

## Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner for Essex

### PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY BOARD

25 June 2024 10:00 – 12:30

### MINUTES

**Present:**

Roger Hirst (RH)	Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner (Chair)
Pippa Brent-Isherwood (PBI)	Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, PFCC's office
Darren Deex (DD)	Supt HR Projects, Essex Police
Jane Gardner (JG)	Deputy Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner
Ben-Julian Harrington (BJH)	Chief Constable, Essex Police
Suzanne Harris (SH)	Head of Performance and Scrutiny, PFCC's office
Fiona Henderson (FH)	Director of Continuous Improvement and Analytics, Essex Police
Darren Horsman (DH)	Strategic Head of Policy & Public Engagement, PFCC's office
Richard Jones (RJ)	Head of Financial Performance and Reporting, Essex Police
Richard Leicester (RL)	Director of HR, Essex Police
Andrew Mariner (AM)	Assistant Chief Constable, Essex Police
Debbie Martin (DM)	Chief Finance Officer, Essex Police
Janet Perry (JP)	Chief Financial Officer / Strategic Head of Performance and Resources, PFCC's office
David Wederell (DW)	Senior Management Account, Essex Police
Jeremy White (JW)	Finance Manager, PFCC's office
Helen Notman (HN)	(Minutes), Scrutiny Officer, PFCC's office

**Observer:**

Kasia Grabka (KG) ICV Manager, PFCC's office.

**Apologies:**

Andrew Prophet (AP) Deputy Chief Constable, Essex Police

#### 1. Welcome and Apologies

1.1. RH welcomed all to the meeting, apologies were noted from those above.

1.2. Kasia Grabka was introduced as the ICV Manager from the PFCC's office, who was in attendance as an observer.

#### 2.

##### 2.1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

2.1.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and agreed.

2.1.2. There were no matters arising.

## **2.2. Action Log**

### **60/23 Collaboration - CSP's**

No update due until November 2024.

**Remain Open**

### **09/24 The Procurement Act 2023**

JP, PBI, SH & DH met regarding publication and transparency issues on 24 June 2024, and it was requested that an update be provided by the Force on the impact of the changes to Essex Police of the Procurement Act 2023. It was subsequently agreed within the meeting under item 2.3 for CM to include this as part of the paper that would be presented at the July PRSB meeting.

**Remain Open**

### **15/24 Public Perception Survey (SMSR)**

It was suggested this cannot proceed until re-procurement was complete. FH believed the contract runs out August/September 2024 and EP needed to ensure there was not a latent period. The due date was amended to August 2024.

**Remain Open – due date August 2024**

### **17/24 Monthly Performance Report**

Jen Housego and JP met regarding this on 3 June 2024 to discuss how to bring in more of a focus on the cybercrime aspect of priority 8.

**Closed**

### **19/24 Forward Plan**

SH to add the Police Closure Report to the June PRSB meeting. SH had updated the Forward Plan accordingly.

**Closed**

### **20/24 Forward Plan**

SH to move Productivity Review to July PRSB meeting. SH had updated the Forward Plan accordingly.

**Closed**

### **21/24 Forward Plan**

SH to move Procurement Update to July PRSB meeting on Forward Plan and to extend meeting to 2.5hrs in view of additional items. SH confirmed that the meeting on 31 July has 2.5-hour diary hold and EP CIT colleagues had been informed of the proposed length of the meeting.

**Closed**

### **22/24 Forward Plan**

SH to add Public Engagement Strategy to the Forward Plan for August PRSB meeting. SH had updated the Forward Plan accordingly.

**Closed**

### **23/24 POA Report**

RJ to provide JW with breakdowns of overheads of Command Team Support. A number of Police Officer posts linked to Dealing with the Public had been mapped at cost centre level 2d – Command Team and Support Overheads but should have been mapped to 2b – Central Communications Unit.

From 2 April 2024, the new target operating model for Contact Management (those posts categorised as dealing with the public) was implemented and saw the introduction of a new HR and cost centre structure. The mapping of posts to the POA level 2 categories would be reviewed for accuracy as part of the POA statutory return and in-year monitoring process for 2024/25.

**Closed**

#### **24/24 Treasury Management of Outturn Report**

- a. Part a. was re-worded to read: DCC to get external benchmark on percentage spend of revenue budget for borrowing, which will assist understanding in relation to borrowing for HQ. Update: AP to get external benchmark on % spend of revenue budget for borrowing, which would assist understanding in relation to borrowing for HQ. The Force would formally share this insight on 5 July 2024. Forces have recently submitted data for an NPCC & APCC Finance Survey, this included data on capital, borrowing and financing debt. The results were discussed at NPCC Finance Committee on 6 June and they do provide the answers the Board requested; however the data will not be published until after the general election. The Force will formally share this insight on 5 July 2024.
- b. JP to discuss with PACCTS colleagues. Update: JP had emailed PAACTS technical team regarding this and is awaiting a response.

**Open - Extend due date to July 2024.**

#### **25/24 PSD Annual Report**

AP to provide RH with personal briefing note of potential changes to Reg 13. This had been provided.

**Closed**

#### **26/24 PSD Annual Report**

SC to add extra content to ensure transparency around number of allegations matching breakdowns of conduct cases. This was completed on 5 June 2024 and a new version was returned to the PFCC's office.

**Closed**

#### **27/24 Response to Angiolini Enquiry**

Re-wording of this action was agreed to read: AP to consider the need for RH to lobby for the new APP re sexual offences to be developed at greater pace and to provide a briefing note if this would be useful. Update: Essex Police had reached out to the College of Policing, and they had confirmed the new APP guidance for non-contact sexual offences would be delivered by September 2024, therefore no lobbying was required.

**Closed**

#### **28/24 Force Stop & Search**

RN to provide long term analysis of Stop Search figures and additional content in next report. RN to provide in the report a table of % of positive outcomes by ethnic heritage and to discuss with NM how to better present this data to make it easier to understand. This would be included within the next report which was due for the August 2024 PRSB meeting. Due date to be amended to August.

**Open**

### **2.3. Forward Plan**

- 2.3.1. SH advised that there had been a duplicate entry regarding the Public Contact paper, which had now been rectified, this was a correction rather than a change.
- 2.3.2. JP clarified that the paper in July regarding the Procurement Act needed to contain information on the status of the Specified Information Order. The PFCC were currently awaiting the Cabinet Office response as to whether the Procurement Act superseded the Specified Information Order. DH was concerned that the Force were not meeting those regulations, which was a Statutory Duty, and the PFCC wanted to know when the Force would be able to meet the requirements. It was therefore agreed to change the papers title to an Update on the Status of the Specified Information Order.

## **Action 29/24**

### **Update to July PRSB Forward Plan; Procurement Act Paper to be re-titled Update on the Status of the Specified Information Order.**

#### **3. Monthly Finance Report**

- 3.1. DM presented the 2024/25 finance report month two position for the Force. The revenue forecast overspend was at £1.457m (0.38% variance) based on an increase in the headcount of Officers. Additional funding of £0.480m in relation to an overachievement of 2024/25 Police Officer Uplift was included in the revenue forecast. The Capital financial monitoring position would first be reported at month three. DM explained that there were no proposed appropriations to/from earmarked reserves. DM outlined that the forecasting of pay was challenging as there were only two months of data, with a forecast for the remaining ten months.
- 3.2. RH wished to clarify how confident the Force were of the headcount figure of 3,820? BJH explained that this was continually challenging, but it was a firm focus for them. RL added that the Force were confident this was achievable but recognised the many factors out of their control around this. RH asked whether the Force had the detailed grant agreement for PUP for 2024/25, confirming that the batch one consolidation from last year was 3,810, with extra flexibility around the extra 10. DM confirmed that this was right, and that for the extra 10 the funding would be for each extra Officer, rather than only if they had the full 10. BJH added his confirmation to this and explained that should the Force go below the 3,810 then there would be a significant drop in funding. RL clarified that the funding was split between two monitoring points in September and March, so the aim was to ensure the Force met the required targets at both dates. Current data for June 2024 revealed that the Force were five Officers over, with 10 projected in September 2024 and 10 in March 2025. RH thanked RL for this clarity.
- 3.3. JP asked DM whether the forecast was an extrapolation, rather than a true forecast. DM explained that high-level exceptions were included in the report, where they had met with budget holders. BJH explained that overtime was extrapolated, they knew there had been 3 bank holidays, and factored in the costs for these. JP thanked BJH for this clarity.
- 3.4. RH questioned whether the income for Operation Grip and Operation Dial had yet been received, and whether the Force were able to extrapolate costs for overtime for these operations, despite not having the revenue? DM clarified that the funding for these Operations was received as an annual grant. RJ added that most of the Operation Dial expenditures were held against LPSU, and therefore the Force would not yet have anything non-pay related for Operation Dial. BJH clarified that there was only one month of overtime so far in the report, but that this was not set against these particular Operations, although the work was being done.
- 3.5. JW clarified whether waterfall figures would be provided at the next meeting and DM explained that the June report was light touch and a full report would be provided at the July PRSB meeting. RH thanked DM for her report.

#### **4. Efficiency and Savings Programme**

- 4.1. FH presented the report outlining the 2023/24 Efficiency and Savings Plan. This report identified cashable savings of £12.213m in year and £10.915m recurring. This represented a significantly increased savings requirement from that identified in 2022/23. Current monitoring identified that the Force had met the in-year target of £12.213m and exceeded this by a further £4.6m. This was largely attributable to a significant contribution from the vacancy factor £3.3m and Force-wide non-pay savings of £1.3m. The 2024/25 Efficiency and Savings Plan identified cashable savings of £10.409m in year, £10.589m full year and a further £0.893m one-off. Early indications

show that the Force needed to closely monitor their vacancies, which FH confirmed they were doing every month, with tight priorities for this endorsed by COG.

- 4.2. RH wished to clarify the figure for the non-cashable savings of £1.8million on Specials? BJH stated that the Force would check this figure considering the small number of Specials they currently had.

#### **Action 30/24**

**FH to check figures for non-cashable savings for Specials.**

- 4.3. BJH explained that the current vacancies in the CCC may be helpful from a budget perspective, but for operational delivery this was an issue. The Force were currently actively recruiting those CCC posts. BJH then expanded on the issue of finding a centralised property store, with the aim to reduce the amount of property and how long this was stored for, as this would reduce the overall costs. This now fell under ACC Morris's portfolio, the challenge being trying to find a location for this, within the ongoing work around estates. This issue was to be discussed at the E&S Board on 9 July 2024, and if a solution was unachievable for this, then the Force would have to look at alternative means of achieving those predicted savings. BJH explained that the Force were forecasting savings further ahead into 2026/27 and looking into how that aligned with the MTFS. RH wished to put on record the huge effort made by the Force and the subsequent overachievement of savings by a substantial margin, which could then be reinvested into the service. RH could see that the Force were on track for another positive effort in the next year, governed by finance. RH recognised the effort from the entire service, but noted there were still improvements to be made within the transparency of the MTFS.

## **5. Performance Reports**

### **5.1. Monthly Performance Report**

- 5.1.1. FH presented the monthly performance report advising there were no grading changes proposed. The priorities were showing as four at good, seven at adequate and one at requires improvement. Key headlines showed that there was a decrease in All Crime and Rural Crime. Business Crime continued to increase by 9.3% due to increase in shoplifting offences. Theft offences also rose by 3.1%, primarily due to shoplifting but also increases in vehicle theft and residential burglary. There was a decrease in repeat victims, VAP offences decreased, but Essex Police solved 4.2% fewer sexual offences. There was a 2.3% decrease in KSIs and 18 fewer OCG disruptions. Officer numbers had increased overall. Specials continued to decrease. FH then went through each priority individually and advised on the headlines as outlined within the report.
- 5.1.2. With reference to priority one, RH had feedback from residents stating that when they reported online, they did not get an incident number, or feedback as quickly as if they had called 101, suggesting 3-4 weeks of delay. FH explained that when reporting online, there was a mechanical delay in this being added to the system and an officer being allocated. ACC Morris would be looking into the volume of investigations and the timelines of this. BJH explained that there was a threat, harm, risk assessment, and for those lower priority crimes, there could be a significant delay, with the unanticipated number of vacancies in the CCC adding to these pressures, but the DCC was leading the focus on this. BJH assured the Board that serious crimes would be picked up quickly. RH highlighted that with a call to 101 there would be an instant conclusion with a crime number compared to the response if you reported online, with the presumption that online reports were being triaged correctly. BJH asked FH to clarify whether the Terms of Reference stated when an online report was completed whether an Athena reference or a true crime reference was provided initially. FH sought to

reassure the Board by pointing to the fact that when HMICFRS conducted a review of threat, harm and risk assessment, in the last 6 months, it stated they were happy with the Force's ability to prioritise its responses appropriately. RL added that the aim was to achieve a super intake in September/October 2024 for the CCC, with those then trained by December. RL highlighted that there were some competing challenges around this timeline, as September was a deadline to hit for the maintenance number for PUP, so a Working Group had been formed with RL and ACC Nolan to push that area forward and make a plan that would be ready by 10 July 2024 for these super intakes.

#### **Action 31/24**

**FH to clarify whether an Athena reference or true reference is provided when incidents are reported online.**

- 5.1.3. There was discussion around priority four; VAWG, which the Force assessed as 'good'. RH suggested with violence against women and girls accounting for over a fifth of all crime in the County, there was a lot more to do in that area. The level of activity the Police were doing was good, but RH felt the Force were on the cusp, and needed to improve outcomes. RH felt that within the new Police and Crime Plan there needed to be a double strand, of how improvement was classified, and that the Force needed a sustained level of improvement in order to achieve a grading of 'good'. BJH disagreed and stood by the Force self-assessment grading of 'good', pointing towards the three-month and one-month comparisons on crime tree, the Force could see this turning around and improving, with reductions in crime and an increase in solved rates. BJH suggested that there were wider issues of accountability around Courts and Probation Services and Local Authorities requiring scrutiny, and improvement was needed in these areas to take this forward. RH agreed that the accountability of Court Services and Probation Services was lacking, and that Probation Services would benefit from being locally accountable. FH concluded by saying that the Force would closely track improvements in the area of VAWG looking at both short- and long-term trends to truly assess if this area was improving.
- 5.1.4. Further discussion occurred around priority five, improving support for victims; which was Force assessed as 'requires improvement'. RH asked when the PFCC would see an assessment of the effectiveness of the Victim Engagement Portal? BJH explained that the Force's biggest issue with this was Officers not updating victims in a timely manner. RH suggested a six-monthly update on Victim Support would be useful, that included the work the PFCC's office were commissioning in this area. PBI highlighted that there was a previous action through this meeting for Greg Myddleton to attend the Victims and Witnesses subgroup, and suggested that a report from that subgroup could be helpful to incorporate the PFCC contribution, plus feed in any issues from the wider Criminal Justice System into that, in order to help to hold them to account. FH was happy to take this away as an action and speak to the Chair of that group, which was now under ACC Morris. BJH confirmed he was happy for a report to the Board in September 2024, to show what the Force was doing to improve levels of victim engagement and that it would be useful for COG to bring together their self-assessment in this area for the PFCC to scrutinise.

#### **Action 32/24**

**Six-monthly update on Victim Support to be added to the Forward Plan initially in September 2024, to include what the Force was doing to improve levels of victim engagement. The Force to provide their self-assessment of victim engagement to be scrutinised by the PFCC, and to include a report from the Victims & Witnesses subgroup to incorporate the PFCC commissioned work plus feed in any issues encountered from the wider CJ System. FH to speak to the Chair of subgroup regarding providing that report.**

- 5.1.5. JP asked for clarification of differences in data for priority seven; dog thefts in the report compared to the Closure Report 2023/24. FH felt that this was due to data being taken from different points in time, the data in this monthly performance report was up to the end of May,

whereas that for the Closure Report was up to the end of March. JP requested this be more clearly outlined where the data was taken to, so there was clarity. RH suggested this matter was taken up outside of the meeting.

#### **Action 33/24**

**FH to discuss with JP data on report and when the data cut off points are.**

- 5.1.6. JP confirmed that she had had the discussion with Jen Housego regarding priority eight; business crime and how best to capture the fraud data, which had been really helpful, and they were looking at how they could bring personal fraud into the equation.
- 5.1.7. Within priority 10; encouraging volunteers, FH clarified that there had been issues with inaccurate data in the previous report for Cadet Leader numbers, and the Force were doing work to verify this data, as it made it look like a large drop in Cadet Leader numbers this month compared to last month. FH proposed the Force provide an amendment to this section before publishing it to ensure there was accountability for the differences. RH agreed to the provision of this amendment.

#### **Action 34/24**

**FH to provide revised Performance Report which would include an amendment to explain the Cadet Leader numbers in the monthly report to clarify the data provided in this month and the previous months reports.**

- 5.1.8. BJH added to the overview of priority 12; increasing collaboration, highlighting that the Force had recently completed a positive action event led by RL's team, reaching in excess of 8,000 children online across schools. In terms of the new Plan and the indicators, BJH wished to ensure this work was being recognised, either under collaboration or community confidence, but currently felt that this was not being recorded and therefore this positive work was not being reflected within Essex Police's portfolio. RH suggested this area needed profiling, to understand how it worked alongside the collaboration piece.

### **6. PEEL Inspection AFIs Update**

- 6.1. FH advised of the update on the actions taken and progress made by the Force against the 14 areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS during the Force's PEEL 2021/22. The Force expected to be in a positive position for all AFIs ahead of the final HMICFRS PEEL evidence gathering window at the end of December 2024. The Force was expecting their next PEEL inspection to formally commence from June 2024 with a document request, body worn video and case file analysis and a crime data accuracy audit with fieldwork later in 2024 and the report published in the first quarter of 2025. Five AFI's were currently rated amber, an improvement from previously being six. In April 2024 the Force was notified by HMICFRS that they had been selected as part of a national thematic inspection on investigating crime, with fieldwork due to commence on 24 June 2024. HMICFRS had already been in contact with the Force because HMICFRS had identified potential areas of promising practice to be included in the final report. RH thanked FH for the report and was pleased to hear the progress the Force was making in self-assessment. RH looked forward to the results of the PEEL assessment, which RH was due to get feedback from HMICFRS on in the following week.

ACC Mariner and Darren Horsman joined the meeting and David Wederall left the meeting at 11.38.

Darren Deex joined the meeting at 11.40

### **7. Public Perception Survey**

- 7.1. FH presented the report on the Public Perception Survey, explaining that 76% of Essex residents thought the police in their area were doing a good or excellent job, 2% higher than in the previous year. 55% agreed Essex Police understand community issues, up 3% from the previous year. 48% agreed Essex Police were dealing with crime and ASB, compared to 54% two years ago. 67% had confidence in local policing, 2% higher than previous year. Confidence in receiving a good service whilst reporting a crime increased from 67% to 71%. 64% agreed that Essex Police used its stop and search powers fairly and respectfully, an increase of 4%. FH highlighted the positive improvements in some districts where there were previously challenges relating to confidence in the Police, which revealed the activity and effort that had been put into those areas. DH added that he attended the Star Chamber at the invitation of the DCC, and he had seen the positive response from the District Commanders, who clearly felt ownership of this issue and were committed to achieving results in this area.
- 7.2. BJH wished to highlight the challenges the Force continued to have with victim confidence compared to non-victim confidence, mostly down to not updating the victims, the more minor the crime the less likely updates were to be provided by Officers. RH responded that this area also related to the PFCC effectively commissioning services.

## **8. Performance against the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)**

- 8.1. RL presented the report outlining the activity undertaken by the Force to progress against the objectives contained within the Diversity Equality and Inclusion strategy. RH asked how recent the census data was that was being used for this in terms of understanding whether 15% of applications from people of ethnic heritage was a good level? RL explained that this was based on 2021 data, and the level was higher than the economically active population which was just over 11%, however RL noted that those that succeed through the recruitment process and joined the Force was lower than this, and the Force were doing work with ARU to better understand why this was, to hopefully allow the Force to positively influence this. RH then raised a question around objective four and what impact the repudiation of the NPCC Race Action Plan by the Black Police Association (BPA) had on what they were trying to do. RL confirmed that this was still ongoing, effectively the BPA had withdrawn support on an interim basis, with the biggest impact how the Force continued to work with its local minority ethnic support association. RL emphasised how much work the Force had done in this area, and how committed they were to delivering the core objectives of the NPCC Race Action Plan, whatever form that would now take. RH responded that he was pleased to hear this.

Darren Deex left the meeting at 11.54.

## **9. Recruitment of Specials**

- 9.1. AM provided an update on recruitment under the Special Constabulary Development Programme. Nationally the NCVO reported significant drops in volunteering across all sectors, while the National position around Special Constables followed a similar trajectory with a 33% reduction in headcount nationally. The current headcount was at 254, however in the last six months the decrease had slowed, with the Force losing an average of six Specials a month. AM explained that the Force currently had 90 businesses in the pipeline under employee supported policing, and the Force aimed to further develop this. A Specials video had been made to be released in National Volunteers week. AM highlighted the innovative links the Force had made with South Essex College, where those undertaking the Policing Course completed mandatory work experience as a Special, and they had nine applications for this so far. JG asked whether there was an understanding of high-level themes of why Specials were leaving. AM explained that a high proportion went on to become regular Officers, but other factors included medical reasons, work-



life balance, and changes in circumstances. AM assured the Board that interventions were put into each of these issues to try and mitigate these, for example being more flexible over the number of hours that Specials could commit to. JG felt that the video was impressive, but wished for clarification of whether the Force pushed this enough during National Volunteers week? AM confirmed there was a lot of work in this area. RH suggested that linking in with local parish councils, town councils and businesses could be a positive step, and a building block between the community and Police. PBI advised that the PFCC had been actively working with the Force and the Essex Association of Local Councils (EALC) on a campaign, one of the aims of which was to get the pipeline of Specials moving. DH highlighted that there were positive signs about these events, but also he had heard feedback that the importance of how Specials were viewed within the Force had changed, that they no longer felt valued. There was great passion within the Specials, but mostly it was Specials creating this, rather than necessarily being highly valued within the Force as a whole. BJH reflected that there were capacity issues within the Communications Team, but that they regularly highlighted the great work the Specials were doing in Despatch. BJH confirmed that he would take this issue up with Robin Punt. BJH admitted that the regular Officers were the Force's priority but emphasised that this did not diminish what the Specials were achieving. SH raised the point that in terms of Parish Councils, she would encourage contact with the Rural Community Council of Essex, specifically Lizzie Rose who collated the monthly Essex Rural Partnership newsletter and regularly included information from the Rural Engagement Team, as there was potential for the Force to add something in there about Specials. AM agreed that he would pick this up.

#### **Action 35/24**

**AM to make contact with Rural Community Council of Essex to explore how they might be able to help promote Community Specials**

### **10. Crime Prevention Strategy – action plan and performance**

10.1. AM outlined the report providing a structured update in relation to each of the 14 strands of the Crime Prevention Strategy 2021-25. RH explained that it was good to see the positive results from the Strategy that crime was reducing but emphasised that the focus must be on increasing the momentum and driving the Strategy forwards. AM reassured RH that the Strategy ensured scrutiny of each area of business, with Boards to drive this forward with governance processes and tactical groups underneath these. AM highlighted the Operation Grip and Operation Dial work, where the Force had achieved 100% compliance with Operation Grip. AM then explained about RASSO and the detail to which they focus on each offender, looking into their background and working with the CPS to ensure a full picture of the offenders was provided, which lead to more charges. BJH wished to highlight the fifth pillar of the Plan and who else was doing that with the Force. RH replied that there was lots of work in parallel with the County Council, but perhaps this section needed profiling better and doing in a more structured way. PBI added that in terms of wider partnership working, she felt that had improved over the last couple of years, with tactical leads through Safer Essex that work alongside Police leads. PBI stated that the aim with the new Crime Prevention Strategy was to start the engagement process earlier, so that ownership of this was not lost, as potentially had happened when the last Plan was developed coming out of Covid. PBI highlighted the Essex Council for Voluntary Youth Services (ECVYS) event, which talked about coordinating the strategic discussion around the Statutory Duty around working with the voluntary and community sector, and PBI felt that there was an opportunity for her & JG to have a conversation around this element, and possibly link up with ECVYS around this, and potentially doing the same with other partners. JG agreed with this and suggested Essex Community Foundation, who fund a lot of organisations that could help in this space and suggested a follow-up with ACC Nolan.

#### **Action 36/24**

**PBI & JG to discuss possibility of linking up with ECVYS & other partners including Essex Community Foundation, and follow up results with ACC Nolan.**

10.2. RH requested feedback on the new initiatives and the impact of these; Operation Grenadier was implemented in February 2024, due to performance analytics anticipating a spike in burglaries. A targeted approach was used, and the anticipated spike was then flattened. The Clear, Hold, Build model was launched in Harlow, which was a national programme, to clear the area of criminality using high visibility patrols and using community-based intelligence, hold it whilst the community assets were built up, such as play areas for children, and this was going well. Right Care, Right Person continued to be a success, although partners were pushing back more, the Force remained on track with this. This programme had enabled the Force to realise the capacity that was need and had actually freed up resources that were being spent on tasks that were not policing. BJH added that there had been push back about how the Force deal with missing children, but this was still felt to be something the police needed to respond to, it was important for the police to do things that only they could.

## **11. Police and Crime Plan 2021-24 Closure Report**

11.1. DH discussed the paper, highlighting that it was primarily a collaborative effort and thanked the Force and the PFCC team for their support in completing this. DH explained that the report was really positive, with context added around any areas the Force had not fully achieved and the circumstances behind this, for example Specials, 101 calls and the contact centre, rape and sexual assault, and the initiatives around this. SH pointed out that there were discrepancies in the figures between the FMS and the Closure Report, which was likely to be due to time periods when the data was taken from. What was needed was a disclaimer to clarify when the data was from on both documents, so the reasons behind any discrepancies were clear. This was agreed to. BJH was happy that the Report revealed the tremendous work done by the Force to achieve all of this.

### **Action 37/24**

**Disclaimer on FMS and Closure Report to clarify when data was taken up to on both documents.**

## **12. Approval for publishing of documents**

12.1. RH advised only item 4 was official sensitive, all other papers were proposed for publishing. This was agreed.

## **13. Any Other Business**

13.1. There being no further business the meeting closed at 12:39 hours.

### **Future meeting dates**

Wednesday 31 July 2024	10.00 (Deep Dive at 14.00)
Thursday 29 August 2024	10.00 (Deep Dive at 14.00)
Tuesday 1 October 2024	10.00 (Deep Dive at 14.00)