

## Panel Recommendation Monitoring

Panel Recommendations	Progress Update Blue – Panel response Black – PCC response Red – Chief Constable response	Committee Assessment of Progress
<p><b>Local Policing Model</b></p> <p>That the PCC continues to keep the new operating model under review with the Chief Constable and that the Panel be provided with a report at the end of the first year of operation.</p> <p>(Two actions in the mins include information on abandoned calls and the Chief Constable sharing the performance dashboard with the PCC)</p>	<p>This will be included in the Work Programme for November 2018.</p> <p><b>PCC requested that this item be deferred as TVP is currently conducting a review of the model which has included a survey, qualitative and quantitative data. There has been some changes to the model and further work needs to be done by the Force to understand the consequences. Accordingly, it is not felt appropriate in terms of timing and/or potential diversion of Force resources either for the Force to prepare &amp; present a report to the Panel before it has reported to the PCC on the results of the LP model review, or for the PCC to commission a separate report from the Force at this time whilst this Force review is still ongoing simply to enable him to present an update to the PCP.</b></p>	
<p><b>Local Criminal Justice Board</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the PCC, in consultation with the LCJB may wish to consider the performance monitoring suggested by the Crest Report to ensure that there is a single overarching vision for the LCJB which is outcome focused.</li> <li>2. That the PCC, in consultation with the LCJB should revisit their decision on publishing further information on their website on performance monitoring</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That would be a decision for the LCJB not the PCC (NB The chairmanship of the LCJB will transfer from the PCC to another Board member w.e.f. Jan 2018).</li> <li>2. That is a matter for the LCJB as a whole, not the PCC as an individual member of the Board.</li> </ol>	

<p>3. That consideration be given to more robust challenge/influence from the PCC, where there is poor practice or where partners were not engaging (e.g holding a one day conference to look at accommodation for released prisoners) and that the Plans and actions from Sub Groups should be challenged by the Board to ensure the most effective outcome for the criminal justice system as a whole.</p>	<p>3. The PCC is the current Chair of the Board (until Jan 2018) but has no power or authority as PCC or Chair to 'hold partners to account'.</p> <p>The Panel have written to the PCC regarding his responses asking him if he can use his influence to raise these recommendations with the Board, including putting more information on the LCJB website to achieve greater transparency.</p>	
<p><b>Modern Slavery</b> To Panel Members That they work with their Councils to ensure that they are doing all they can to identify and combat modern slavery in all its forms and provide an update to the Scrutiny Officer on how this is being undertaken To PCC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That he ask TVP to provide a checklist for all Councils to ensure that they are meeting their obligations in terms of the Modern Slavery Act and that where there were gaps in services that he address this through his powers to require a report from a CSP where he was not content that the CSP is carrying out its duties efficiently and effectively.</li> <li>2. That he ask for a steer to be given on how Health and Wellbeing Boards should tackle the issue of modern slavery</li> </ol>	<p>An update can be given at the June meeting when a general report is written on the work of Community Safety Partnerships.</p> <p>The PCC has funded a TVP 'Modern Slavery Coordinator' post to work with Local Authorities to improve awareness of obligations and support development of a common approach.</p> <p>The Local Government Association has produced a detailed guidance document for Local Authorities <a href="https://www.local.gov.uk/modern-slavery-council-guide">https://www.local.gov.uk/modern-slavery-council-guide</a></p> <p>A training needs assessment is currently being developed in order to establish current awareness and the level of training need, whilst the production of content for an e-learning package was an action from the last meeting. A number of training sessions have been delivered by the organisation Hope for Justice as well as by Rahab. It may be therefore</p>	

3. That data be provided to the Panel on repeat victims of modern slavery where they have been referred to the National Referral Mechanism more than once and that the PCC inform the Panel how he will ensure that victims who are at risk of being re-trafficked are being minimised.

that Councillors would have the opportunity to attend a session organised in the future which would help with their role.

By the very nature of trafficking and the movement involved, any repeat victims would need to be recorded at a national level rather than force level. In theory, the Modern Slavery Human Trafficking Unit would be able to see any victims who have been referred into the National Referral Mechanism (NRM) more than once, however this would only capture adult victims who have consented to going into the NRM. I have raised this with the South East Regional Organised Crime Unit who has raised this with the National Insight Team to see if they are aware of any other agencies who might be collecting this data and if not, that it be given national consideration.

The 'Project Eagle' Tactical Group was developed (Qtr. 1, 2017/18) to identify and safeguard those at risk of / victims of human trafficking / modern slavery.

The Police Innovation Fund/PCC funded Independent Trauma Advisory (ITA) service project ended in April 2017; however, the project supported 145 victims with 59 people receiving significant longer-term support. The greatest proportion of victims were UK citizens, with increasing number reporting forced labour over the two years of the project.

The project is largely responsible for the incremental increase of National Referral Mechanism (NRM) referrals from Thames Valley (from 23 in 2014, 36 in 2015 and 80 in 2016). This is an increase of 122% in Thames Valley compared to 63% nationally.

<p><b>Serious Organised Crime and Counter-Terrorism</b></p> <p>The Panel recommended that the PCC provide a report to the Panel at its next meeting responding to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A request by a Panel member that the street operation to address aggressive street culture, which had been very successful, as to whether this operation would be repeated.</li> <li>• Questions as to whether the PCC was happy that he was fulfilling his legal duties under the PREVENT strategy; how was he working with partners, what funding and activity will he undertake to support local plans and, if there is any misalignment with these Plans, how will he co-ordinate this to ensure the strategy is being delivered for the Thames Valley?</li> <li>• A request for an update on the ‘dare to share’ culture.</li> </ul>	<p>This is an operational policing matter.</p> <p>The first PREVENT Virtual Learning Group Newsletter was circulated on 21 Sept. 2017.</p> <p><b>TVP has fully recruited into all Counter Terrorism Firearms Officer positions and the recruitment of Authorised Firearms Officers is ongoing.</b></p> <p>No ‘Dare to Share’ progress update is available at this time – OPCC is currently liaising with TVP to clarify matters.</p>	
<p><b>Unauthorised encampments</b></p> <p>That the PCC provides reassurance that the application of the unauthorised encampment policy and the interpretation of legislation are being consistently applied by liaising with Local Area Commanders across the Force and Local Authorities across the Thames Valley.</p> <p>Actions include :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chief Superintendent commented that he was very happy to work with Authorities across the</li> </ul>	<p>Response from the PCC: I have raised this issue with the Chief Constable who has undertaken to arrange for all Local Police Area Commanders to receive and implement consistent policy and procedures.</p> <p><b>The setting up of a TVP/LA task and finish group was agreed at the Thames Valley-wide Chief Executives’ Meeting.</b></p> <p><b>This Task and Finish Group will meet on 28<sup>th</sup> November for the first time</b></p>	

<p>Thames Valley to work towards a more consistent approach and policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Superintendent reported that the Force had recently undertaken a significant piece of work on signposting homeless people to appropriate help such as the local housing authority. He would send a copy of this policy to the Scrutiny Officer to circulate to the Panel.</li> <li>• The PCC referred to the recent suggestion from the Chief Superintendent, that he work with relevant Local Authority contacts across the Thames Valley to ensure that policies for unauthorised encampments were consistent, where possible. This could cover, for example, that any decision making in relation to unauthorised encampments should be undertaken at Local Area Commander level.</li> </ul>	<p>and most Councils will be represented (currently 'reminding' the 3 councils who have not nominated a representative yet).</p> <p>At a Panel meeting in April 2018, the Chief Constable referred to a meeting with Chief Executives from each Local Authority where a protocol on unauthorised encampments had been submitted. This protocol was now used by all local authorities within Thames Valley to ensure a consistent approach was used to unauthorised encampments.</p>	
<p><b>Collaboration</b></p> <p>To liaise with the Hampshire Police and Crime Panel Chairman to look at scrutinising the decisions and actions of the two respective PCCs in respect of collaboration between both Force areas and to identify areas of mutual interest that could benefit from cross panel working.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>In terms of how outcomes were assessed the Chief Constable reported that the performance framework was a 'Restricted' document and could not therefore be circulated, as it included information on recent cases</p>	<p>A collaboration meeting was held with PCP Chairman from Thames Valley, Hampshire, West Sussex, Surrey on 20 October 2017. The Panel Chairman discussed areas where collaboration was taking place and also the National Association for Police and Crime Panels. They agreed to meet on a quarterly basis to discuss joint issues.</p> <p>The SE Four Area Collaboration Police and Crime Panel meetings continue to take place, looking at collaborative work across the four Force areas.</p>	

<p>including significant seizures of cash and drugs and cyber crime investigations. He would produce information for the Panel which can be shown in the public domain on what outcomes had been achieved.</p>		
<p><b>Roads Policing</b> That a Working Group be set up to look at roads policing and that requests for information on this area be sent to the Deputy Chief Constable. Areas for consideration could include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More transparent documentation on their strategy on roads policing</li> <li>• Consideration of a business case for average speed cameras</li> <li>• Improved dialogue between police and local authorities on the siting and decommissioning of speed cameras and the need for a Deployment Strategy</li> <li>• Consideration of developing a Thames Valley wide partnership to ensure better co-ordination of information across the Thames Valley</li> </ul>	<p>The road safety summit for officers was held on 19 September 2017 to address some of these issues. At the summit meeting on 25 January 2018, it was agreed that a Working Group should be set up which will meet 3 times a year to ensure better co-ordination of information across the Thames Valley and look at ways to improve partnership working. This will include improved dialogue on the siting and decommissioning of speed cameras. The Working Group will look to develop a Strategy/Framework and co-ordinate campaigns across the Thames Valley. Meeting have taken place in May and October 2018.</p> <p>In relation to the discussion held at the Panel on 17 November 2017 regarding 20mph enforcement in Reading the Panel Member has written to the Chief Inspector.</p>	
<p><b>Taxi Licensing – Follow up from previous year</b> 1. That the PCC/Chief Constable be asked to consider looking at Council funding / part-funding a dedicated Police Taxi Licensing Officer specifically to ensure prompt information sharing about incidents, drivers, arrests, charges, convictions – so that Police Licensing becomes the central point for information sharing.</p>	<p>An event was held in May where the Deputy PCC confirmed that the PCC and Chief Constable have agreed the principle that (a) the Force should host a police ‘Taxi Licensing Officer’ to coordinate Force and local authority activities across the Thames Valley, and (b) that the PCC will fund the initial costs of this post for year pending agreement being reached that the local authorities will jointly fund the post thereafter (subject to negotiations)</p>	

	<p>Responses from the smart survey have been received from the Licensing Authorities. It has been suggested that a list of minimum standards be put together for the Single Point of Contact Post, which will be put through an evaluation panel shortly.</p> <p>A review of internal TVP procedures on Child Sexual Exploitation and taxi drivers was undertaken (Qtr.1 – 2017/18) following a serious case review.</p> <p>A Single Point of Contact (SPOC) co-ordinator has been appointed (end of September) and subject to vetting (6-8 weeks approx.) should be in post.</p> <p>Once the SPOC is in place the intention is to hold another workshop to see how the pilot is working and review the minimum standards, perhaps looking at Oxfordshire’s detailed standards that have been agreed – the PCC is funding the post for a year but if successful it is hoped that LAs would contribute towards funding this post.</p>	
<p><b>Cyber Crime – Follow up from previous year</b> To consider whether a Working Group should be set up to look at this area in more detail.</p>	<p>A cybercrime event was held in March and following this event a Thames Valley wide strategy has been circulated for comment (copies will be available at the meeting) to ensure that there is a common approach to cybercrime.</p> <p>Grant funding (of just under £100,000) has been awarded by the PCC out of his Community Safety Fund to help tackle Cybercrime preventative measures.</p>	

	<p>TVP is maximising the use of the Special Constabulary to support victims and the public on cybercrime and fraud prevention.</p>	
<p><b>Female Genital Mutilation</b> Update on this would be helpful for Preventing CSE Sub Committee in Autumn</p>	<p>The OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan (under policy development) has an action to develop a business case to consider and support development of a Thames Valley FGM strategy. A FGM meeting took place with stakeholders in June and a TV FGM Partnership Group has been proposed including Health, third sector, police, education and the OPCC.</p> <p>This FGM Group has met for a second time and agreed to become an FGM Board and are considering adopting an FGM Strategy for Thames Valley.</p> <p>Grant funding (over £100,000) has been awarded by the PCC out of his Community Safety Fund to support local projects / organisations providing services which are designed to increase engagement with local communities, provide opportunities for dialogue, engagement and education for key professionals, and to improve reporting and prevention of FGM. All project leads attend the FGM Board chaired by the OPCC.</p> <p>The Policing Strategy Unit is undertaking a review of the operational guidance for key areas of safeguarding, and has completed the Child Sexual Exploitation guidance, which now includes guidance regarding Female Genital Mutilation.</p>	
<p><b>Preventing CSE Sub Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the PCC be asked to look at the Staffordshire PCC CSE Outcomes Framework and whether there</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to Panel report on Preventing CSE Sub Committee at 20 April meeting.</p>	

<p>was any benefit for Thames Valley having a similar document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the 12 Strands on CSE within the Force Strategic Assessment be used as a framework for scrutiny</li> <li>• Members asked for a written response on how TVP were addressing HMIC recommendations to prevent online CSE</li> <li>• Further information was requested on prosecution numbers</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Complaints Sub-Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the PCC to comment on whether he has made small amendments to the process in terms of personalisation and IT</li> </ul>	<p>Responses from the PCC to complainants are now routinely personalised in the name of the PCC (unless there is an appropriate reason not to). Changes to the Force ICT email systems have been made in respect of the 'PCC@thamesvalley' email address to lift the automated security features that otherwise divert some external mails into 'quarantine'.</p> <p><a href="#">A Complaints Sub-Committee took place on 7 September when the Sub-Committee considered two complaints.</a></p>	