



## **Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel**

### **Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2023, 10.30am**

### **The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton**

#### **Present:**

#### **Local Authority and Independent Member Representatives:**

Councillor Andy Wait (Bath and North-East Somerset), Councillor Ann Morgan (Bath and North-East Somerset), Councillor Asher Craig (Bristol City Council), Councillor Jonathan Hucker (Bristol City Council), Councillor Lisa Stone (Bristol City Council), Richard Brown (Independent Member), Gary Davies (Independent Member), Julie Knight (Independent Member), Councillor Steve Hogg (North Somerset Council), Councillor Brian Bolt (Somerset Council), Councillor Heather Shearer (Somerset Council and Chair), Councillor Federica Smith-Roberts (Somerset Council), Councillor Martin Wale (Somerset Council), Councillor Raj Sood (South Gloucestershire Council), Councillor John Bradbury (South Gloucestershire Council)

#### **Host Authority Officers Present:**

Patricia Jones	Lead Officer
Pippa Triffitt	Clerk/Democratic Services Officer
Jonathan Hallows	Administrative Support

#### **Police and Crime Commissioner OPCC and Constabulary Staff:**

Mark Shelford	Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)
Sally Fox	Director of Performance and Accountability
Inspector Stuart King	Commissioner's Staff Officer
Chief Superintendent Liz Hughes	Head of Neighbourhoods and Partnerships
Marc Hold	Director of Policy and Partnership
Joanna Coulon	Scrutiny and Performance Manager
Ben Valentine	Senior Performance and Governance Manager

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Nicola Clark and Councillor Peter Crew.

## **2. Public Question Time**

None.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

None.

## **4. Minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2023 (AGM)**

The Chair invited comments on the minutes of the previous meeting.

The PCC highlighted that the figure of 80 staff who worked to identify and record missed crime as stated on Page 11 of the minutes, had been clarified within his letter responding to the Panel's review of his Annual Report; the team with this responsibility comprised only 6 members of staff, and they were situated within the broader Incident Assessment Unit.

This clarification was noted, and the minutes were otherwise confirmed as an accurate record.

## **5. Matters Arising**

None.

## **6. Chair's Business**

The Chair informed the Panel that it was Councillor Steve Hogg's last meeting as a representative for North Somerset Council. She thanked Councillor Hogg for the valuable contributions he had made during his time as a member of the Panel.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Lisa Stone back to the Panel as a representative for Bristol City Council.

## **7. Crime Prevention Assurance Report**

The Chair invited Liz Hughes, Chief Superintendent for Neighbourhoods and Partnerships, to introduce the Report. The key points of her presentation were as follows:

- The Chief Superintendent outlined her portfolio, highlighting that prevention of crime was a major theme of her work. This needed to be driven across the force to deliver the outcomes of the PCC's Police and Crime Plan. Prevention itself covered a large scope of activity, and the force was making progress in all the key areas.
- There were multiple different avenues of work in progress which were described in the Report. In their inspection last year, there were two areas of improvement that were highlighted; they needed more consistent problem-solving practices, and a more structured programme of neighbourhood policing.
- In response to the first area, there was now an evidence-based policing team ensuring that the force's problem-solving training and processes were fit for purpose. It was making good progress on this; the College of Policing had published a guide, and the force was aligned to the guidelines provided.
- In response to the second area, the force was working on creating a more cohesive programme of training for neighbourhood officers. Work was also being done on obtaining the resources required that would allow neighbourhood officers to have comprehensive and continued professional development. The team was taking advantage of digital resources to achieve this.
- The national strategy broke crime prevention down into primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention. Previously, the force had not focused on this tiered system, but was looking to adopt it going forward.
- Prevention had historically sat with neighbourhood policing, but there were good prevention strategies sitting elsewhere in the constabulary; the intention now was to push for a cultural change, making everyone responsible for the prevention strategy.

- The Chief Superintendent had attended a National Police Chiefs' Prevention meeting and learned that at national level, they were looking to strengthen prevention within the curriculum of detectives and leaders.
- Within the Assurance Report, examples of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention in the constabulary were identified, in both urban and rural areas. Groundbreaking work was ongoing to prevent violence against women and girls, and online webinars run by cyber protection experts were broadcast nationally. The PCC had been very supportive of the team's work.
- The Chief Superintendent highlighted the need for a collaborative approach to prevention. They needed to make optimum use of the resources available to make prevention strategies work at their best. There were funding streams still left untapped that could be exploited; she encouraged the Panel members to suggest any potential sources they were aware of.
- In terms of the recommendations in the Report, some had already been completed since the Report was published, and others had made good progress. The aim was to have a solid draft of the prevention plan ready by the beginning of December. A lot of the groundwork had already been completed, so this should be achievable.
- Other recommendations were more tactical, such as the training for PCSOs. Others revolved around technology and using it to identify domestic abuse perpetrators, for example. The last recommendation concerned the work of recording and supervising problem-solving plans.
- The Chief Superintendent concluded by emphasising the team's proactive approach to prevention and the strengthening of the public's trust in policing.

The Chair thanked the Chief Superintendent for her Report and invited comments and questions from the Panel. During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- The Panel emphasised the importance of the detection of crime, as well as its prevention. The Report also did not mention the main methods of policing used to prevent crime, such as patrolling areas and attending

scenes. The Chief Superintendent informed the Panel that the Report had a tight scope and did not cover every aspect of crime prevention. There was, however, ongoing work to raise investigative standards and the quality of leadership training to boost the inexperienced workforce.

- The Panel questioned whether the force was satisfied that it had sufficient resources for Operation Remedy in place. How were they planning to measure the progress made over the past four years? They would need to know the baseline from which they were measuring to see the difference. This process would need to be intelligence-led by experienced officers. There were issues with solely measuring the quantity of crime as rates would appear higher with more staff members recording incidents. The Chief Superintendent confirmed that Operation Remedy was under her remit and that positive outcomes were emerging. She acknowledged they would need a baseline from which to measure its success in addition to a cross-department strategy and assured the Panel this suggestion would be fed back to the team and an update brought back to the Panel. The PCC agreed that deciding on the measures of success was a priority, whilst acknowledging it was difficult to find a metric that met with broad acceptance. There were however sub-divisions that could be used as measures of success, such as the prevention of re-offending.
- The Panel recalled a statistic that stated around 1,800 people created 80% of the policing demand in Avon and Somerset. These individuals needed to be identified so that prevention strategies could be tailored. Work needed to continue with high-risk families, and PCSOs needed training in this area. The Chief Superintendent confirmed that high-intensity users of the force were in focus, and that support systems were being developed for these individuals. The PCC encouraged the dissemination of such statistics between the police, local authorities, and the health and education sectors, as they would help them to understand the cohorts of people who most needed support.
- The Panel asked whether the plans for continued professional development for the neighbourhood policing teams would include rotating teams around the neighbourhoods. This would help to broaden their experience, but it may cause issues with continuity akin to those currently experienced in Bristol. The Chief Superintendent stated this was not part of the plan as continuity in police presence was important so that public trust and confidence could be fostered. She resolved to investigate the issues of continuity in Bristol going forward. The PCC

added that the issue of continuity was a frequent theme in his communications with the Chief Constable. It further highlighted the importance of the force's relationship with the parish councils as this was a good example of the feedback they could provide.

- The Panel raised the issue of business crime, and asked whether these issues were on the public forum. The PCC acknowledged that tackling business crime was crucial. There was a business crime forum for stakeholders to discuss this issue in Bristol the next day, to hear their concerns and discuss ways to keep shop-owners safe. Anti-social behaviour was also important to consider, as this was linked to shoplifting. The Director of Performance and Accountability added that an assurance report on business crime was scheduled for January 2024, and she encouraged the Panel members to contribute their ideas as to what areas were most important.
- The Panel asked how confident the force was that they had identified the most important matters that required problem-solving plans. The Chief Superintendent stated that the priority areas depended on knowing who the high-intensity users were, who was causing the most harm, and where the most high-risk areas were, and that with the data available they were confident they knew the answers to these. The data would be strengthened by building relationships with the community to gain their trust.
- The Panel asked how confident the force was that they could achieve a significant measure of success in prevention. The Chief Superintendent was confident in the support her team was receiving as it was recognised that prevention was a cross-departmental collaborative process. The PCC added that prevention was an ongoing process and would never see an end point. Crime as an entity was ever-changing, as shown by the great increase in cybercrime over the previous few years. The plan for prevention would therefore need to be fluid, and therefore the PCC encouraged the Panel to return to the issue of prevention frequently.

### **Actions:**

- 1. Neighbourhoods and Partnerships team to decide on a baseline and the measures of success for Operation Remedy and share these with the Panel.**

**2. Panel members to contribute their ideas for the OPCC's assurance report on business crime in January.**

**8. Commissioner's Update Report**

The Chair invited the PCC to introduce the Report.

The PCC began by indicating the changes made to the format of the Commissioner's Update Report to align with the four Police and Crime Plan priorities and to include enhanced information on key decisions and national developments. He encouraged feedback from the Panel to ensure the content was as useful as possible. He highlighted the following key points from the Report:

- The force had been awarded £1.2 million from the Ministry of Justice to support the work of mitigating violence against women and girls. The OPCC had also contributed £100,000.
- In terms of serious violence, the key development was the introduction of the A&S Serious Violence Reduction Partnership Board, an Executive Board bringing strategic direction to the process. Furthermore, the Home Office had provided the funding for two new roles in this sector – a VRP Director and a Partnerships and Engagement Manager.
- The first PCC Councillor Forums had been held and the PCC encouraged the Panel members to attend the upcoming meetings. The meetings would also include updates from the local neighbourhood policing team. Parish councillors from rural areas were particularly encouraged to attend to contribute and ask questions.
- The ongoing programme to build low-cost high-quality accommodation for those former prisoners on low wages had been recognised nationally and was awarded a prestigious government prize in London two days beforehand. It was the work of five PCCs coming together. The team were thankful to Bristol City Council for providing six areas of land and building was scheduled to start on these by Christmas. If there was an opportunity for this to be considered in their respective local authorities, members were encouraged to establish if there were any further sites suitable for this programme.

The Chair thanked the PCC for his summary and invited the Panel to ask any questions they had. The following discussion ensued:-

- The Panel asked whether the OPCC had any figures to show how many people were watching the live broadcasts of the Performance and Accountability Board. The PCC stated they did not have the exact figures, but he was aware the numbers had grown over time; he would obtain and share the figures with the Panel. The Director of Performance and Accountability added that the figures would not consider those who watched the broadcast after it was livestreamed. Therefore, viewing figures would be more accurate if they looked at the metrics over time. Furthermore, viewing figures depended on the topics covered and concurrent national events.
- The Panel added that the broadcasts risked coming across as stilted, rather than favouring a free flow of conversation. The PCC stated it was a difficult balance to strike; earlier broadcasts by the former PCC had attracted criticism as they appeared too relaxed/insufficiently robust.
- The PCC mentioned the National E-Scooter Safety Community that he had formed. The Panel agreed that e-scooters were an important issue, as they continued to be driven on roads despite this practice being illegal. Central government needed to be clearer about the rules surrounding this.
- The Panel asked why the figures showing the number of Police officer leavers were shown only for the month of July, as trends could not be identified this way.
- The Panel raised concerns over the high percentage of resignations amongst the leavers at 71.4%. Whilst 5 fewer Police officers left the service in July 23 compared to July 22, of those 14, 71.4% resigned and only 14.3% retired. This conflicts with what we have been previously advised about it being more about retirees than resignations.
- Is the reason for officer resignations being effectively monitored so the Constabulary can understand why and act on it?
- The PCC informed the Panel that the numbers were consistent for each month, but broader information/the full years' figures would be shared so the Panel had a clearer line of sight. He emphasised his interest in the reasons behind the resignations, particularly new officers, and



mentioned that they did conduct exit interviews. The PCC agreed to obtain and share the common themes that came out of the exit interviews. The Director for Performance and Accountability added that the reasons given did often vary. Policing itself had changed substantially over the past few decades and it was not necessarily a vocation for life anymore. There was, however, a high rate of retention amongst new starters. The Panel would be interested in receiving this information.

- The Panel suggested the negative national image of policing could be a factor in the high percentage of resignations. The PCC was asked when a public confidence strategy to improve the reputation of the force would be available and if he would consider a positive proactive publicity piece to help with public understanding of the strategy and sensitivities behind the approach of the Commissioner and Chief Constable. The PCC suggested this should be put on the agenda for a future meeting. Work on improving public confidence was ongoing, with initiatives expanding the number of new police stations and a focus on leadership training.
- The Panel praised the PCC Councillor Forums, but questioned whether the councillors themselves were consulted on the locations, dates, and times, as they risked clashing with other events and could be difficult to access. The PCC informed the Panel that participants had been contacted by the consultancy hired to deal with the arrangements. The Panel suggested that the opinions of those who were not able to attend were also important to consider. The Panel also questioned the use of a consultant when the OPCC team structure had been strengthened. The PCC stated that planning had begun several months beforehand, therefore the consultant was hired before the growth in the team.
- Councillor Craig highlighted the higher rates of drug crime and serious violence in Bristol, which prompted questions as to the availability of resources to tackle this. The Director for Performance and Accountability requested a conversation with Councillor Craig to obtain more information about this so it could be compared to the force's data.
- Councillor Craig drew attention to the story in The Guardian newspaper about an undercover Police officer and commented on the impact of this in terms of both the victim and public confidence.

- Councillor Craig asked whether the PCC would support the creation of a drug consumption room in Bristol. The PCC was not in favour; they were illegal in mainland England and Wales, and research had shown they were not as successful as had been hoped. They had also proved to be honeypots for drug-dealers. He was willing to hear other opinions and consider the data further, but current reports suggested they were not helping to save lives.
- The Panel praised the ongoing work between the force and Public Health in terms of reducing youth violence but suggested the education sector also needed to be involved. The PCC confirmed that individuals from education, health, local authorities, and the police force attended these meetings, as they did for all committees that dealt with children. Work was ongoing to create a senior control body for such committees that could make decisions and fund the necessary actions.
- In terms of Priority 3, the Panel highlighted the importance of good leadership in setting the culture and tone of the force. This was particularly important considering the current vacancy for Deputy Chief Constable. The PCC confirmed that the recent current DCC had resigned due to personal considerations and an open and transparent recruitment process needed to be followed. The Panel asked how the PCC planned to mitigate the risk of any negative public perception of the process. The PCC offered to respond in full after the recruitment process had completed and assured the Panel that it would be a thorough and independently scrutinised process. The interviews were scheduled for 7<sup>th</sup> October 2023, and it was noted that the PCC was a member of the recruitment panel.
- The Panel reiterated concern about the regular abstraction of neighbourhood officers to strengthen response teams. The PCC advised the Panel that there was a statutory requirement to respond to emergency calls and the practice of abstraction (Operation Hibiscus) was the best compromise for a difficult situation. It maintained operational balance during the summer months when demand was high and was regularly monitored.
- The Director of Policy and Partnerships informed the Panel that, historically, the focus of serious violence had been to spend the money available to commission interventions, with most of the funding going to local authority areas. However, each area required different resources, and partnerships were varied in nature. The Home Office

therefore instructed the force to reduce the focus on commissioning and transfer it to system changes by using the resources and structures already in place within the constabulary and partnerships. This shift constituted a substantial part of the changing approach to the issue of serious violence. The Panel welcomed these comments and praised the positive approach adopted.

**Actions:**

- 1. Panel members to raise the issue of site spaces for the former prisoner accommodation programme with their respective local authorities if the opportunity arises.**
- 2. The OPCC to obtain the live viewing figures for the meetings of the Performance and Accountability Board and share these with the Panel.**
- 3. The OPCC to advise the Panel of the full number of leavers from the force between July 2022 and July 2023.**
- 4. The OPCC to obtain and share with the Panel the common themes that emerged from the leavers' exit interviews.**
- 5. The OPCC to bring the strategy to improve public confidence to a future Panel meeting.**
- 6. Councillor Craig to discuss her concerns related to resource issues in Bristol directly with the OPCC.**
- 7. The PCC to share with the Panel the assurances put in place for the upcoming appointment of a Deputy Chief Constable after the selection process.**

**9. Performance Summary/National Police and Crime Measures**

The Chair invited the OPCC to introduce the report.

The Director for Performance and Accountability reminded the Panel that this Report was provided on a quarterly basis and invited their comments and questions. The Senior Performance and Governance Manager added that 'detection rates' were now called 'positive outcomes' and that all recorded

crimes were allocated one of twenty-two outcomes. Of these twenty-two, nine were positive. Charges given made up around two-thirds of all positive outcomes. The discussion raised the following points:

- The Panel asked whether the PCC was satisfied with the rate of positive outcomes. The PCC stated that the levels of detection could never be high enough and could always be improved, but the current focus was on preventing crime occurring in the first place.
- The Report stated on Page 68 that Avon and Somerset was second in its Most Similar Group (MSG) in terms of the charge rate for rape offences, with above average rates for the group. The Panel acknowledged that it was difficult to show all the data available but suggested it could be formatted to show the difference in rate between first and second.
- The Panel requested an update on recruitment for the CID (Criminal Investigation Department). The PCC stated that some constables entered CID from other departments, which was the traditional practice; Operation Remedy had proved to be a fruitful way in. Others entered the CID directly and trained on the job to get the full qualification, which took many years to obtain. Currently, there were four Degree-Holder Entry Programme (DHEP) cohorts, of which one had graduated and three were progressing towards graduation.
- The Panel asked for clarification on the figures related to cybercrime on Page 66. The PCC explained that Action Fraud received all cybercrime reports. The results went to the intelligence bureau, who then passed them onto the National Crime Agency, regional level or the appropriate force. The figures showed that of those reported, 700-800 were referred to Avon and Somerset. The Panel suggested that the stats lacked nuance, particularly as there were no benchmarks for comparison. The PCC was asked if there were plans to develop the data sets to provide better insights into current developments in tackling cybercrime. The PCC confirmed that work was in progress; tackling cybercrime was a national issue, and the data was also opaque nationally, but they were trying to change this. The Senior Performance and Governance Manager acknowledged that the data could be presented more clearly; this would be considered for future reports.
- The Panel questioned the discrepancy on Page 71; the graph indicated a downward trend for the Special Constables' Duty Hours, but the trend

was described as stable. The Senior Performance and Governance Manager explained they used a correlation between the date and numbers. A threshold was set to determine the constabulary's performance and where a downward trend would begin. Therefore, although there was a decrease in hours in real terms, the trend itself remained stable. The decrease demonstrated the reality of the uplift, as the focus was on recruitment and training.

- The Panel asked why there was a bell-shaped trend for average reoffences per reoffender on Page 73. The PCC stated he could not explain this trend. He informed the Panel that the recording of figures related to reoffending had ceased in recent years; he was disappointed to learn this when first in post, as he was keen to understand re-offending in terms of prevention. The Panel asked whether the apparent uptick after 2020 suggested an increase of re-offending rates. The PCC confirmed the rate of reduction had slowed but there was still a downward trend in numbers.
- The Panel raised the issues surrounding collaboration and partnerships; the pilot initiative to improve communication had not proved successful in Bristol as the City Council was often the last to find out about issues. The PCC confirmed he had asked the constabulary to continually review the call list to ensure it contained the appropriate and most up-to-date contacts.
- In terms of victim satisfaction, the Panel highlighted the downward trends shown on Page 67 of the Report. The Senior Performance and Governance Manager confirmed that a national survey concerning victim satisfaction in relation to rape and sexual offences was expected. In terms of the broader issue, the data available showed that victim satisfaction was lower for the follow-up compared to the initial contact. This needed improvement; the process had to be victim-centred, open, and transparent. The Panel suggested the use of victim's advocates for serious violence cases. The PCC agreed to take this suggestion back to the Chief Constable.
- The Panel praised the value of the information contained in the Report and suggested incorporating information relating to the Victims Code of Practice (VCOP). The Director for Performance and Accountability stated the OPCC was revising performance through the lens of PEEL (Police Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Legitimacy) in line with their 5-year strategic plan. This involved reviewing their measures of success,

how they discharged their scrutiny and assurance function. Evidence had shown they were successful in terms of activity, but this activity lacked co-ordination in terms of identifying the most vital or overlooked areas on which the PCC should focus.

**Actions:**

- 1. The OPCC to review the presentation of data on cybercrime for next quarter's Performance Summary.**
- 2. The PCC to discuss the use of victim's advocates for serious violence cases with the Chief Constable.**

**10. Standing Complaints Report**

No comments were received, and the report was taken as read.

**11. Governance Review Report**

The Chair invited the Lead Officer to introduce the Report.

The Lead Officer reminded the Panel that a series of amendments to the Panel's Operating Arrangements had been submitted to the constituent local authorities primarily around membership; this was due to the reduction in local authorities following the dissolution of Somerset's district councils on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023. The Lead Office invited the Panel to note that these amendments had been approved by the current local authorities and the final version was attached as Appendix 1 of the Report.

The Lead Officer went on to inform the Panel that, by contrast, the Panel itself had the authority to alter the Panel's Rules of Procedure as laid out in Appendix 2 without consultation with the constituent authorities. She invited the Panel to comment on the changes proposed and suggest any further amendments.

Councillor Bradbury sought clarification of the rationale for the allocation of seats.

The Lead Officer explained that Bristol had three representatives due to its comparatively high crime levels; this had been decided collectively by the

Leaders of the councils in 2012. Somerset's allocation of 5 seats was in line with its population and geographic size and reflected the 5-seat allocation before the districts were dissolved, thereby maintaining the status quo. The Chair highlighted the importance of making sure all the areas' voices within the force were heard, regardless of the number of representatives.

Independent Member Gary Davies asked whether the OPCC had requested independent observers from the Panel for the selection process for the Deputy Chief Constable. The Lead Officer confirmed the Panel had no statutory role in the process.

The Panel noted Appendix 1 and approved the changes made in Appendix 2.

## **12. Panel Annual Report**

The Chair invited the Panel to suggest any amendments or additions they wished to make to the content of the Annual Report.

Councillor Hucker highlighted that he had submitted to the Lead Office, a minor change to his commentary in the 'Reflections from Panel Members' section which better reflected his views.

The Panel noted this amendment and approved the Annual Report.

## **13. Panel Funding and Expenditure Report**

The Chair introduced the Report and explained its purpose was to outline the Panel's financial arrangements.

For the previous ten years, the Home Office had offered Panels across the country the same funding of up to £53,300 per year for running costs plus up to £920 per member for expenses; some authorities did not claim it, others claimed the full sum, and others used funding from the host authority to supplement. For 2022/3, the Panel invoked an indemnity mechanism of £5,000, with each constituent authority which provided the necessary supplement to the amount of £68,940 the Panel receives from the Home Office. With a surplus of £19,700 going into 2023/4, the indemnity mechanism did not need to be invoked for this year. The appendices showed that without the indemnity supplements the Panel would use up all of the reserve (£19,700) this year.

With the reduction in constituent authorities from nine to five in 2023, the Report gave the option of increasing the request from £5,000 to £6,000 for 2024/5 to help compensate for the otherwise reduced total amount of supplementary funding from the constituent authorities. The Chair stated that surplus funds in any given year could be returned proportionally or kept as reserves as in the case of 2023/4. What was key was preventing a future deficit due to the reduction in the number of constituent authorities.

The Lead Officer added she had written to the Home Office on several occasions to ask them to review their baseline funding which had been stagnant for 11 years. The prevailing message from the Home Office was that the funding would not be increased whilst some Panels failed to claim.

After considering the budget information, the Panel agreed that the established funding mechanism should be increased by £1000 for 2024/25 and an amount of £6000 sought from the constituent authorities.

#### **Actions:**

- 1. The Panel to give notice to the constituent authorities by the end of October 2023 of the Panel's agreement to increase the indemnity mechanism from £5,000 to £6,000 for 2024/25.**
- 2. The Lead Officer to bring similar budget reports back to the Panel in the future to keep the members sighted on the Panel's budget.**

#### **14. Work Programme**

The Chair invited the Lead Officer to present the item.

The Lead Officer introduced the Panel's Work Programme for 2023/4 and members considered business crime as a potential alternative theme for the March meeting (in place of Equality and Diversity which had replaced the initial estates strategy report). An assurance report has been commissioned by the OPCC on the theme of Business Crime in January 2024 that would provide opportunity to engage with the business community on this issue. Delaying the Equality and Diversity theme to September 2024 would enable the Panel to have sight of an assurance report on this theme from a Force perspective, in addition to the planned OPCC input.



The Panel suggested the proposal was sensible but was reluctant to set aside any scrutiny of the estates strategy. It was considered an important part of the Work Programme because of its links with the diminishing public confidence in policing. It was suggested that December was an optimal time to look at the estates strategy as the outcome of the discussion could inform budget decisions in February.

The Lead Officer added that the Budget Task and Finish Group had held their first meeting and had been meticulous in their scrutiny of the budget monitoring information. Having reviewed the paperwork for Quarter 1, their questions had been sent to the Chief Finance Officer at the OPCC and his responses had been received. These would be circulated to the Panel in due course.

**Actions:**

- 1. The Lead Officer to adjust the Work Programme to enable scrutiny of the estates strategy to be covered in December 2023 if possible and Business Crime in March 2024. The Panel's request to include previous successes of the estates strategy and any plans to build on this.**
- 2. The Panel's request for sight of the PCC's Public Confidence Strategy to be dealt with as part of the work of the Public Confidence Sub-Committee (dispensing with the need for an agenda item at a Panel meeting).**
- 3. The Lead Officer to circulate the CFO's responses to the Budget Task and Finish Group's questions regarding Quarter 1.**

**15. Commissioner's Annual Report (For Information Only)**

Taken as read.

**16. Date of Next Meeting**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Friday 8<sup>th</sup> December 2023 at 10.30am at Deane House.