

PFCC Decision Report

Please ensure all sections below are completed

Report reference number: TBC (Strategic Change)

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

Title of report: Marked Motorcycles for Training

Area of county / stakeholders affected: Whole County

Report by: Chief Superintendent Mat Newton

Date of report: 10.02.21.

Enquiries to: Chief Superintendent Mat Newton

1. Purpose of the report

(Set out the purpose of the report)

To seek funding for two additional marked police motorcycles to meet the internal training requirements for the organisation, avoiding the need to pay external organisations for the training.

2. Recommendations

(Set out the decision and recommendation which is to be made as a part of the proposal)

The proposal is to purchase two marked police motorcycles for the primary purpose of delivering internal training to officers that are required to drive police motorcycles as part of their role. The expected replacement period of the motorcycles is every 3 years or every 60,000 miles.

The decision is to support the purchasing of two marked police motorcycles and the associated revenue costs to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of motorcycle training.

3. Benefits of the proposal

(Specify the benefits of the proposal including financial or operational benefits. Highlight whether this proposal is linked to another decision or earlier paper. Also specify the consequences of not proceeding)

The benefits of this proposal are:

- To be able to effectively deliver motorcycle training to meet the internal demands of the organisation which in turn will ensure that officers have the required skills to complete their job role.
- It avoids the need of sending officers to external service providers for this specialist training which will amount of average to £54,000 per annum based on an average attrition rate of 3 officers per year.
- It provides the opportunity for potential income generation to be made from other organisations needing the training as there is a national shortage of instructors and training being delivered for motorcycles.
- If this proposal is not supported, it will result in additional costs being incurred by the organisation to acquire this training from an external training provider.

4. Background and proposal

(Set out the background, chronological history and relevant contextual information to support the proposal including what has happened so far and what is being proposed)

To date, Driver Training have delivered the required motorcycle training using Operational Policing Command (OPC) motorcycles and through the use of motorcycles due for decommissioning. This is no longer a sustainable solution due to the OPC needing the motorcycles for their own team.

Currently the options are; to either stop maintaining this vital training capability, or to send officers to external organisations to undertake this specialist training. If the training was delivered by external organisations Essex Police would be required to spend approximately circa £54,000 per annum.

To maintain the delivery of this training for officers who are required to ride motorcycles for their daily role, and in order to avoid sending officers to external organisations for this training, this proposal seeks to purchase two marked police motorcycles. The skills of the organisation's training staff are already present to deliver the training.

5. Alternative options considered and rejected

(Set out any alternative options considered and rejected in favour of the recommendation(s) made. In some instances (e.g. where the recommendation is made to fulfil a statutory requirement), there may be no viable alternative. However, in most cases, there will be at least one alternative option, this being to do nothing / maintain the status quo).

Options considered for delivering this training have included:

- Utilising the motorcycles that OPC have for operational teams to deliver training. This option is not viable as the first training course is five weeks in length and OPC cannot free their resources for five weeks without having an operational service delivery impact.
- Stop delivering the training internally and outsource the training requirement to other organisations that have the capacity and capability to deliver the training.
- Using motorcycle fleet which is coming to the end of its useable life. This has been utilised as a short-term solution but is not sustainable for the medium to longer term.
- Purchase two new motorcycles to deliver the training to meet internal needs. This is the preferred option as it does not impact upon service delivery within OPC and avoids the need to send officers externally for this specialist training at a high annual cost.

6. Police and Crime Plan

(Demonstrate how the issue is relevant to the [Police and Crime Plan](#) and any other relevant strategic plans.)

This proposal supports 2 of the Police and Crime Plan priorities:

- Cracking down on antisocial behaviour.
- Improving safety on our roads.

This proposal ensures a continued capability within Essex Police to provide an efficient response to local and national matters. This proposal enables an alternative policing response to antisocial behaviour which is dynamic and effective. The proposal is a key part of our road safety response for the county.

7. Police operational implications

(Outline any operational policing implications and how Essex Police has been engaged or consulted.)

- If the organisation stops providing this training for officers, it will result in the loss of this specialist training capability, which will have operational and reputational risks.
- Chief Officers, Transport Services, OPC and Finance have been consulted as part of this proposal.

8. Financial implications

(This section should set out the key revenue and capital finance issues arising from the report. Report authors, working with the relevant CFO, will need to demonstrate that the decision is within existing financial and other resources and if not identify the source of any additional resources.)

The below table outlines the capital and revenue requirements arising from this proposal.

| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | TOTAL |
|--------------------|------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|---------------|
| Capital | | 32.594 | | | 32.594 | | 65.188 |
| Revenue - | Recurring | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 15.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total Costs | | 35.594 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 35.594 | 3.0 | 80.188 |

9. Legal implications

(This section should set out the key legal issues arising from the report and include any legal advice if received)

No legal issues have been identified as part of this proposal.

10. Staffing implications

(This section should set out any staffing implications. It needs to demonstrate that the decision complies with relevant employment legislation and / or policies).

There are no identified staffing implications from this proposal.

11. Equality and Diversity implications

(This section should describe the equality and diversity implications of the proposal and should attach and address any findings from the equality impact assessment if one has been carried out).

There are no Equality and Diversity implications identified from this proposal.

12. Risks

(This section should describe the key risks relating to the proposal, and what would be undertaken to mitigate those risks.)

There are no identified risks from this proposal being supported.

13. Governance Boards

(This section should describe the meetings that this proposal has been discussed at prior to the decision being presented to the Commissioner for decision)

This proposal has been discussed and supported as part of a Chief Officer Group (COG) agenda item.

14. Background papers

OFFICIAL

(Please list sources of information e.g. documents that are not readily available to the public and that were used in the writing of the report. Please provide an electronic link embedded into the report).

There are no additional papers to the proposal paper.

Report Approval

The report will be signed off by the OPFCC Chief Executive and Treasurer prior to review and sign off by the PFCC / DPFCC.

Chief Executive / M.O. Sign:

Print:

Date:

Chief Finance Officer / Treasurer Sign:

Print:

Date:

Publication

Is the report for publication? YES

NO

If 'NO', please give reasons for non-publication (Where relevant, cite the security classification of the document(s). State 'None' if applicable)

.....
.....

If the report is not for publication, the Chief Executive will decide if and how the public can be informed of the decision.

Redaction

If the report is for publication, is redaction required:

1. Of Decision Sheet? YES NO 2. Of Appendix? YES NO

If 'YES', please provide details of required redaction:

.....
.....

Date redaction carried out:

Treasurer / 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.

Please continue to next page for Final PCC Decision and Final Sign Off

Decision and Final Sign Off

I agree the recommendations to this report:

Sign:

Print:

PFCC/Deputy PFCC

Date signed:

I do not agree the recommendations to this report because:

.....
.....
.....

Sign:

Print:

PFCC/Deputy PFCC

Date signed: