maturity of its processes, all of which are early priorities for Keith Bristow. The Protocol and the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR) will both provide an important statutory underpinning to ensure that both Chief Constables and Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) cooperate effectively with these arrangements in their respective functions.

We have, on 21 November, published a shadow SPR, which can be found at [www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police/strategic-policing-requirement](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police/strategic-policing-requirement). Although this does not, at this stage, have statutory effect, it will form the basis for testing and consultation with police forces and authorities. We envisage that they will use it when exercising their respective functions, particularly when developing their Policing Plans for 2012/13, and we will work with partners to learn from their experiences as part of the consultation required to issue a statutory SPR ahead of the election of PCCs.

The SPR will form an important basis for the NCA's tasking and coordination remit in respect of the police. The SPR will support PCCs to hold their Chief Constables to account for putting in place effective capabilities for tackling cross-boundary crime – in many cases the policing capabilities on which the NCA will be dependent, either within forces or in collaborations between forces - and for ensuring they cooperate with the NCA.



We expect all other law enforcement agencies to act on the NCA's intelligence and participate fully in operations given the obvious public interest. The wider law enforcement community will benefit directly from its ability to draw on the expertise and intelligence of the NCA, including the agency's specialist capabilities. We will also consider what, if any, additional legislative powers are required to underpin tasking and coordination.

**11. We welcome the publication of the Organised Crime Strategy, although it would have been more useful if it had been published before the plan for the National Crime Agency. Now that the strategy has been published, we look forward to further information about how the National Crime Agency will work towards achieving the aims of the strategy. In particular, in relation to raising awareness of the threat from, and methods used by, organised criminals, we would like to see plans for how the National Crime Agency will interact with the public and businesses as well as other law enforcement bodies. (Paragraph 80)**

The Organised Crime Strategy was launched on 28 July but work on its implementation was already underway, particularly in understanding how the creation of the National Crime Agency would help to bring about a step change in the fight against organised crime. The strategy is founded on a multi-agency – and multi-departmental – approach to fighting organised crime, and pending the launch of the NCA in 2013, it sets out how effort and resource will be brigaded and directed to best effect against organised crime. For the first time it will mean all the agencies involved in tackling organised crime are working to common objectives and with a clear line of accountability.

The strategy also sets out the important implementation work that is already underway, not just to ensure that the NCA will have the right infrastructure from the outset, but to drive operational improvements to the approach to organised crime ahead of the commencement of the new Agency in 2013– in particular, to improve our intelligence gathering capability, analysis and exploitation at national and regional level. Key to this is the establishment of the new multi-agency Organised Crime Coordination Centre (OCCC), now up and running, functioning as a national hub to collate, analyse and disseminate for action criminal intelligence relating to organised crime. This will both drive better national coordination of law enforcement efforts ahead of 2013 and be a key building block for the NCA's intelligence hub.

The NCA will work with a wide range of partners to help ensure that serious and organised criminality is tackled across the board. As part of the detailed design of the new Agency, we will seek to involve key partners from business, communities, charities and wider civil society to capture their expertise and develop strong relationships ahead of the NCA being established. The NCA will serve the public and, as a matter of principle, engage with them wherever possible and appropriate. It will look to publish information which helps the public to better understand and protect itself from threats, as well make transparent information on how well the Agency is performing.



For example, we will continue to support CEOP's work to educate children and their carers on how to protect themselves online, such as their "Think U Know" education programme that has reached nearly 8 million children. The Economic Crime Coordination Board (ECCB), the forerunner to the NCA's Economic Crime Command, will work closely with the private and public sector as we step up activity on prevention of economic crime and equip individuals and businesses with the information they need to help protect themselves from fraud. The ECCB is already in place and has established a cross-agency Operational Group to coordinate the law enforcement response to the most harmful economic crime threats.

The NCA will house the National Cyber Crime Unit, which will build on the work currently done by the Police Central e-Crime Unit and SOCA e-crime. This unit will support the work to tackle organised criminals as well as being the national centre of expertise on cyber crime providing support, intelligence and guidance to police forces and the commands of the NCA. It will work in partnership with the private sector to intervene against criminals operating online and will also be responsible for the development of mainstream law enforcement capability to tackle cyber crime.

**12. It is surprising that the plan the Government published on 8 June 2011, nearly a year after the original proposals for the National Crime Agency, does not contain any further information about which National Policing Improvement Agency functions can or will be taken on by the new Agency. (Paragraph 82)**

**13. Only those National Policing Improvement Agency functions that relate directly to the National Crime Agency's focus on improving the operational response to organised crime and improving border security should be transferred to the new Agency. The task ahead of the National Crime Agency is sufficiently daunting without its focus being diverted by additional functions only tangentially related to its purpose. Although we expect that only a small number of functions will be transferred, we are concerned about the gap in time between the scheduled phasing out of the National Policing Improvement Agency in spring 2012 and the setting up of the National Crime Agency, which is due to become fully operational by December 2013. This adds further weight to our call to the Government to delay the phasing out of the National Policing Improvement Agency. (Paragraph 85)**

(Response to recommendations 12 and 13): Work to establish the NCA has focused initially on the major, strategic tasks. As the Committee notes, only a small number of NPIA functions were expected to transfer to the NCA, which is why the NCA Plan did not provide further detail. The Plan did set out its criteria for which functions could transfer to the NCA from other bodies, including that they fit the operational crime-fighting focus of the Agency. We welcome the Committee's endorsement of this approach.

The Government is planning a methodical and careful phasing out of the NPIA in 2012. To achieve an ordered transfer we are taking careful decisions about the future of its functions, following thorough prioritisation and working closely with the police service. It is the Government's intention that the NPIA will be phased out in 2012 with its functions ceasing to exist under its current auspices by December 2012. We have identified a small number of important NPIA functions which will transfer to the National Crime Agency. They will be placed in SOCA in the period during the NPIA's phasing out and before the creation of the NCA in law to ensure that there is no gap in provision ahead of the establishment of the NCA. In line with the operational crime-fighting focus of the NCA, five functions that are confirmed to transfer are: Crime Operational Support, Specialist Operations Centre, Central Witness Bureau, Serious Crime Analysis and National Missing Persons Bureau. We are working closely with SOCA and the NPIA to ensure a smooth transition for these functions.

**14. Although London is a prime target for terrorist attacks, the terrorist threat is a national problem and there would be advantages in placing responsibility for counter-terrorism in the National Crime Agency. We recognise, however, that there is a danger that this would divert resources and attention from the fight against organised crime, but this will be the case wherever counter-terrorism is placed, and a national agency may be better placed to make such judgments. We agree with the Government that responsibility for counter-terrorism should remain with the Metropolitan Police until after the Olympics, not least because the National Crime Agency will not be fully functional until the end of December 2013. However, we recommend that, after the Olympics, the Home Office consider making counter-terrorism a separate command of the National Crime Agency: there should be full co-operation and interaction between the different commands. Such a change would also allow for greater clarity in the leadership and accountability of the Metropolitan Police through the Mayor of London, since there would be less justification for involvement by the Home Secretary: for example, in appointing the Metropolitan Police Commissioner. (Paragraph 90)**

As we have said in the NCA Plan, counter-terrorism policing already has effective national structures in place. All forces have responsibility within their areas for counter-terrorism policing. This is complemented by the network of regional counter-terrorism investigative and intelligence hubs and the national coordination arrangements formed through the ACPO agreement under which responsibility for national functions and capabilities are held by a number of lead forces, particularly the Metropolitan Police. The Government is considering how to ensure the strengths of the present arrangements are maintained and enhanced alongside the rest of its new approach to fighting crime. This includes the NCA building on the strong relationship and intelligence links that SOCA has developed with the security services and counter-terrorism policing. We welcome the Committee's agreement that there should be no major changes to counter-terrorism policing structures ahead of the London 2012 Games and the establishment of the NCA. At that point in time it will be right to look at counter terrorism policing and to decide where it is appropriate for that to sit in terms of national responsibility.

**15. We seek an assurance from the Home Office that the National Crime Agency will be subject to at least the same level of scrutiny as the Serious Organised Crime Agency. We ask it to provide details of which bodies will undertake this scrutiny. We also ask it to supply, as soon as possible, a more detailed indication of the governance arrangements that will apply to the new agency so that we have time to consider these before the publication of the Bill. We expect that some elements of the National Crime Agency's work could not reasonably be subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but we ask the Government to ensure that as much of it as possible is subject to the Act. (Paragraph 94)**

We welcome the Committee's views on the need to ensure the National Crime Agency is appropriately governed, scrutinised and transparent. We are in agreement in this respect. It is not our intention to reduce the level of scrutiny and we are clear that the governance model should be open, transparent and un-bureaucratic, with clear and direct accountability to the Home Secretary and to Parliament.

The final governance model will balance the need for clear oversight of the activities of the NCA with ensuring that operational decision-making rests with the Agency. In financial terms, the governance arrangements will need to ensure: propriety and regularity; prudent and economical administration; and value for money. We will also want to maintain the ability of CEOP to raise and hold funds from donors to continue its innovative partnerships with the public, private and third sectors. In transparency terms the arrangements for the new Agency will need to balance ease of public access to information with the risk of prejudicing criminal investigations and protecting national security. In scrutiny terms, where an external scrutiny body currently exists with a responsibility to examine functions that fall within SOCA's remit, it would be fair to presume that such a body would have a role in the scrutiny of the NCA where those functions form part of the new Agency.

The precise governance arrangements are being finalised but there are a number of different models which exist in the law enforcement, criminal justice and intelligence arena which we will want to draw on, where appropriate. These include Non-Departmental Public Bodies, Non-Ministerial Departments and Executive Agencies. Existing organisations which fall within these different governance models include the Serious Organised Crime Agency, HM Revenue and Customs, the Crown Prosecution Service, the Serious Fraud Office, the UK Borders Agency and the National Fraud Authority. Whichever the finally agreed model, it is vital that it results in clearly defined roles and responsibilities and a public facing organisation able to visibly demonstrate a strengthened law enforcement response to serious and organised criminality. Key aspects of the governance arrangements will be reflected in the legislation. Details on the NCA's governance arrangements will be shared with the Committee in due course.

**16. Not only will the new National Crime Agency have to prove itself more effective than the Serious Organised Crime Agency at tackling organised crime, the**

**constraints of the Spending Review mean that it will have to do so with what will be in effect a smaller budget than that of its predecessor. Although the need to make savings offers the opportunity to find more cost-effective ways of working, the magnitude of this challenge should not be underestimated. Once the head of the new Agency is in place, and the Agency's remit and responsibilities have been laid out in more detail, a plan should be produced setting out where the necessary savings will be found. (Paragraph 97)**

We welcome the views of the Committee and recognise the scale of the challenge involved to provide a step change in performance and delivery at a time when budgets are reducing as part of the Spending Review. Clearly identifying savings and efficiencies will be a critical part of the NCA business plan and a key challenge for Keith Bristow in his role as Head of the NCA.

Financial and affordability considerations will play a key role in informing all elements of the programme to build the NCA. This work will follow a set of agreed finance principles to ensure opportunities to make efficiencies are fully exploited, for instance, by effective prioritisation of resources to meet key strategic objectives and effective rationalisation of infrastructure. The Home Office is working with precursor bodies to ensure potential costs such as transition and running costs are kept to an absolute minimum.

**17. The National Crime Agency has the potential to be more effective than its predecessor at preventing organised crime, particularly in the light of its ability to task police forces and other law enforcement bodies. However, much of the detail of how the Agency will work in practice is still unpublished. The position of Head of the National Crime Agency should be regarded as one of the key policing jobs in the UK. The delay already experienced in appointing a permanent head is regrettable. We are disappointed that there was very little interest in the post when it was originally announced. We urge the Government to appoint a head of the National Crime Agency as a matter of urgency. The salary should be set at a level appropriate to attract senior Chief Constables of the highest calibre. When the Home Secretary presented the Government's plan for the National Crime Agency she referred to "a transition for a permanent individual to be established as the head of the National Crime Agency." We do not believe that it would be helpful to have one individual involved in setting up the Agency, with another individual then taking over as head. The individual who is appointed should be directly involved in setting up the new Agency and should go on to become its permanent head. We trust that once a permanent head has been appointed, they will stay in post for sufficient time to provide continuity and stability. Leadership in the police service suffers if people in senior positions are continually moving jobs. (Paragraph 100)**

The Government welcomes the Committee's comments and agrees with their assessment of the importance of the role of the Head of the National Crime Agency.

The post was re-advertised at the end of July with a salary equivalent to that of the Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police to attract a wide field of high calibre candidates. The post was also advertised for a fixed term of three years to allow the successful candidate time to create and lead an organisation fully fit to deliver its national responsibilities.

Keith Bristow has been appointed to the post and took up the role earlier this month; he was consulted on important decisions ahead of this. Keith has extensive experience of leading organised crime investigations and developing and using criminal intelligence. As Chief Constable of Warwickshire, he has transformed the force both operationally and organisationally and has already worked at national and international level to build relationships between police services and law-enforcement agencies in many countries.

The Committee should be reassured that the three year appointment term means that Mr Bristow will both play a vital role in developing the new agency and become its first operational head, ensuring a smooth transition to a fully functioning NCA. He will oversee the establishment of the NCA and lead the Agency once it becomes operational in 2013. He will have a central role in the governance of the NCA programme, providing strategic leadership for the law enforcement community and preparing staff across precursor agencies and partners for working with the Agency from 2013. During this period, he will play a key role in galvanising the law enforcement response to serious and organised crime in line with the Government's Organised Crime Strategy. Specifically, he will be responsible over the next year for putting in place each of the four shadow commands, designing the operating model for the Agency as a whole and starting to test the tasking and co-ordination arrangements.

**18. There is some support for a Professional Body for policing from within the service itself, but there does not appear to be a strong demand for such a body as yet. Peter Neyroud's proposals seem to have been strongly influenced by the need to adjust to the phasing out of the National Policing Improvement Agency and redefine the role of the Association of Chief Police Officers, rather than the need to professionalise the police service per se. This does not mean that a Professional Body could not ultimately become a useful part of the policing landscape, but it does mean that if the Government proceeds with these proposals, it will need to win hearts and minds and to convey coherently the nature and role of the new body. (Paragraph 106)**

We agree with ACPO that a professional body is what is needed. The mission of the police professional body will be to develop the body of knowledge, standards of conduct, ethical values, skills and leadership and professional standards required by police officers and police staff in England and Wales, supporting them to more effectively fight crime. The professional body must work in the public interest. The detailed proposition for the professional body will be worked up in close dialogue with Police Service representatives and our current intentions are set out in response to Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 8 and 26



above. The Government recognises the importance of working with the police to establish the Body. The professional body will exist for the whole of the police service, not just chief officers.

The Board of the professional body will include a balance of Service and independent members, and will provide a level of co-ordination and direction across the Service. The Board will be chaired by an independent person. This is consistent with modern best practice for the governance of "public interest" professions.

**19. It is extremely unhelpful to talk of ACPO as being the head and the heart of the new Professional Body, or to use similar expressions. ACPO represents and involves chief officers and the most senior managers in the police service, whereas a significant contribution is made by superintendents. The Police Superintendents' Association has for years made a valuable contribution to professional development and standards, as well as reflecting the practicalities of crime reduction work on the ground. The majority of police officers are represented by the Police Federation, which also makes an important contribution to training and development. All three elements of the police service, and all three bodies need to share and be engaged in developing a Professional Body. (Paragraph 116)**

The Government agrees with the Committee, and has already been clear that the new professional body must speak for the whole of policing, staff and officers.

To achieve this, and in line with modern best practice for the governance of "public interest" professions, the new body will be governed by a Board with an equal balance between Service representatives and independent members of the board, including Police and Crime Commissioner members. The Board will have an independent chair.

**20. It is also unhelpful to suggest that the Professional Body could become inclusive in stages. If the Professional Body is to succeed, it must be inclusive from the outset. The police's basic Peelian mission to prevent crime and disorder should be at the centre of the Professional Body. The Professional Body has the potential to change the police service for the better, particularly with regard to training—a point to which we return later—but only if it is emphatically not, and not perceived to be, a repositioned ACPO. Individual police officers and members of staff, whatever their rank, need to believe that this is their body: not least because, as we discuss below, they would be contributing a substantial element of its running costs. (Paragraph 117)**

The Government agrees with the Committee that the professional body must be inclusive from the outset.

**21. The new Professional Body should not be a policy-setting body for policing. National policy should be set by the Home Office and guidance and standards issued**

**by the Professional Body should be subordinate. In recognition of the fact that guidance and standards sometimes shade into policy, the Home Office will need to review what is developed and refer it to Ministers as necessary. (Paragraph 120)**

The detailed proposition for the professional body will be worked up in close dialogue with Police Service representatives. Our current intentions are set out in response to Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 8 and 26 above. The Committee has raised an interesting point which we will consider as this work develops.

**22. There should be a Chief Constables' Council, separate from the Professional Body. Its purpose should purely be for Chief Constables to discuss operational matters. The Council should not be a policy-making body, any more than the Professional Body should be. In addition, the Council should not have its own operational capacity or functions, and should not conduct for-profit activities. (Paragraph 122)**

We are working with ACPO and other policing partners/colleagues to determine the future location of functions and remit of the Chiefs' Council. The Home Secretary will keep Parliament and the Committee informed of the progress of this work.

**23. A properly resourced and structured Professional Body could have the potential to improve police training, particularly if it encourages practical learning and places an onus on individuals continually to update their knowledge. The emphasis on specialist training and qualifications also harmonises well with Tom Winsor's proposals to reward those who do skilled jobs. However, it is not clear which of the functions currently provided by the National Policing Improvement Agency and listed in chapter 1 of this report will migrate to the Professional Body in the new landscape. We urge the Home Office to provide a list of exactly which functions will be transferred to the new Body. (Paragraph 128)**

The Government has set out the purpose of the Body in broad terms in the Home Secretary's recent statement to Parliament. The detailed proposition for the professional body will be worked up in close dialogue with Police Service representatives. Our current intentions are set out in response to Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 8 and 26 above. Further decisions on precisely what functions will migrate to the new Body are still being considered by Government; the Home Secretary will keep Parliament and the Committee informed.

**24. As far as we can tell from the current evidence, the funding proposals for the Professional Body seem viable. However, we reiterate that the fact that a substantial element of the running costs of the new body will be contributed by individual police officers and staff makes it all the more important that this truly is a body for everyone and not just for senior members of the police service. For that reason, it must neither be 'owned by', nor subsumed under or within ACPO. (Paragraph 129)**



We agree with the Committee that the new professional body must be an inclusive body, speaking for the whole of policing, staff and officers.

To achieve this, and in line with modern best practice for the governance of “public interest” professions, the new body will be governed by a Board with an equal balance between Service representatives and independent members of the board, including Police and Crime Commissioner members. The Board will have an independent chair.

The professional body must be inclusive, and for the whole service. As the Committee suggests, it will not be owned by, nor subsumed by, ACPO.

We are working with ACPO to determine the future location of functions and remit of the Chiefs’ Council.

**25. We are not convinced that there would need to be an Independent Scrutiny Board for the Professional Body. We believe that the role of scrutinising the Professional Body could be carried out by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary. There should be a Police and Crime Commissioner on the Board of the new Professional Body in order to help connect local policing with the national policing landscape. We have already stated that we think that the Council of Chief Constables should be a separate body with a strictly operational focus. (Paragraph 132)**

The Government believes that the decisions taken by the professional body should be open and transparent. The new body will be governed by a Board with an equal balance between Service representatives and independent members of the board, including Police and Crime Commissioner members. The Board will have an independent chair. The Government is still considering the future role of the Council of Chief Constables, and will take the Committee’s views into account as it does so.

**27. IT across the police service as a whole is not fit for purpose, to the detriment of the police’s ability to fulfil their basic mission of preventing crime and disorder. The Home Office must make revolutionising police IT a top priority. This is one area of policing where direction from the centre is not only desirable but vital in order to effect change. (Paragraph 138)**

The Government agrees with the Committee’s assessment of the importance of radical reform of police IT and has established a programme within the Home Office to oversee the establishment of an ICT company. This company will be owned by police authorities and subsequently police crime commissioners, with the police service as its customer, so that the needs of local policing can be met efficiently. The programme will design, build and implement the new company and secure the long-term management arrangements of the current services delivered in-house by the NPIA.

It is now clear that the best and quickest approach to improving police ICT does not involve a national grand plan specifying exactly what ICT all forces should buy. Instead, police forces need to identify the best way forward to get more efficiency from ICT – both directly and through improving the way the force functions. As part of this, they need to get better and more seamless ICT services for their officers and staff, for example avoiding time-wasting re-keying of the same data into different systems.

The new company, which will be legally separate from the Home Office, will ensure a more commercial and efficient approach to police ICT provision, using economies of scale and market forces to more efficiently manage the expenditure on ICT and to save public money whilst freeing up police officer time from having to manage the provision of ICT services. The service it provides will cover the procurement, implementation and management of complex contracts for information technology, related business change and outsourcing services.

**28. Not only is the current state of information and communications technology in the police service unsatisfactory, the National Policing Improvement Agency is being phased out and a successor must be found for many of the information and communications technology functions that it fulfils. This provides an additional urgency to the imperative for a new approach to police information and communications technology. However, in devising this new approach the Home Office must not neglect those few elements of the existing landscape that are working well. In particular, the Home Office must secure the future of ISIS and continue to support Project Athena. (Paragraph 143)**

The Government agrees that the current state of police ICT is unsatisfactory. That is why the Home Secretary announced the creation of a new police ICT company. It is now clear that the best and quickest approach to improving police ICT does not involve a national grand plan specifying exactly what ICT all forces should buy. Instead, police forces need to identify the best way forward to get more efficiency from ICT – both directly and through improving the way the force functions. As part of this, they need to get better and more seamless ICT services for their officers and staff, for example avoiding time-wasting re-keying of the same data into different systems.

The new ICT company will be responsible for the procurement, implementation and management of complex IT contracts. It will ensure a more commercial and efficient approach to police ICT provision, using economies of scale and market forces to save public money. The company will be ready to assist forces, where they identify its services as the best way of achieving savings and greater efficiency. It will be able to assist forces by negotiating better prices for IT services, providing information as a service and enabling forces to reduce the number of procurement specialists and IT professionals they employ.

Forces have already made substantial savings in ICT. We are seeing a deepening of voluntary collaboration on ICT – through wide partnerships of forces as exemplified by the Athena project, and through bilateral collaboration, for example as in Hampshire/Thames Valley and South Yorkshire/Humberside.

Project Athena is being taken forward by the forces and Police Authorities involved. The Home Secretary has confirmed to the Authorities and forces that she supports the objectives of project Athena and has no objection to the size of this collaboration. Project Athena provides a good example for the service of the power of voluntary collaboration on ICT and business processes

We agree that there is a role for the Police Service's Information Systems Improvement Strategy (ISIS). ISIS will remain an enabler of voluntary collaboration between forces and to provide advice from forces collectively to Ministers on key interoperability issues. This will be owned directly by the service rather than the ICT company which instead will deliver services and products that forces and other customers require and will have a core objective of delivering services and products that support forces and other customers in their drive for interoperability.

**29. Both this and the previous Government have at times claimed that there is a convention whereby special advisers do not give evidence to Select Committees. However, special advisers have given evidence to Select Committees in the past. Considering the significant advice that Lord Wasserman has provided to the Government, we believe that it was an error of judgment to prevent us from hearing from him about his proposals for the future of police IT: this is a vital element of the new landscape and he is a key figure in determining its future. (Paragraph 146)**

**30. We note again that Lord Wasserman has had a long and distinguished career in public service, but we note again that it would have been helpful if we could have spoken to him in person as part of our inquiry, given his central role in shaping the new police IT company. We give notice that we intend to invite Lord Wasserman to give evidence to us in the autumn on these issues and on recent developments. (Paragraph 153)**

(Response to recommendations 29 and 30) The Home Secretary has written to the Chair of the Committee explaining that decisions on the role and remit of the company rest with her and her Ministers. Therefore, it should be Ministers who account for that work to Parliament and the Committee.

**31. We seek clarity from the Home Office on which police force or forces it has in mind to take on responsibility for the existing IT systems provided directly by the National Policing Improvement Agency and an assurance that the force in question will be given the necessary resources to take on this task. In addition, we seek clarity**

**on precisely which IT systems will become the responsibility of a local force and which will go directly to the new police IT body. We expect that Airwave will become the responsibility of the new police IT body, but we would like this confirmed. (Paragraph 155)**

As the Committee recognises, a new approach to police ICT is vital. That is why the Government is carefully considering all elements of the existing landscape, and is committed to ensuring the best future for each, in the interests of supporting the effectiveness of the police but it is likely that the management of the Airwave contract will transfer to the ICT Company at an appropriate time. The Home Secretary will write to the Committee as further decisions are taken on the future of ICT functions.

**32. There is so little detail currently available about the police-led IT company that we find it difficult to reach a conclusion about its viability. There are advantages to creating a single body with the sole purpose of overseeing information and communications technology in the police service, provided that it has the right degree of commercial and technological expertise, a clear focus, clarity about resources, and a good relationship with the wider police service. However, it seems that a key reason for it being considered that a company is the best kind of body to perform this role is that it will not be subject to EU procurement rules. If the body is set up as a company, it is important that it is made subject to Freedom of Information legislation. The people setting up this body have a great deal of work to do in a short space of time, if it is to be up and running by spring 2012. We recommend that the Home Secretary updates Parliament no later than December 2011, by means of an oral statement in the House of Commons, on the progress that is being made. (Paragraph 162)**

The Government agrees that there are considerable advantages to the creation of a single body, as the Home Secretary set out in her speech to ACPO this summer. We are carefully considering all aspects of the new body, including transparency and governance arrangements and will take the Committee's views into account in doing so. The Home Secretary will update Parliament on progress in January 2012 subject to other key decisions concerning the structure of the company being agreed.

**33. The new IT body should make reducing procurement timescales a high priority. (Paragraph 165)**

A key objective of the ICT Company will be to improve the value for money that the police service receives from its spend on ICT services. This will include looking at how best to meet overall procurement timeline commitments, as defined by the Public Contract Regulations 2006.

**34. We see merit in Intellect's proposal that there should be a single national register of approved suppliers to be updated annually, so long as it is an alternative to**

**separate pre-qualification processes rather than an additional requirement, and urge the Government to consider setting up such a list, covering both IT and non-IT suppliers to the police service. (Paragraph 166)**

We look forward to engaging with Intellect on the detail of their proposal and how such an approach could work in practice. We are also engaging with the Cabinet Office on their new Pre-Qualification Questionnaire work and how this will help suppliers.

**35. The new IT body should consider at an early stage what processes should be involved before deciding that awarding a major new contract is the best way of meeting the business aim in question. It should give particular consideration to how it will ensure that contracts that run over many years, such as Airwave, deliver value for money throughout this period. (Paragraph 167)**

The ICT Company will work with its police customers to properly define the appropriate requirements for any services that are required. The sourcing strategy stages of any contracting process would normally evaluate the different routes that are available toward meeting that requirement in the manner that provides the best value for money.

We agree with the Committee's observation that long term value delivery is key in any contractual relationship. The ICT Company will be active in ensuring professional contract management approaches and engagement with suppliers are such that value is delivered throughout any contractual relationship period.

**36. We agree that, although the money spent on procuring goods and services is a relatively small proportion of the overall police budget, it is still a substantial sum of money in itself. The proportion of the total savings required of police forces that can come from more efficient and effective procurement will necessarily be relatively modest, but, as we said in our previous report on Police Finances, even a modest contribution is better than none at all and will help reduce the savings that have to be found elsewhere. (Paragraph 171)**

We welcome the Committee's recognition of the importance of more efficient and effective procurement. The Collaborative Police Procurement Programme (CPPP) was initiated in the NPIA, working closely with procurement leads from the police service, on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2010. Most of the non-IT elements of this programme transferred into the Home Office on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011. The programme is focussed on collaborative procurement of common goods and services across the police forces. Through a combination of voluntary police participation and mandation where appropriate frameworks are in place, this programme will save £200m over the CSR on commonly purchased police goods and services.

Since its inception, the CPPP Programme has already delivered £40m worth of savings to the police service last financial year, and in the first 6 months of this financial year has realised £29m cash releasing savings.

**37. Compulsory national framework agreements will enable savings to be realised more quickly than a voluntary approach to collaboration on procurement. The Home Office should extend them to other categories of procurement, and in particular commodity items, as well as goods and services where interoperability is paramount. The Home Office should indicate in its response which categories it plans to make subject to such agreements next and when the relevant legislation is likely to be passed. However, national framework agreements are not suitable for all types of procurement and there may be instances in which local solutions are more suitable, either because they better meet the needs of local forces, or because they offer better value for money, or both. (Paragraph 179)**

The Government agrees with the Committee that compulsory national framework agreements will enable savings to be realised more quickly than a voluntary approach to collaboration on procurement.

The first Regulations to specify particular frameworks to be used by the police service came into force in March 2011. The Government intends to consult soon on further Regulations to specify frameworks to be used by the police service for further categories of equipment and services.

Categories likely to be part of the consultation later this year include: vehicle light bars, translators and Interpreters, utilities, customer surveys, some training services, consultancy and the Police Procurement Hub. Subject to consultation, Regulations would be made early in 2012.

The Government agrees that national framework agreement will not be suitable for all types of procurement. The categories of non-IT procurement on which the Home Office supports the police service are likely to change over time depending on the value for money assessment of taking a national approach in each case and reflecting analysis of the pattern of spending by the service.

**38. We recommend that the Protocol should be amended to specify that Police and Crime Commissioners and Chief Constables have an obligation to collaborate with other forces on procurement to deliver value for money for the police service overall. However, we emphasise that the protocol is being drawn up by the Home Office and by ACPO, which has a vested interest, and without the benefit of engagement by Police and Crime Commissioners, who cannot be involved until the first elections have taken place. As the expressed purpose of the Government is to provide local accountability in relation to the police in every part of the country, the protocol must**



**be considered as provisional until further discussions have taken place following those elections. We urge Ministers to make it clear that this is their intention. (Paragraph 185)**

The Government appreciates the contributions made by the Committee and hopes it recognises the influence its recommendations have had in the drafting of the Protocol. The Protocol that is currently before Parliament for approval via the negative resolution process, clearly states the power and duty of PCCs to enter into collaboration agreements with other PCCs, policing bodies and partners that improve the efficiency or effectiveness of policing for one or more policing bodies or police forces in consultation with the Chief Constable. This power and/or duty to collaborate is mirrored in the responsibilities of the Chief Constable which are also outlined in the Protocol. To keep the Protocol to a manageable length, it cannot set out all of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act provisions or refer to all of the duties placed on PCCs and Chief Constables.

Our intention is to demonstrate the need for PCCs to deliver value for money across the policing landscape and anyone who puts themselves forward as a candidate will know that that is one of their key responsibilities on which the public will expect them to deliver. The power taken to issue a Protocol also enables the Secretary of State to consult and reissue a Protocol as and when the Secretary of State sees fit. Therefore once PCCs are elected it may be necessary to consult on the then current version of the Protocol but as it is the case that London will go live in January, subject to Parliament approving the necessary secondary legislation, it is our view that the Protocol should take effect in order for the roles and responsibilities of the MOPC and Commissioner to be publicly clear and transparent. The Protocol also states that a further duty of the PCC is to provide the local link between the police and communities, working to translate the legitimate desires and aspirations of the public into action.

**39. Central Government does not have an encouraging record on achieving efficient and effective procurement. The National Policing Improvement Agency was beginning to make some progress in achieving savings from procurement and it is vital that this momentum is maintained when responsibility for non-IT police procurement is transferred to the Home Office. We note that the Home Office Procurement Centre of Excellence has achieved some successes over the short time it has existed and trust that it will now urgently build on these. This will involve building good relationships with local forces and, in due course, with Police and Crime Commissioners. The Home Office should publish yearly statements setting out the progress it is making in realising savings from non-IT police procurement. (Paragraph 186)**



As detailed in response 36 above, the CPPP Programme has a proven track record in savings delivery to the police service. With the transfer of the function to the Home Office we are keen to maintain and accelerate this momentum. Part of our strategy will be to explore synergies and savings opportunities for using the Home Office Procurement Centre of Excellence both in terms of expertise and aggregating requirements. We will also ensure that we are linked into the wider pan-Government collaboration agenda. We would expect to publish statements of progress on savings either on a quarterly or bi-annual basis. We recognise the importance of building and maintaining good working relationships with the police service. It is intended that we will use the regional procurement engagement team transferred from NPIA and expand their role to include supporting wider police programmes which engage with the private sector.

We will also ensure that we are linked into the wider non-Government work on procurement and we will draw to the attention of the police service and encourage it to adopt the package of reforms to central Government procurement announced by the minister for the Cabinet Office & Paymaster General on 21 November.

**40. In taking on responsibility for non-IT police procurement, the Home Office should focus in particular on aligning the timings of contracts between forces and on standardising products, where this is possible and not to the detriment of local operational effectiveness. It should also take a holistic approach to procurement, focusing on demand management as well as price. Officials in the Home Office who have responsibility for non-IT police procurement should liaise regularly with their colleagues in the new police-led IT company to ensure that there is a collective purpose across police procurement as a whole. (Paragraph 189)**

The positions in relation to non-IT and IT procurement are distinct and separate. The NPIA Non-IT procurement team transferred into the Home Office in October 2011. The Home Office will seek to maximise the opportunities this brings to deliver the principles defined in the Home Office procurement strategy and to pursue all opportunities for improved value for money.

The management of demand for goods and services is primarily a responsibility for Chief Constables, with the Home Office encouraging them to consider value for money in the deployment of resources.

The role of the new police-led company will be to respond to the police service as the primary customer, where it identifies the company's services as the best way of achieving savings and greater efficiency. The company will be responsible for the procurement, implementation and management of complex contracts for information technology, related business change and outsourcing services, supplying both national and local services for police. The demands of the customers will shape the service provision.

**41. Finally, it would be helpful if the Home Office specified precisely which categories of goods and services in the police service will be its responsibility, which will fall within the discretion of Police and Crime Commissioners, and which will be the responsibility of the new police-led IT company. In relation to communications in particular, there seems scope for some confusion at present. (Paragraph 190)**

The service the New ICT Company will provide the procurement, implementation and management of complex contracts for information technology, related business change and outsourcing services. It would not be appropriate to suggest a rigid demarcation between categories of non-IT goods and services that will be procured nationally or locally. The categories of non-IT procurement on which the Home Office supports the police service are likely to change over time depending on the value for money assessment of taking a national approach in each case and reflecting analysis of the pattern of spending by the service. However in all cases we will continue to engage with Police Authorities and from November 2012 Police and Crime Commissioners.

**42. We commend Kent and Essex Police Forces and Authorities for their work in setting up collaborative agreements. We find it curious that there was not more interest in the project from the Home Office and the National Policing Improvement Agency, although the Agency itself was not formally established until April 2007 so was not in a position to provide assistance or advice in the early stages of the collaboration. At the very least we would have expected the Home Office to check regularly on how the project was progressing to ascertain whether there were lessons that could be learned for future collaborative projects between other forces. (Paragraph 196)**

The Government welcomes the excellent collaborative working taking place between the Kent and Essex police forces. They are a good example of how collaboration can help improve the efficiency of support services and the effectiveness of operational policing.

There have been several Home Office visits to the forces to see their collaborative work and, in March 2011, the Policing Minister addressed the Collaboration in Policing Conference arranged by Kent and Essex. The Home Office has provided a considerable amount of support and advice to Kent and Essex in respect of their collaboration programme. This included £160,000 funding support in 2010-11 for the forces' joint Serious Crime Directorate. Officials monitored these and other projects closely and evaluation reports were produced.

**43. The example of Kent and Essex provides some evidence that collaboration between forces offers scope for modest, but clear, financial savings. As we have commented before, modest savings are better than none. Collaboration by itself will**

**not enable forces to make all the savings being required of them, but it could contribute towards them. (Paragraph 197)**

The Government agrees with this observation. Collaboration should be seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself and existing examples of force collaboration such as that between the forces of Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire has demonstrated the potential to achieve savings. The HMIC report due to be published in February 2012 will help to quantify the savings that can be derived from collaboration. The Home Office will continue to support forces looking to identify good practice on collaboration arrangements, in particular through information sharing via the NPIA's Police Online Knowledge Area (POLKA).

**44. The operational benefits of collaboration, such as a greater critical mass and the sharing of best practice, are an equally powerful reason for encouraging collaboration between forces as the need to make savings. The example of Kent and Essex suggests that there is no cause for undue alarm about collaboration inappropriately undermining operational independence, although we note that this is just one example and the need to safeguard operational independence is certainly an important consideration to be borne in mind by other forces considering collaborative agreements. (Paragraph 200)**

The Government agrees that collaboration can significantly improve operational effectiveness, for example in tackling crime that crosses force boundaries. Police forces in England and Wales collaborate to tackle organised crime through a network of regional units comprising Regional Intelligence Units, Regional Asset Recovery Teams and proactive operational enforcement capabilities. These units are becoming increasingly integrated into 'Regional Organised Crime Units', enabling a regional tasking model which is informed by a wide intelligence picture and that can deploy specialist and highly skilled operational capabilities to disrupt and prosecute organised criminals in ways which a single force acting alone could not achieve.

Chief Constables' operational independence is clearly set out in the Protocol and will be a consideration when drawing up collaboration agreements. As noted in the Kent and Essex example, it need not be problematic, particularly where all parties enter into an arrangement in a truly collaborative way.

**45. For collaboration between police forces to succeed, it must have the backing of police officers and staff, and of the public the forces serve. The key to addressing this challenge is communication. The senior officers and staff who are involved in setting up the collaboration must focus from the outset on communicating, both to**

**more junior officers and staff and to people in the local community, the benefits that collaboration offers. The public must also be told with clarity where ultimate accountability lies. Some initial wariness is to be expected, but the example of Kent and Essex suggests this can be overcome. We would expect Police and Crime Commissioners to have a central role in ensuring this. (Paragraph 204)**

The Government agrees that effective communication is an important part of securing support for any form of business change – including collaboration – and PCCs will have a role to play in ensuring this. It is worth noting that forces are able to share their experiences of engaging their workforce and their local communities in the design and implementation of change through the communities of practitioners on POLKA.

**46. We recommend that the Home Office review the legislative framework in which collaboration between police forces takes place with a view to ascertaining whether it could remove any obstacles that are making collaboration more difficult. In particular, we recommend that it consider whether legislation could be changed to make procurement on behalf of multiple forces more efficient. (Paragraph 207)**

The Government reviewed the legislation only recently, bringing forward measures in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 to remove obstacles to effective collaboration. The Act:

- introduces a strong duty for chief constables and PCCs to keep collaboration opportunities under review and to collaborate where it is in the interest of efficiency or effectiveness,
- replaces the current arrangement for two types of collaboration agreement (one for chief constables and one for police authorities) with a single type of agreement which PCCs and chiefs can sign-up to together,
- repeals the current requirement to consult the Secretary of State before entering into collaboration agreements involving seven or more parties, and
- introduces a new power for the Home Secretary to specify, by Order, particular policing functions on which all forces must collaborate.

In its evidence to the Committee, Norfolk and Suffolk police highlighted a problem with the use of police staff in collaborations. The Government has addressed this point in the 2011 Act, which contains provisions to allow a member of police staff designated with police powers to exercise those powers in the area of a different police force that is engaged in a collaboration agreement with his or her own force.

Police forces will continue to be separate legal entities. The Government's approach to non-IT police procurement is to increasingly specify frameworks to be used across the service

including through regulations to mandate such frameworks. In addition, the introduction of the police procurement hub will help to reduce the bureaucracy of the procurement process both for forces and for suppliers.

**47. Police forces entering into collaborative agreements should be aware that differences in the financial histories and circumstances of both forces will need to be taken into consideration. The Home Office should explore whether it can offer any advice to forces on how to deal with this area, but ultimately, collaboration depends on a coalition of the willing and forces will have to be prepared to put these differences aside, as far as is possible, to achieve the benefits that collaboration offers. (Paragraph 208)**

The Government agrees with the Committee that police forces should consider differences in their financial situations before entering into collaboration agreements. A common barrier to collaboration is the 'net donor' syndrome. This describes the perception that resources committed to collaboration will be deployed away from the home force and into a partnering force's area. It is important for all parties to a collaboration agreement to understand that a collaboration may not provide equal benefits in all parts to all participants or in total but is sometimes necessary for the greater, collective good. Potential savings from collaboration will also vary between forces depending on the extent of any previous cost saving measures they have undertaken.

The Home Office has published general advice to forces and authorities on funding issues, including the 'net donor' syndrome, to ensure they are properly considered before entering into collaboration agreements. Solutions, however, will depend on local circumstances and, as such, can only sensibly be addressed locally by the forces concerned. As the Committee notes, for collaboration to work effectively, all parties need to be willing to work around their differences.

**48. The fact that Police and Crime Commissioners will be directly elected by people in their local police force area does not necessarily mean that they will be any less willing to enter into collaborative agreements than Police Authorities. Indeed, it almost certainly means that any Police and Crime Commissioners who do enter into collaborative agreements will be particularly keen on conveying the benefits of the agreement to the public, which could be an advantage, and Police and Crime Commissioners may also have a greater incentive to make savings since the level of the police precept will be one of the most visible indicators of their performance to their electorate. However, it does change the landscape in which future collaborative agreements will take place. We welcome the fact that the draft Protocol specifies that Commissioners have a wider duty to enter into collaboration agreements that benefit**

**their force area and deliver better value for money and enhanced policing capabilities. (Paragraph 213)**

The Government welcomes this recommendation. The Policing Minister made the same points at the Collaboration in Policing Conference on 22 March 2011. The Government agrees that there is no reason to believe that PCCs will be an obstacle to collaboration. They are likely to be strongly motivated to drive out costs to maximise investment in frontline policing. But to allay any fears, the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 will place PCCs under a strong legal duty to collaborate. This duty is reflected in the Protocol, too. PCCs will also need to collaborate to meet their responsibilities under the Strategic Policing Requirement, which will set out what capabilities forces must have to tackle national threats.

**49. Collaboration between forces offers clear benefits, both financial and operational. The Home Office should be more active in encouraging and supporting forces to collaborate with one another—for example, by bringing Police and Crime Commissioners and Chief Officers together to discuss collaboration. Certainly without such intervention collaboration between police authorities and forces outside Kent and Essex has taken place in a piecemeal fashion and at a slow pace. (Paragraph 214)**

The Government accepts that police forces and authorities welcome support on how to approach collaboration. The Policing Minister chairs the High Level Working Group on Value for Money in Policing, which provides a forum for policing leaders to discuss collaboration issues, and has established a Policing Value for Money Unit, which brings together multi-agency resources to support forces to manage the spending review settlement, including by promoting learning on new approaches to collaboration. The Government provides funding to support regional collaborations to tackle organised crime and, as noted above, it has acted to remove obstacles to collaboration through the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Home Office and the NPIA offer guidance on collaboration, and the NPIA provides further support through its POLKA, which includes a number of communities of practitioners working together to share experiences and learning on all kinds of organisational change.

HMIC is also now conducting support and challenge visits to all police forces, looking at the extent and pace of their collaboration with other forces, and with wider public and private sector partners. The Government will keep the need for further support under review.

**50. Collaboration between police forces and the private sector was one element of our much larger inquiry into the new landscape of policing and we do not feel that we received enough evidence to comment in detail on the potential it offers. However,**



**the evidence that we did receive convinces us that there needs to be further research in this area. We recommend that the Home Office either carries out this research itself, or commissions another body, such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, to carry it out, to assess whether large-scale collaboration with the private sector offers forces the scope to make savings, whilst maintaining or enhancing operational effectiveness. The picture is far from clear at present. This is an emerging area and some research about the benefits and disadvantages would be helpful to forces who might be considering following Cleveland's example. The research should include consideration of the evidence from other countries. (Paragraph 225)**

Work is already underway through the High Level Working Group to explore the potential value of business partnering to the Police Service. The findings from this work are being shared with the service through the High Level Working Group and through POLKA. This work includes insights from suppliers, police forces and other parts of the public sector with experience of business partnering arrangements to achieve transformational change. Useful findings from international examples will be shared with the Service in due course.

**51. We do not rule out the possibility that in the future an increasing number of functions performed within a police force might be provided by the private sector, leaving warranted officers to focus on the functions which they alone can provide. However, we remain cautious about advocating such an approach, given the lack of evidence about the advantages and disadvantages of even the current level of collaboration with the private sector. We cannot therefore currently recommend the relaxing of the constraints on collaboration, although we certainly recommend that the Home Office should consider these constraints, including legislative constraints, as part of its research. (Paragraph 232)**

A number of forces have already established arrangements with private sector partners and have not reported significant legislative barriers to building and maintaining these relationships. The High Level Working Group commissioned work to explore the potential value of business partnering, including looking at barriers and constraints to establishing arrangements with the private sector which enable forces to maintain and improve services to the public while reducing costs.

**52. Ultimately, decisions about whether to embark on large-scale collaboration projects with the private sector will, and should, be taken locally. However, Government has a role to play too, in providing some initial research that enables forces to take informed decisions. Questions such as "will it make the force more operationally effective" and "will it deliver better value for money for the public" are the right ones to ask, but it should not be left to individual forces to provide all the**



**answers. Both police forces and the private sector need more clarity about how this aspect of the landscape of policing is likely to develop in the future and it is for the Home Office to provide this clarity. (Paragraph 236)**

The Government agrees that decisions about embarking on large-scale collaboration projects should be taken locally. The Home Office role in supporting these decisions will be to make information available to forces considering alternative service delivery models (including business partnering), including via POLKA Transforming Policing Community. Supplier engagement, led by the Home Office, will continue to share learning and market intelligence with the Service to enable them to make robust decisions about which options to pursue. The Home Office will establish a commercial forum in which the Service can share information and determine how best to aggregate and shape locally driven demand with industry in order to get the best possible value for the taxpayer.

**53. We reiterate the point that we made in our report on Police and Crime Commissioners. Our sister Committee, the Justice Committee, found that authorities and agencies other than the police, and indeed outside the criminal justice system altogether, have the ability to reduce both the number of people entering the criminal justice system in the first place and the likelihood of reoffending. We therefore consider that it will be vital for each Police and Crime Commissioner to support and drive the work of Community Safety Partnerships. We are encouraged by the Government's inclusion in the draft Protocol of a reference to Commissioner's responsibility to bring together Community Safety Partnerships at the force level. (Paragraph 240)**

The Government agrees that PCCs need to support and when necessary bring together the work of Community Safety Partnerships, as provided for in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act. We hope the Committee recognises the influence of their recommendations on both the initial draft Protocol and the latest version which has been laid before Parliament. The Protocol provides that the PCC has a specific responsibility for the delivery of community safety and crime reduction and also goes on to specify that PCCs have the responsibility of bringing together Community Safety Partnerships at force level (except in Wales).

**54. Collaboration is a generic term for a wide variety of different partnerships. To take just one example, a police force looking to form a partnership to deliver back office functions such as finance could collaborate with another police force, with a local council or another public sector body, or with a private sector organisation. Different types of collaboration are not necessarily mutually exclusive: it would be possible, for example, for the same police force to collaborate with a neighbouring force on IT**

**provision, and the local fire and rescue service on community safety. However, there does come a point when one type of collaboration makes another type more difficult. For example, Cleveland's partnership with Steria would make it hard for Cleveland to collaborate with another force on, say, the provision of a joint serious and organised crime directorate. Decisions about which approach to adopt should be taken locally, but they are strategic decisions, with long-term impacts and the Government should provide assistance in the form of research and advice to enable forces to assess the various merits of the different approaches. (Paragraph 243)**

HMIC has followed their 'Adapting to Austerity' report with support and challenge visits to all forces focussing on the extent and pace of their collaboration with other forces, public sector partners and the private sector and how these partnerships will contribute to their CSR savings requirement. A report, due to be published in February 2012, will provide a comprehensive picture of the types of collaboration that exist nationally, the barriers to collaboration and equally those factors that enable progress to be made. The report will for the first time identify the savings that can be derived from collaborating across a range of different functions.

It is for Police Authorities and eventually PCCs, in consultation with forces, to decide the best option for service delivery. The Policing Value for Money Unit provides a range of information for forces to consider through POLKA and will continue to add to this knowledge bank.

**55. We agree with Jan Berry, the former Reducing Bureaucracy in Policing Advocate, that reducing unnecessary bureaucracy is not simply about reducing paperwork, but about addressing the causes of that paperwork. We shall continue to monitor her recommendations to see what progress is made. We know that the Minister for Policing and Criminal Justice has met Jan Berry, and we urge the Home Secretary to do the same to discuss how the Home Office can take her work forward. (Paragraph 264)**

The Home Secretary is grateful for the work that Jan Berry did in assessing police bureaucracy. The Reducing Bureaucracy Programme Board, chaired by Chief Constable Chris Sims, is taking forward the Government's work to cut unnecessary police bureaucracy. This Board has taken into account the recommendations from Jan Berry to inform their plan of work. The Board has a membership of key policing partners, including Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, the Association of Chief Police Officers, the Home Office and the Association of Police Authorities.

The Home Secretary has announced a package of policies that will cut police red tape, saving up to 3.3 million police hours per year and the Programme Board is working with policing partners to ensure that the new measures the Home Secretary has announced are progressing in practice.

The Programme Board is also working closely with the Reducing Bureaucracy Practitioners Group, which was set up by Jan Berry, and consists of frontline officers from forces across the country.

**56. We await the outcome of Sara Thornton's review of police guidance with interest. We regard the review as a positive step, but we re-emphasise Jan Berry's point that it is important to look at causes as well as symptoms. Reducing 600 pieces of guidance to 100 pieces of guidance is welcome but it must be accompanied by a recognition of what caused the proliferation of guidance in the first place. (Paragraph 266)**

This work is now well underway and a set of core practice documents is being developed which covers recurring activities common across policing. This reduces duplication and therefore the volume of guidance material, as the core is written once and only cross-referenced in subsequent documents. Much of the work will be completed by March 2012. In addition, in a limited number of high risk areas, specific practice will be brought together in order to support consistency of the police response and interoperability.

Reducing bureaucracy is not only about freeing up police time. We agree with the committee that there is a need to change the culture to reduce risk aversion and increase professional judgement. The Association of Chief Police Officers has now published ten risk principles to encourage a more positive approach to risk and support decision makers in building their confidence. The new National Decision Model will be embedded in all core police practice by the end of 2012 as part of Sara Thornton's work.

**57. In responding to, and taking forward, Peter Neyroud's proposals for a new Professional Body for Policing, the Government should consider the Body's potential to foster the kind of culture that is needed to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy: a culture in which there is continuing professional development and officers are confident about making their own decisions where appropriate. (Paragraph 269)**

The Government agrees with the importance of reducing bureaucracy. Replacing bureaucracy by informed professional discretion unlocks both savings and improved service for the public. This not only requires a culture change at the heart of policing but also from Whitehall. This is about demonstrating our commitment to reducing police bureaucracy through clear and tangible actions that will make a real difference to the service, and we are already doing this through national changes, such as the return of certain charging decisions to the police.

The professional body will play a key role in enabling officers and staff to be sufficiently skilled. This will, in turn, ensure procedures are followed correctly the first time and reduce forces' need to employ people responsible for checking compliance. Strengthening the skills and abilities of individual officers and staff rather than ineffective bureaucratic double-checking must be the way forward.

**58. One of the most important aspects of reducing bureaucracy in the police service will be integrated IT, not just across the police service itself, but across the whole criminal justice system. The new police-led IT company needs to make this a priority. (Paragraph 270)**

Ministers are clear that interoperability must be a priority in ensuring an effective and efficient police service. While the new company is not responsible for national strategy or delivering government commitments, it will facilitate interoperability and is likely to provide services that support national initiatives.

**59. The impact that Police and Crime Commissioners have on bureaucracy is likely to depend heavily on the individuals who are chosen to fill these roles. To encourage all Police and Crime Commissioners to realise the importance of bearing down on unnecessary bureaucracy, we recommend that the Protocol should specify that Commissioners should have regard to the need to keep bureaucracy to a proportionate level when making decisions about their local forces. (Paragraph 272)**

The Protocol has been laid before Parliament for approval and provides Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) with the power and duty to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of police forces in consultation with the Chief Constable.

Our intention is to demonstrate the need for PCCs to deliver value for money across the policing landscape and anyone who puts themselves forward as a candidate will know that that is one of their key responsibilities on which the public will expect them to deliver. This encompasses the importance of reducing unnecessary bureaucracy.

**60. Overall, it seems likely that the new landscape will contain more bodies than the current landscape: for example, although the National Policing Improvement Agency is to be abolished, a Professional Body for policing and a police-led IT company seem likely to be created. On the other hand, it is possible that the changes will lead to a more logical and better functioning police landscape and ultimately make the police more successful at achieving their basic mission of reducing crime and disorder. In the end, it is our view that this is what the Home Secretary should be held to account for, not the number of bodies in the policing landscape. However, the scale of the change is unprecedented and the scope for mistakes accordingly large. We have reservations about the timetable for these changes, particularly regarding the transfer of functions from the National Policing Improvement Agency and the setting up of the National Crime Agency. (Paragraph 273)**

We welcome the Committee's comments and agree with its interpretation of what effective reform to the policing landscape should seek to achieve.

Our far-reaching reform of policing in England and Wales will support the police in their clear mission – to cut crime. There has been a paradox of policing in recent years. Central government has spent too much time interfering in matters which should properly be determined locally, yet paid insufficient attention to national issues, national threats and areas of policing which need to be coordinated more strongly on a national basis. Our determination is to reverse that position and create greater freedom and accountability at the local level, matched by much better national crime fighting capability.

This national crime fighting capability must be supported by a more coherent, streamlined national policing landscape. In recent years, at national level, there has been a proliferation of different organisations with some overlapping roles and responsibilities, and a lack of clear accountability. We are reforming the national landscape in order to ensure national issues have a focused, co-ordinated response. At the heart of this is the National Crime Agency, a powerful body of operational crime fighters to spearhead the response to serious organised crime. This is underpinned by the Strategic Policing Requirement to which Chief Constables and Police and Crime Commissioners must have regard. A police professional body will have responsibility for setting standards for entry and promotion to the police service and for ensuring that officers' skills and knowledge is up to date. A Police ICT Company will ensure a more commercial and efficient approach to police ICT provision.

Together, these reforms will rationalise and streamline the national policing landscape, providing greater coherence through clearer roles and responsibilities, better accountability and greater efficiency.

As we set out earlier in the document, we have been planning for some time to close down NPIA in 2012; its functions will cease to exist under its current auspices by December 2012. Transfers started in October 2011, with additional functions moving from the NPIA in phases, with the first transfers being those destined for the National Crime Agency, which will be transferred to SOCA as the precursor body. This first transfer will be completed by Spring 2012.

The Home Secretary has updated Parliament and the Committee with details of further decisions and timescales and will continue to do so as this work progresses.

**61. There is a great deal to achieve in a very short space of time. In its response to our report, we urge the Government to provide a realistic, revised timetable for the phasing out of the National Policing Improvement Agency, which we recommend should not happen before the end of 2012, the setting up of a fully functioning National Crime Agency, the setting up of a new Professional Body, and the setting up of the police-led IT company. This timetable should be broken down into key stages, with specific dates. We will then keep track of the progress against this timetable. We also urge the Home Secretary as a matter of urgency to propose where each function of each of the existing bodies should land under the new arrangements. Clarity is becoming extremely urgent and in some cases it would be better for Ministers to**

**make a proposal—even if that leads to discussion and debate—rather than to delay further. We would be happy to contribute to that process and would applaud Ministers if they are willing to lead an open process—even if that then leads to second thoughts—rather than to delay any longer. (Paragraph 274)**

We are planning a methodical and careful wind down of the NPIA, which has involved detailed consultation on those functions which should be transferred. The Home Office engaged with NPIA and senior police representatives as the work developed, taking their input on the consideration of existing functions, and has sought to give Chief Officers clarity as early as possible.

Decisions were communicated early about the creation of a new ICT company and the transfer of some NPIA functions to the NCA (via SOCA).

As outlined in our response to recommendation 60, the Government intends to phase out the NPIA in 2012. Functions will be transferred from the NPIA in phases, with the first transfers being those destined for the National Crime Agency, which will be transferred to SOCA as the precursor body. This first transfer will be completed by Spring 2012.

**62. The changes are certainly the most far-reaching that have been proposed to the police service since the 1960s and are among the most significant that have been proposed since Sir Robert Peel laid the foundations for modern policing nearly 200 years ago. The Government aims to reduce intervention from the centre in policing in the long term, but this will require more clarity from the centre in the short term. Change on this scale requires clear and strong leadership from the Home Office—of which effective communication is a key part—if it is to succeed. There will be a need to keep the development of the Government’s proposals under review, and we plan to return to this important subject before the next election. (Paragraph 278)**

The Government welcomes the Committee’s recognition of the scale and ambition of our reforms. Through our organised crime strategy, the plan for the National Crime Agency, the Strategic Policing Requirement and the Protocol, we are providing the strong national leadership needed to reform the national policing landscape.

We would be happy to continue to provide the Committee with such evidence as it needs to review these important reforms.

**63. Finally, we welcome the fact that a great deal of consensus does continue to exist in regard to the role of the police, even when there is controversy about specific policies and structural changes. We concur with the words of both the Home Secretary and the Minister for Policing and Criminal Justice, who at different times, were asked to indicate their view about the purpose of the police. Both of them quoted the words of Sir Robert Peel when the first police force was established in London in 1829 that the basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder. This, and the rest of the nine principles set out by Sir Robert Peel,**



**remain key principles today and should continue to command the support of Ministers, parliamentarians.**

The Government strongly agrees with the Committee that Sir Robert Peel's principles should continue to inform the reform of policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We have given the police one mission – to cut crime. We will support them in doing so by replacing bureaucratic interference with democratic accountability and ensure a better national grip in the fight against serious crime.



information & publishing solutions

Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

**Online**

[www.tsoshop.co.uk](http://www.tsoshop.co.uk)

**Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail**

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich, NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries: 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-Call 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

E-mail: [customer.services@tso.co.uk](mailto:customer.services@tso.co.uk)

Textphone: 0870 240 3701

**The Parliamentary Bookshop**

12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square

London SW1A 2JX

Telephone orders/General enquiries: 020 7219 3890

Fax orders: 020 7219 3866

Email: [bookshop@parliament.uk](mailto:bookshop@parliament.uk)

Internet: <http://www.bookshop.parliament.uk>

**TSO@Blackwell and other Accredited Agents**

ISBN 978-0-10-182232-9



9 780101 822329