

PFCC Decision Report

Report reference number: 038/2020

Classification (e.g. Not protectively marked/restricted): Not protectively marked

Title of report: Correspondence Standards

Area of county / stakeholders affected: Countywide

Report by: Darren Horsman (AD Communication and Public Engagement)

Date of report: 28 February 2020

Enquiries to: Darren.Horsman@essex.police.uk

1. Purpose of the report

To approve adoption of the Correspondence Standards attached at Appendix 1.

2. Recommendations

That the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner (PFCC) for Essex approves the Correspondence Standards attached at Appendix 1.

3. Benefits of the proposal

Implementation of the Correspondence Standards will provide greater consistency in how the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner's office is available to respond to public enquiries. It will also provide a clearer set of standards for the PFCC's team to work to and help set expectations for the public.

4. Background and proposal

The PFCC and their team work hard to provide a timely and responsive service to the public, addressing their enquiries and concerns effectively and efficiently. Hearing from the public and understanding their views is an important element of building a closer relationship between the public and police. The way the PFCC's office engages with the public is an important element of this ongoing engagement.

5. Alternative options considered and rejected

Officers considered not producing this set of standards but rejected this as we expect this document to create greater consistency in adherence to the standards we are committing to.

6. Police and Crime Plan

Engagement with the public is identified as an important building block for the successful delivery of the Police and Crime Plan and as such these standards will contribute to the overall successful delivery of the Plan.

7. Police operational implications

There are no operational implications arising for Essex Police as a result of this report.

8. Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

9. Legal implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

10. Staffing implications

While the standards set out in the document are all existing responsibilities, so there are no direct staffing implications, having them presented in a single document is intended to help the PFCC's office work collectively to ensure consistency across the team.

11. Equality and Diversity implications

There are no direct equality and diversity implications arising from this decision, however all engagement with the PFCC's office should be undertaken with consideration of the PFCC's obligations under the Equality Act 2010 in mind.

12. Risks

There are no additional risks relevant to this decision.

13. Governance Boards

The Correspondence Standards have been discussed and agreed at PFCC's Senior Management Team.

14. Background papers

Appendix 1 – Correspondence Standards

[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Report Approval

The report will be signed off by the review and sign off by the PFCC /		Chief Executive and Treasurer prior to
Chief Executive / M.O.	Sign:	Melos Live
	Print:	P. Brent-Isherwood
	Date:	2 April 2020
Chief Finance Officer / Treasurer	Sign:	N/A – No financial implications
	Print:	
	Date:	
<u>Publication</u>		
Is the report for publication?		YES X
		NO
If 'NO', please give reasons for non-publication (Where relevant, cite the security classification of the document(s). State 'None' if applicable)		
	N/A	
If the report is not for publication, the can be informed of the decision.	he Chief	Executive will decide if and how the public
Redaction		
If the report is for publication, is	redaction	on required:
1. Of Decision Sheet? YES		2. Of Appendix? YES
NO	X	NO X
If 'YES', please provide details o		ed redaction:
Date redaction carried out:		

Ireasurer / Chief Executive Sign Off – for Redactions only		
If redaction is required, the Treasurer or Chief Executive is to sign off that redaction has been completed.		
Sign:		
Print:		
Chief Executive/Treasurer		
Decision and Final Sign Off		
I agree the recommendations to this report:		
Sign:		
Roger Hirst Print:		
PFCC		
Date signed: 7 April 2020		
I do not agree the recommendations to this report because:		
Sign:		
Print:		
PFCC/Deputy PFCC		
Date signed:		