

# Minutes

---

**Minutes of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 16 June 2017, in Olympic Room Aylesbury Vale District Council Gatehouse Road Aylesbury Bucks HP19 8FF, commencing at 11.00 am and concluding at 1.30 pm.**

## **Members Present**

Bill Bendyshe-Brown (Buckinghamshire County Council), Councillor Margaret Burke (Milton Keynes Council), Cllr Arvind Dhaliwal (Slough Borough Council), Councillor Trevor Egleton (South Bucks District Council), Julia Girling (Independent Member), Cllr Tom Hayes (Oxford City Council), Councillor Angela Macpherson (Aylesbury Vale District Council), Councillor Kieron Mallon (Oxfordshire County Council), Curtis-James Marshall (Independent Member), Councillor Chris McCarthy (Vale of White Horse District Council), Councillor Iain McCracken (Bracknell Forest Council), Councillor Barrie Patman (Wokingham Borough Council), Cllr Emma Webster (West Berkshire Council) and Cllr Barry Wood (Cherwell District Council)

## **Officers Present**

Clare Gray

## **Others Present**

Francis Habgood (Thames Valley Police Chief Constable ), Paul Hammond (Office of the PCC Chief Executive), Shona Morrison (Office of the PCC Policy Development Manager) and Anthony Stansfeld (PCC)

## **Apologies**

Councillor Julia Adey (Wycombe District Council), Councillor Derek Sharp (Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead), Councillor Emily Culverhouse (Chiltern District Council), Councillor Tony Page (Reading Borough Council), Councillor Carol Reynolds (West Oxfordshire District Council) and Councillor Ian White (South Oxfordshire District Council)

## **108. Election of Chairman**

### **RESOLVED**

**That Cllr Egleton be elected Chairman for the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.**

## **109. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

### **RESOLVED**

**That Cllr Mallon be appointed Vice Chairman for the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.**

## **110. Declarations of Interest**

New Members of the Panel were welcomed as follows:-

Cllr Bendyshe Brown – Buckinghamshire County Council  
Cllr Dhaliwal – Slough Borough Council  
Cllr Hayes – Oxford City Council  
Cllr Webster – West Berkshire Council  
Cllr Wood – Cherwell District Council

There were no declarations of interest.

## **111. Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 April 2017 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:-

- Page 9 second paragraph – should say ineffective trials rather than cracked trials – which are trials that do not go ahead.
- 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph – Julia Girling made a comment that some domestic abuse victims are relocated out of their area and sometimes there is very little hand over which makes them feel vulnerable and re-victimised.
- Feedback from the public had been that sentencing was not tough enough and did not provide an effective deterrent.

## **112. Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

## **113. PCC Annual Report**

The PCC presented his fifth Annual Report for 2016-17 and highlighted the following issues:-

### Strategic Objective 1

Cut crimes that are of most concern to the public and reduce re-offending

- There has been an increase in crime of 7.2% but the national average increase is 19%. The increases in domestic burglary (up 13.6%) and all violent crime (up 7.9%) will naturally be of concern to the public. The increases are in part due to the continued drive for improving reporting and recording of crime by the Force. Nevertheless there appear to be real increases in crime in some areas across the Force and these will be examined in depth as part of the new Service Improvement Review process.
- Thames Valley Police force are categorised by HMIC as most similar to Sussex, Hampshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Avon and Somerset and Leicestershire.
- Thames Valley were doing well on reducing reoffending compared to other Forces.
- The number of homicides has increased by 1% (19 in the past year) but three of the recorded homicides included in the 2016/17 figures are in relation to the deaths of three men at Didcot Power Station in February 2016 (Demolition Project).

### Strategic Objective 2

Protecting Vulnerable people

- This was a key priority area for the PCC
- Thames Valley was one of the first areas to set up Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs which was represented good practice. There was a concern that there were too many MASH in Berkshire and also there needed to be further input from the education sector. He would review the MASH later this year

with a view to combining some MASH in Berkshire as they were not large enough to be sustainable or effective.

- He also had concerns about safeguarding in language schools and had discussed this issue with the Sussex PCC.
- Various local partnership arrangements exist to identify and protect those at risk of Female Genital Mutilation.

### Strategic Objective 3

Work with partner agencies to put victims and witnesses at the heart of the criminal justice system.

- Funding for the Local Criminal Justice Board was better than other areas.
- Commissioning services were working well – his staff were re-designing victim services across the Thames Valley to improve access to support services and the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery.

### Strategic Objective 4

Ensure police and partners are visible, act with integrity and foster the trust and confidence of communities

- Satisfaction rates of victims remain high at 88%, compared with the national average of 84%.
- The Complaints, Integrity and Ethics Panel continues to constructively challenge the Force on how well it delivers services and this year examined stop and search data.
- There has been specific work to improve trust and confidence amongst gypsy, romany and traveller communities – the PCC received a reasonable amount of correspondence on this area from the public, including complaints which were difficult to solve, particularly with the use of Section 61 powers where people could be removed from a site. However, some communities could leave sites with some damage and also waste on the site which could be extremely expensive to clear. Police were reluctant to use their Section 61 powers in some cases.

### Strategic Objective 5

Communicate with the public to learn of their concerns, help to prevent crime and reduce their fear of crime

- The PCC undertook an external consultation to inform his new Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021. The top four crimes which caused the most concern to the public were burglary, violence, sexual offences and cybercrime.
- The OPCC developed a new website 'Victims First' which acts as a dedicated resource for victims, containing information and advice on what to do and how to get help following a crime.  
<https://www.victims-first.org.uk>

### Strategic Objective 6

Protect the public from Serious Organised Crime, Terrorism and Internet based crime

- Serious Organised Crime continued to be a challenge and there was an upturn in terrorist incidents. The Regional Unit covered a large area in the South East which went down to Cornwall.
- Reference was made to the prosecuting six people in relation to the bank fraud where at least £245m was defrauded from businesses and shareholders. This prosecution followed a six year investigation which cost TVP nearly £7m. The PCC was trying to recover the funding for this investigation and had a meeting with the Cabinet Office. The bank had offered £100m compensation but the fraud had had a significant impact on businesses and also a psychological impact on individuals.

### Performance headlines

- The latest Peel Assessment was good with the Force only a few points away from outstanding.
- They were awaiting proposed changes to the funding formula for policing but expressed concern that there was a huge imbalance in funding across the Country e.g Durham (outstanding) received a similar budget to Bedfordshire (inadequate) but was a quarter of the size of Beds and received £18million more funding. Bedfordshire was also closer to Luton and London.

The following questions were asked:

## **Strategic Area 1 – cut crimes that are of most concern to the public and reduce re-offending**

Cllr Mallon

How has the change in recording crime led to a rise ?

The PCC responded that the baseline had been reduced. For example if there was a fight in a school involving 4 people there would be a crime recording of 4 crime incidents. If there was a domestic dispute between 2 brothers and the father become involved then that would be recorded as 3 crime incidents.

Cllr Bendyshe-Brown

From the data our Council receives violent crime has increased despite the change in recording – would the PCC like to comment on this issue?

The PCC reported that violent crime has gone up slightly but the main reason was the change in recording. There was also a national increase in violent crime. Generally crime figures were low in the Thames Valley and the night economy was reasonably civilized and well policed. There was also a lot of co-operation with businesses which was much better than it used to be. Cllr Bendyshe Brown agreed with this but commented that the CSP Strategic Assessment did show a rise in violent crime. The PCC commented that this was due to the change in the baseline.

Cllr Dhaliwal made reference to the £10.5 million savings in 2017/18 and asked what impact the recent terrorist attacks would have on the policing budgets?

The PCC reported that with further cuts there were fewer police officers and that some police resources nationally had been diverted toward terrorism incidents. He again made reference to £7m which the Force had to spend on investigating the fraud case which they had not yet been paid back for. Cllr Dhaliwal asked them when they expected to hear whether they would be reimbursed. The PCC said he had raised this at the highest level and hoped that they would be paid back in the next month or so.

With the new police funding formula are you worried that you may be penalised as a good performing police force. Cllr Barry Wood commented that looking at the statistics Thames Valley appeared to be doing well in terms of comparison with other Force areas and asked whether in that respect what impact would it have on the Force if they did receive fairer funding ?

The PCC reported that he would increase police officers which would reduce crime in other areas. He also referred to the impact of the fraud case and the need to fund technology to reduce crime. Cyber crime was increasing and criminals were now using the internet to commit crime. Serious organized crime was challenging and gangs had come across from Eastern Europe who committed crime in this country. There had been a 2% increase in the precept which was a small amount per resident but it was important to get the balance right in terms of fighting crime.

## **Strategic Area 2 – Protecting Vulnerable People**

Cllr Mallon asked the following question:-

As we can see from the CSP report anti slavery networks are being created across the Force area to draw in the support and expertise of private and third sector partners to combat modern slavery and HMIC was complimentary of the Force's approach highlighting the positive progress that TVP has made. Please can you elaborate on the progress made in this area and how many prosecutions have been made with this approach ?

The PCC reported that there have been prosecutions in this area and gave an example of the Redbridge Site in Oxford where a man with learning disabilities was used as slave labour. The PCC commented that the perpetrators had been released from prison earlier than he would have expected. He was working in partnership with Local Authorities to identify and address modern slavery.

The 2016 Peel Assessment says the Force has made good progress in its ability to investigate so-called honour-based abuse (HBA). It has created an operational group which has provided training and heightened awareness of this type of crime. The group has also created new operational guidance to help officers provide effective protection to people who are vulnerable to this type of abuse. This has resulted in higher levels of identification of HBA within the Thames Valley area. Do you keep any data on how many forced marriages have been prevented and prosecutions for HBA?

The PCC reported that there were no statistics on this area and he would ask the Chief Constable. It was a difficult area to identify when prevention had been effective but it was confident that the work of the Force was having an impact. It was very difficult to reach closed communities. One of the issues was that if a person did report HBA or the threat of a forced marriage then they would be ostracized by their family.

Cllr Bendyshe-Brown, Bucks County Council referred to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub in Aylesbury which had just been reviewed by their Select Committee at Bucks County Council and it was agreed that the impact of the MASH was good. However, they would like to see further involvement from the Clinical Commissioning Groups. He asked whether other MASH's were experiencing any issues ?

The PCC reported that he would be reviewing all MASH in the Thames Valley at the end of the year and particularly expressed concern about the resourcing of the MASH in Berkshire as there was one for each Unitary Authority and that a combined MASH would be more efficient. He was particularly impressed with the MASH in Windsor and Maidenhead but commented that a large amount of resources had been invested in the hub. The PCC commented that he was looking at ways e.g use of Associate PCCs to ensure better liaison with Health and Wellbeing Boards.

Cllr McCracken asked about the progress for using the MASH to help find missing people. The PCC said he had not had a recent update on this area and he would ask the Chief Constable. Cllr McCracken then asked about the terms of reference of the MASH. The PCC reported that the Buckinghamshire MASH also looked after adults. The remit of the MASH would be looked at as part of the review.

### **Strategic Area 3 – Putting victims and witnesses at the heart of the criminal justice system**

Ms Girling referred to the last Annual Report where she had expressed concern whether restorative justice was providing value for money, particularly when £270,000 had been spent on 25 completed cases whilst £780,000 had been spent on victim support for 1459 face to face visits. The provision of Restorative Justice was also not a mandatory requirement. In response the PCC said he was aware of the issue of relative cost and value for money of the various support services commissioned for victims and that the OPCC was keeping an eye on outcomes and effectiveness as part of its routine contract management performance monitoring arrangements, in readiness for when the current victims services contracts come up for renewal. Have you had any further thoughts on this ?

The PCC reported that restorative justice was working well and they were developing future victims' referral services in conjunction with partners. He commented that he would like it used for more serious crime as using restorative justice for some crimes at the bottom end was not such good value for money.

### **Strategic Area 4 – Police visibility and confidence of communities**

Cllr Hayes asked about the visibility of the police force and how the new operational structure for neighbourhood policing was impacting on communities ?

The PCC commented that he was looking at whether to reintroduce helmets for police officers to make sure police officers were more visible. Cllr Hayes commented that he wanted to know about the impact on police officer numbers. He asked the PCC how satisfied he was that the Force was visible to the public on a scale of 1:10. The PCC commented that he would score it at 6/7 out of 10 but that police officers were less visible in rural areas as crime rates were lower. Visibility was an issue but also there was a counter argument for police officers to be less visible to catch criminals. Cllr Hayes asked whether he was more or less concerned about visibility since he became a PCC? The PCC said more concerned.

Cllr McCarthy referred to police visibility in town centres and that a police presence helped reduce crime. The PCC reported that city centres such as Milton Keynes, Oxford and Windsor had a good police presence. Cllr McCarthy then asked about market towns. The PCC reported that there were a limited number of police officers and that they had to use the resources they had in the areas of most demand.

Cllr Hayes referred again to the visibility of police and asked whether the PCC would like to see more police officers on the street?

The PCC commented that he would like to see more police officers and expressed concern about police funding. He referred to the proposed changes to the funding formula and concern that funding may not be fairly allocated across the Country but all Forces had to cut police numbers during this period of austerity. Cllr Egleton

also commented that resources had to be used for new types of hidden crime such as cyber crime and CSE and it was important to balance funding for these new crimes and community policing.

Cllr McCarthy asked about the use of Section 61 in terms of the gypsy, romany and traveller communities and that they had local issues in Grove where a lock was broken and it cost £6,000 to clean up the site. The PCC commented that it was unjust to have to pay for the damage caused to a site and that it was important to be tough on these issues. He had written letters to his Local Area Commanders to use their Section 61 powers if damage was being caused. Cllr Egleton reported that the Panel had previously asked for guidance to be given to Local Area Commanders on this area as the legislation was not being interpreted consistently. The Panel Members agreed that there should be a consistent approach to this issue through robust guidance.

Cllr Hayes asked about the increase in hate crime of 8-9% and whether this had increased because of an emphasis on reporting. The PCC reported that there had been an increase in hate crime and that could sometimes be linked to a specific incident such as a terrorist attack. Cllr Hayes asked whether that figure would have significantly increased as a result of the recent attacks? The PCC did not believe that there would be a significant increase. Cllr Hayes commented that he was surprised that the figure was not higher. The OPCC Chief Executive reported that the Brexit decision had an impact on the increase of anti social behavior.

Cllr Mallon asked about the increase in hate crime and asked whether this included imposing the caste system within communities. The PCC commented that this could be a hate crime.

#### **Strategic Objective 5 – Help to prevent crime and reduce fear of crime**

Cllr Webster asked about the Victim's First website and asked what feedback they had received? The OPCC Policy Manager reported that they had received good feedback although at this point it was anecdotal. She did not have any figures on the number of hits to the site. There had been an increase of direct referrals to agencies through the website.

Ms Girling referred to the website and commented that it could be better signposted from other websites such as Thames Valley Police. The Policy Manager agreed to look into this area.

Cllr Hayes referred to the survey response of 5000 on the new Police and Crime Plan priorities and asked the PCC what he would do to consult more widely? The PCC reported that this was difficult to do on a wide scale and that he relied on the 18 Local Authorities and attending their Councils to reach residents.

#### **Strategic Objective 6 – Serious Organised Crime, Terrorism and internet based crime**

Cllr Margaret Burke referred to the increase in armed police officers and where they came from and when they would change back to ordinary police officers? The PCC reported that they had increased the qualification of many police officers so they could be armed. They also had armed response vehicles which were multi-functional. He commented on the Hungerford massacre which happened 25 years ago where it took Scotland Yard about 4 hours to get to Berkshire whilst 16 people were killed. Therefore it was important to use local resources so that there was a quick response for example by giving police officers tasers. He would prefer it if the police were not armed but with terrorist incidents it was important that an effective response could be delivered quickly to protect the public.

Cllr Egleton commented that in London there was a 8 minute response to a terrorist attack as they had a large number of armed officers. How many armed officers do you have in each Local Authority area in the Thames Valley and how quickly would they be able to respond to a major incident? The PCC reported that the response time in rural areas would obviously be slower but the likelihood of attack would be much lower. Police officers would be able to attend large events such as football matches and concerts much more quickly.

Cllr Webster referred to the Reading festival and whether this was a risk for a potential terror attack. The PCC reported that the Gold Group would look after major events and would identify any potential risks. However, with such a large number of people attending it was difficult to provide 100% reassurance. Police officers would rely on intelligence – there would be internal security within the site and police officers would patrol outside the

site. Cllr Webster suggested that concrete bollards were put around the site to stop vehicles driving into crowds. The PCC reported that they had identified areas of high risk such as Windsor Castle and taken measures to reduce that risk.

Cllr Bendyshe Brown asked with the recent cyber crime event a strategy for the Thames Valley is being drawn up – will the PCC be supportive of this action plan and where appropriate help resource this effectively ?

The PCC reported that cyber crime was one of his priorities and he had attended and been fully supportive of the cyber crime event. He had not yet seen the strategy but once he had sight of this he would be in a position to see whether he could support this financially. The Scrutiny Officer reported that CSPs had met on 12 June to look at a draft strategy and that this should be circulated in the near future. The PCC emphasised that cyber crime affected everyone e.g. schools and banks and was not just the responsibility of the police to prevent this crime.

#### Performance

Cllr McCracken asked the PCC whether he was a lone voice in terms of asking for money back on the fraud case ? The PCC said that he wasn't but as his Force dealt with the most recent high profile case he had to challenge the Government on this area. He had also commented that the Government had to put more funding into cyber crime as approximately £193 billion was loss to cyber crime. He expressed concern that Section 5 of the Finance Act meant that the Treasury could close down a fraud investigation and that this Section of the Act should be repealed to ensure that all valid investigations should take place. His fellow PCCs also supported him in reimbursement and also that the Government needed more capacity to take on major fraud cases. The Panel agreed that their support should be given to the return of this funding to be reinvested in the Force.

Cllr Hayes asked about the PCC Controlled Expenditure and the cost of democratic representation and where this was shown in the staffing structure? The PCC reported that this related to the Policy Manager post and the PR/Communications Officer.

Cllr Hayes asked how the Policy Officers were feeding in ideas to Government particularly on local issues. The PCC commented that he had good communication links with the previous Minister but that there were obviously changes with the new Government and he will be meeting the new Police Minister. He also had good links in with the Ministry of Justice through Local MPs.

The following areas for actions were raised during the meeting:-

- Unauthorised encampments – that a meeting be held with relevant Local Authority representative as recommended by the Panel in September 2016 to discuss a consistent approach to the interpretation of legislation by your Local Area Commanders with robust guidance being issued.
- Timescales of written responses to the Police and Crime Panel
- Timescale of the review of the MASH and confirmation that this information will be submitted to the Preventing CSE Sub-Committee (even if a confidential session needs to be arranged)
- Review of links to the Victims First website
- Confirmation that resources will be put in place in order to ensure better liaison with Health and Wellbeing Boards to improve outcomes for health related issues e.g MASH representation
- To support the Thames Valley wide strategy on cyber crime (once sent to you for comment).
- To be kept informed of how the new operating model is working and whether there needs to be any change in strategy e.g if officers are taken away from local policing on a regular basis to deal with more urgent priorities such as back filling of vacant posts.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That a letter be sent to the OPCC in accordance with Section 28(4) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 to review, report and make recommendations regarding the PCC's Annual Report 2016/17.**

## 114. Update on Community Safety Partnerships

Members noted the report and welcomed the information from each of the Community Safety Partnerships, including information from Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees and were impressed with the innovative work being carried out by CSPs.

Cllr Burke expressed concern that she was not a Member of her CSP and that this was an important link to being a Member of the Panel. She suggested that it would be helpful if the Chairman wrote a general letter to CSP Chairman emphasising that this link was crucial. The Chairman commented that this was a matter for individual Councils to address. Cllr McCarthy commented that he was not on his CSP but that this did not hinder the work with the Panel. The Chairman commented that they did not have to be a Member but could observe the meetings to act as a link to the Panel. The Chairman reported that he was happy to write a general letter.

Cllr Webster referred to the perception of crime and that it was important for the police to focus on actual crime rather than reduce the perception of crime. It was important also for Members to have links/or to be aware of the work of other useful bodies such as the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Iain McCracken provided an update on the work of his Council in relation to Domestic Violence and Members noted the following:-

- The Domestic Abuse Service Co-ordinating Project was initiated in April 2011 as one of the projects funded by the Bracknell Forest Community Safety Partnership to tackle domestic abuse.
- It aimed to address a gap in service to standard and medium-risk victims and perpetrators by providing an enhanced level of support to victims as well as provide an enhanced level of management and supervision of perpetrators.
- The 2011/12 cohort (11 couples in total) was monitored to establish the effectiveness of the approach and results showed a reduction from 69 repeat calls to the police in 2011/12 to 24 calls in 2012/13
- In 2013 at the Thames Valley Police Evidence Based Policing conference, Professor Lawrence Sherman and Dr Heather Strang of the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge were approached by the Chair of the DASC Project, a police officer with the Force, who proposed to test the DASC programme with a randomised controlled trial (RCT).
- The proposal was made in order to provide an unbiased and evidence-based evaluation of this multi-agency approach. The proposal was accepted and the author was accepted as the principal researcher for the trial. The trial commenced in 2013, focused on standard and medium harm offenders and victims who are repeat subjects of reports of Domestic Abuse.
- The intention was to test the hypothesis that “a multi-agency integrated case management system, will reduce both the frequency and severity of incidents. The trial was well conducted: the treatment group received a high proportion of the intended treatments. The control group received “normal” follow up with very little cross contamination. The treatment group received a far **greater** level of referrals and contacts by the supporting agencies than the control group did.
- The treatment group had about the same frequency of re-offending as the control group. But a **significant** reduction in harm. Harm was measured by using the Cambridge Crime Harm Index which gives a weighting to each offence based on its sentencing
- This is one trial – albeit a well conducted one – and replication will be important.
  - The findings on the effectiveness of the treatments in reducing harm appear to be consistent with findings in treating low harm domestic violence offenders in Hampshire (Operation CARA).
  - DASC provides a promising approach to reducing harm from domestic violence. Combined with the findings from Operation CARA, the DASC project provides an opportunity to improve and develop local strategies to reduce harm from Domestic Violence.

Cllr McCracken reported that this had been an excellent piece of work which could be used by other Local Authorities in the Thames Valley and that he would be happy to send further information to the Chairman.



Cllr Webster referred to the diagram in the CSP report, on behalf of Cllr Patman who had to leave the meeting earlier, saying that the diagram should be amended to show a two way link between Panels and CSP's. Members noted that this was a diagram produced by the LGA.

Members welcomed the report.

### **115. PCP Annual Report**

The Panel noted the draft Police and Crime Panel Annual Report.

The draft report included a section for Panel Members who were asked 'what could the Panel do better'. One of the areas that was raised in this section was public engagement. Nationally Panels did find public engagement fairly limited and locally Thames Valley had the additional issue of covering such as a wide media area it was difficult to get consistent messages out to the public. The Chairman asked that Members liaise with their Communication Teams and their Council to publicise this report as much as possible. One of the new Panel Members reported that she had public relations skills and could help in this area.

Cllr Bendyshe-Brown asked that the following amendment be included in the Annual Report:-

Page 6 – In relation to the Cyber Crime event the report should be amended to say that CSPs are looking at a Strategy from which local areas can develop local or collaborative action plans.

Cllr Hayes referred to feedback from Panel Members which related to lack of public engagement and also obtaining a timely response from the Office of the PCC. He also commented that the public still did not understand the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Curtis James Marshall referred to the low turn out for the PCC elections and commented that this was a wider issue and more publicity needed to be undertaken by the Home Office. Cllr Hayes asked the OPCC whether they would be prepared to commit to a 2 week response period. Cllr Egleton reported that it would need to take slightly longer than 2 weeks because of the need to liaise with Thames Valley Police. He also referred to public engagement and commented that the Panel did have a public question time but that it had not been used much by the public.

The Panel also had a recommendation monitoring item to follow up on recommendations made to the PCC. Cllr Burke commented that it was difficult for the public to ask questions as the Panel agenda was only published the week before the meeting. Cllr Egleton reported that the Work Programme of the Panel was published giving advanced notice of items and also that the public had time to put questions to the Panel once the agenda had been published. If any Members had any concerns they could put a request in writing to the Scrutiny Officer asking for the rules of procedure to be amended.

Reference was made to the fact that Oxford Scrutiny Committee had suggested that the Panel should rotate. The Panel had held meetings across the Thames Valley in previous years but there had been no public attendance and had made it harder for Panel Members to attend.

Cllr Mallon suggested that Members of the Panel should put forward any ideas for the Work Programme which would engage the public. He also commented that the PCC does attend Council meetings once a year to engage with each local area. If any Members had any suggestions on how to improve public engagement which they used for their own Councils they should inform the Scrutiny Officer.

Cllr Egleton commented that it would be helpful to meet with new Members to discuss how the Panel operated and the limits of the legislation and also to hear if they had any ideas on how to improve the Panel. Nationally Thames Valley was seen as a Panel that provided effective scrutiny and good practice but the question had been put to Members about what they could do better as the Panel were always looking at the drive for continuous improvement and hold development sessions with Frontline Consulting to enable this. Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel were also in a unique position having representation from across the 18 Authorities and used this opportunity to look at spreading good practice across this wide area.

**RESOLVED**

**That the Annual Report be adopted and published and that Panel Members submit the Annual Report to their respective Authorities for information.**

**116. Recommendation Monitoring**

As there had been robust discussion of other items on the agenda the Chairman asked the OPCC to respond to the recommendation monitoring report in writing.

**117. Annual Review of the Panel's Rules of Procedure, Panel Membership and Budget**

The Panel received the report of the Scrutiny Officer on the Panel rules of procedure, Panel membership and budget. No amendments had been submitted to the rules of procedure.

In terms of Membership the following changes were made:-

Budget Task and Finish Group – existing Members to continue but Cllr Burke will be replaced by Cllr Bendyshe Brown

Preventing CSE Sub Committee – existing Members to continue with the addition of Cllr Webster.

**RESOLVED**

**That the Panel budget as outlined in the report be approved and Panel membership be agreed subject to the changes outlined above.**

**118. Report of the Complaints Sub-Committee**

The Panel received the report of the Scrutiny Officer on the Complaints Sub-Committee. The PCC was asked to response in writing to the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee.

**RESOLVED**

**That the report be noted.**

**119. Topical Issues**

The Panel received the report of the Scrutiny Officer on topical issues. In relation to the Cyber crime event this had been discussed earlier during the item on the PCC Annual Report. The PCC reported that he did not believe that any PCC had done something as collaborative as this.

Members also welcomed the taxi licensing event which was held at the end of May and noted that a number of authorities across the Thames Valley and outside of the area had signed up to a Thames Valley wide Working Group to identify how they could work together on addressing safeguarding concerns in the Thames Valley.

**120. Work Programme**

The Work Programme was noted.

**121. Date and Time of Next Meeting**

8 September 2017 at 11am at Aylesbury Vale District Council

**CHAIRMAN**