



DORSET POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 24 SEPTEMBER 2019

Present: Cllrs Mike Short (Chairman), Bobbie Dove (Vice-Chairman), Julie Bagwell, Colin Bungey, Barry Goringe, Mohan Iyengar, Rachel Maidment, Iain McVie, Bill Pipe, Molly Rennie and David Taylor

Apologies: Cllrs Les Fry

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Simon Bullock (Chief Executive, OPCC), Marc Eyre (Service Manager for Assurance), Adam Harrold (Director of Operations), Julie Strange (Chief Finance Officer), Martyn Underhill (Police and Crime Commissioner) and Fiona King (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

17. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Les Fry.

18. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2019 were confirmed and signed.

The Service Manager for Assurance drew members' attention to minute 7 in respect of the Monitoring Officer's meeting with those members of the public that were in attendance at the 9 July 2019 meeting. He advised that this meeting had not yet happened due to illness of one of the representatives but that it would be re-arranged in the near future.

19. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

20. Public Participation

There were no statements or questions submitted from Town and Parish Council at this meeting.

There were no public statements and questions submitted for this meeting.

21. **Police and Crime Plan Monitoring Report**

The Panel considered a report informing them of the progress against the Police and Crime Plan and Priorities 2017-2021.

The Vice-Chairman raised a question to the PCC regarding Brexit and the impact on Dorset residents should there be a 'no deal' Brexit. She sought assurance from the PCC that for Dorset residents' life would carry on as normal as it could and that they would remain safe. The PCC advised that he was the National representative for Brexit and as the PCC scrutinised what the Force was doing and some of the issues raised were operational and was therefore unable to comment. However, he advised that the Government had planned for contingency in respect of Martial Law but they were not invoking that. There were no plans to go to Martial Law if there was a 'no deal' Brexit. In the PCCs view it was business as usual. He added that Brexit was funded centrally from government and that it would continue to be into next year if it was not resolved. The OPCC had reviewed their commissioned services and did not believe that any services would be disrupted in the short term. The PCC was sighted on local and regional issues and was content that plans were in place and were scenario tested. He would ensure that all local elected members were briefed to a suitable level to ensure members of the Police and Crime Panel that plans were in place.

The monitoring report provided information on the financial outturn position for the year ending 31 March 2019, including updates on the following items which are listed under the relevant Pillars:-

Pillar 1 – Protecting People at Risk and Harm – Cllr Julie Bagwell

The PCC highlighted key areas as set out in the report. The pillar lead did not have any questions.

Following a question about the Police Cadet Scheme and whether there were plans to set up further schemes, the PCC advised that the current one was based at the Bourne Academy and that there were plans for more. He felt this scheme was a good example of the PCC setting something up and then handing it over to the Force. He was aware there was a demand in the west of Dorset and was currently looking at opportunities.

A panel member asked for an update on knife crime as the rating had moved from red to amber. The PCC advised that until the actual issues were known they were unable to commission services. Now that there was a new knife crime profile for the Force and the issues were better understood he was starting to commission services, it was very much work in progress. The Chairman highlighted that a knife crime review featured in the Panel's forward work plan.

In respect of the improvement of detection in hate crime, hate incidents and domestic abuse, the PCC advised that the overall detection rate was around 16%, which based on national trends, put Dorset favourably in the top 5 nationally. The whole county detection rate had gone down which reflected the issues across the whole criminal justice system.

The PCC explained that hate incidents and hate crime were acts of violence or hostility directed at people because of who they are or who someone thinks they are. Hate incidents can take many forms. Examples include: verbal abuse like name-calling or offensive jokes; bullying or intimidation; hoax calls, abusive phone or text messages; online abuse for example on Facebook or Twitter; or making malicious complaints for example on parking, or noise. Where these behaviours escalate into criminal offences they are known as hate crimes. Any criminal offence can be a hate crime if it was carried out because of hostility or prejudice based on disability, race, religion, transgender identity or sexual orientation. When something is classed as a hate crime, tougher sentences can be placed on offenders under the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

The PCC noted that members had previously raised questions regarding the percentage changes in recent Quarterly Police & Crime Plan Monitoring Reports (officers report on the % increase/decrease rather than the actual numbers which are generally low). Small numbers of crime and incidents do mean that % fluctuations can appear quite dramatic. This was useful, as the OPCC has now reviewed this matter, and concluded that it was unhelpful to continue to report hate crimes and incidents on a quarterly basis due to these variations, as without the narrative context these can appear extreme.

The Home Office, the College of Policing and the CPS have all undertaken reviews of hate crime data quality in recent years, and it is recognised that the variability and inconsistency of data suggests that that it would be more effective to make longer terms comparisons.

The OPCC will therefore work with Dorset Police to produce rolling 12 month figures on hate crime and hate incidents, or similar, that would offer better opportunity for the identification of trends.

Pillar 2 – Working with our Communities – Cllr Les Fry and Cllr David Taylor

The PCC Highlighted the key areas as set out in the report.

One member highlighted that he was currently engaging with communication officers from Dorset Council when he met with parish councils and was looking for ways to further engage with the PCC. The PCC advised that media officers from the OPCC were available to support him at with his parish council work and would advise him further outside of the meeting.

In respect of road fatalities the PCC noted that there had been a spike of fatalities which was a concern. He advised that there were 2 driving schemes currently in place, in relation to older people (an older driver awareness scheme and an older driver mobility scheme) and he felt that the group that should be targeted now were the 'silver bikers' riding 1000cc bikes.

Following a question about the Bobby Van scheme, the PCC advised it was progressing well and was on track. The van had been designed and procured and would ready for a launch in January 2021. Recently an officer who

previously delivered on community safety for the Fire Service had been recruited to the scheme.

The Chairman raised a concern about the failure of Action Fraud and the PCC advised that from a Dorset point of view he was seriously concerned. There had been 4 different suppliers for the Action Fraud scheme since 2013 which had been confusing but confirmed there was a full fraud triage system set up by Dorset Police. He was due to meet with Oliver Letwin, the local MP, and was planning a consultation with the public to say that if you live in Dorset and have suffered badly at the hands of Action Fraud to please contact him so that he and Oliver could then go to Ministers with real examples. It was also noted that Trading Standards were picking up some of this work. The PCC undertook to write to the other Dorset MPs as part of the consultation process.

Pillar 3 – Supporting Victims, Witnesses and Reducing Reoffending – Cllrs Bill Pipe and Molly Rennie

The PCC highlighted key areas as set out in the report.

Cllr Pipe noted that whilst he was pleased to see that 2 of the red areas in this pillar had disappeared he was concerned that the victim satisfaction rate had decreased to an amber rating. The PCC explained the outcome on the consultation on satisfaction of victims. The figures did fluctuate on a quarterly basis but he was comfortable with the rates at the present time and his approach was to consider trends. He undertook to continue to press the Chief Constable for continual improvement in the service his officers and staff provided but remained comfortable with the confidence and satisfaction ratings for Dorset Police.

Following a question about the victim support contract and was the replacement a like for like contract, the Chief Executive, OPCC explained it was different in that the contract had been split to get a better service. The funding for victim support was set by government and hadn't changed but they did have some local commissioning funds that the PCC could work with which aimed to place an advocate with the complainant to work through court processes. The Chief Executive confirmed there had been a cost saving compared to the previous arrangement of £25k.

In response to a comment about the changes in probation, the PCC advised that the changes were going in the right direction but were not good enough. He was trying to do things locally but accepted that more impetus and drive was needed nationally.

Pillar 4 – Transforming for the Future – Iain McVie and Cllr Barry Goringe

The PCC highlighted key areas as set out in the report.

In respect of a timeline for the new Police complaints system, the PCC advised it was the end of January 2020. This would see all complaints against the Police being fielded by the OPCC.

Members asked the following questions to the PCC:-

1. There has been a national focus on all Police officers carrying a taser weapon. The Panel sought a PCC view on all police officers in Dorset carrying Taser.

As the national lead for use of force, and a former police officer who was assaulted multiple times, you would not be surprised to hear that I am passionate about improving officer safety. However, as the national lead I must ensure that we balance officer safety with the proud tradition of policing by consent and that we consider the full range of options that are available.

Therefore, my short answer is that having discussed this with the Chief, as this is an operational decision, we would both like to increase the number of Taser trained officers. However, that does not mean all officers should carry a Taser, as we know from research that roughly 80% of officers want to carry, assuming they pass the training, which of course many don't.

There is, of course, a cost associated with this. Northamptonshire Police is roughly comparable in size with DP, and its Chief recently decided to issue Taser to every frontline officer. He stated that this would take around 18 months to achieve, at a cost of £220k. I have asked the Chief to produce a similar estimate for Dorset.

My longer answer is that Taser is but one option available. All officers are trained in personal safety and unarmed defensive tactics, but the national provision for these activities is low. Here in Dorset we have worked very hard to provide a level of training to all officers that is above that which is currently mandated by national guidance, and we continue to encourage other forces and the College of Policing to recognise the improvements that our training tactics have delivered.

Other relevant factors including things like the availability of police officers, so double crewing can be used more routinely, and the availability of dog units to provide an operational capability that can drastically reduce the use of violence against officers.

On the governance side, there are still a number of areas that must be considered:

- *There is still a problem with the Assaults on Emergency Workers Act (commonly known as the Protect the Protectors act), as despite Govt agreeing to an uplift in sentences for those who commit assaults against emergency workers, there is no meaningful impact yet.*
- *Many officers do not wish to carry Taser for fear of trial by newspaper, or being subject to – in their views – a overzealous investigation by the IOPC.*
- *There is also the recognition that BAME individuals are disproportionately Tasered by officers, and this issue continues to be subject to national study.*

Overall, whilst I am supportive of increasing the availability of Taser to officers, we must recognise the need to establish an evidence base for the effectiveness of Taser. Indeed the NPCC are undertaking a national safety review, and have approached Chiefs and PCCs for evidence. At the same time the College will be issuing a safety survey to every police officer and police staff member this week asking about their experiences of being assaulted; supervisory support; whether there were criminal proceedings; their feelings of safety and views on personal safety training and equipment.

2. The PCP understands that, within the Southwest Forensics Business Improvement Review, the current Dorset Chemical and Fingerprint capabilities are to be redistributed to other locations. Would the PCC please give a view on this restructuring proposal?

Unfortunately, the Panel has been provided with inaccurate information by the GMB union. Firstly, and most importantly, members should note that the current regional services are already not located in Dorset.

The current issue we are facing is there is an imbalance of demand and capacity, and the current structure is costly. Demand has significantly reduced in traditional forensics services (crime scene investigation and identity services) which means that the current structure is over resourced. At the same time, demand has increased in digital forensic services and the department is under resourced.

At the same time, this imbalance is exacerbated with a number of further challenges:

1. *We are facing significant cost and resource impacts due to the new accreditation requirements that will be bought in from 2020;*
2. *There are ongoing difficulties with the recruitment, retention and training of skilled employees, and this has resulted in a backlog of work;*
3. *At the same time, higher than usual levels of absenteeism have increased pressures of work and increased exposure to sensitive material; and*
4. *The forensics senior management team has difficulties in providing effective leadership due the size of the teams and their geographical spread.*

Proposals were therefore developed to consolidate traditional forensics services, thereby freeing up estates to meet the current and expected growth in digital forensics. These options underwent the usual, extensive staff, staff association and union consultation, before going to the SW Collaboration Strategic Board for decision last week, which was attended by my Chief Executive and the Chief Constable.

Based on the feedback submitted by staff, the Strategic Board directed the project team to reconsider the site locations for the consolidated hubs and determined that a single chemical laboratory did not have to be co-located with a single fingerprint bureau as these functions are complimentary but

separate. In addition, the Board determined that both chemical laboratories should be accredited and have capacity to expand for additional posts.

For Dorset staff particularly, the equality impact assessment shows that there would be minimal impact as a result of the proposed changes, as the new structure is comparable with the current structure (in that both labs are already outside Dorset) and changes are being managed through vacancy management. Additionally, there would be the benefit of additional staff (6FTE) which should reduce the current demand and expectations on existing staff.

I remain comfortable with the direction of this work.

The Panel agreed to write to the original letter sender, GMB, saying they were satisfied with due diligence and request that any future letters be sent centrally and not to individual members. The Service Manager for Assurance added that he had already written to GMB to remind them of the process.

3. Based on the fact that the issue of a Social Media appointment within Dorset Police had been raised by the Home Secretary, following national media coverage, the PCP was interested in hearing the PCC's view on the justification of this new post.

Of course, this is an operational matter for the Chief Constable and he has made his feelings on the matter very clear. The role is not how some sections of the national media have depicted it – the post holder will help the Force identify and engage with a wide range of online communities; provide expert advice on how best to spread important crime prevention advice and support investigations; and assist with 24/7 digital content on behalf of two police forces. Ultimately, this is someone who will be communicating with tens of thousands of people on behalf of Dorset Police – when emergencies happen police social media feeds are a vital part of the response, supporting officers and saving lives. That is very important indeed. The Chief also raised his views that comparisons of salaries with police officers were unhelpful and he encouraged a debate on police starting salaries.

As for my opinion – I endorse the Chief's position. Tens of thousands of police staff make a significant difference to frontline policing – bringing in different skills and backgrounds – and it is seriously disappointing if the Home Secretary doesn't realise this. Indeed, the Home Office, Number 10, the Conservative Party etc, all employ media, marketing and engagement roles and I have to tell you they do so in far greater number than police forces do! The College of Policing is currently recruiting a senior media officer role at a salary up to £40k, some £12k more than our role.

Some commentators have described the comments as 'dangerous and disingenuous' and I don't disagree.

Finance questions

1. Can the OPCC please outline how the McCloud case may impact on the Dorset Police budget (accepting that this case is still ongoing) in order to bring new Panel members up to date.

The McCloud / Sargeant case originally related to the Judges and Firefighters pension schemes and claimed that the transitional protection' offered to some members as part of the reforms to their pensions amounted to unlawful discrimination. The case was successful and the Government were denied leave to appeal in June 2019. The Treasury has accepted that whilst the case only related to 2 pension schemes, the ruling applies to all public sector pensions.

Whilst the ruling has been made, the remedy for the discrimination has not been identified and could range from applying protection to all scheme members at the point of change, significantly increasing scheme costs, to a once off payment of compensation to each member affected. The decision on which remedy to adopt will significantly change the impact on the Dorset Police budget.

The 2018/19 annual accounts were required to be adjusted for the latest ruling with the actuaries making significant assumptions on the likely outcomes. The value of the pension fund liabilities increased significantly as a result of this ruling – by £33.174m for the Police Pension Scheme, and by £3.341m for the police staff Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS).

If this increase in liabilities does materialise, it will translate into additional employer's contributions at the next actuarial valuation for each scheme, assuming that no further changes to the scheme benefits are made. The Police Pension Scheme is due for the next valuation in 2020, with payments following the valuation expected to commence in 2023/24. The next LGPS valuation is due to take place later this year (2019), with the effect on employer contributions expected to be felt from 2020/21.

2. Can the OPCC please provide a short verbal brief on how financial risk is managed:
 - across the OPCC domain and what management tools are in place in order to hold Dorset Police to financial account;

Financial risk is managed continuously throughout the year for both the Force and OPCC, starting initially with setting the budget by making sure estimates are robust, maintain appropriate levels of reserves to deal with any unexpected expenditure, to regular budget monitoring to ensure appropriate action is taken to address any variances which occur during the year. Medium Term Financial Planning is also critical to ensuring actions to mitigate future risks are developed.

The main mechanism for the PCC to hold Dorset Police to financial account is through the Resource Control Board, which is co-chaired by the PCC and the Chief Constable. The Board is also attended by both Section 151 officers, the Chief Executive, and various relevant officers of the Force. This monthly meeting's terms of reference includes:-

- *Maintaining effective oversight and scrutiny of revenue and capital expenditure through the year, including the achievement of financial targets.*
- *To consider the impact on the medium term financial strategy of in year budget variations.*
- *To oversee the use of reserves and balances.*
- *To have regard to the financial impact of any major projects. Where requested by the Dorset Joint Leadership Board, to approve funding for business cases.*
- *To monitor and review treasury management performance and outcomes*
- *To receive reports from the Section 151 Officers and approve and monitor any resultant action plans*

The Board receives regular reports from the Force, including:

- *MTFS updates*
- *Monthly revenue monitoring reports*
- *Quarterly capital monitoring reports*
- *Treasury management monitoring / policy / outturn*
- *Outturn reports*

Which allow every aspect of financial performance to be scrutinised

In addition, regular meetings take place between the S151 officers to ensure financial appropriateness of any business decisions, and to ensure full transparency.

- *for the increased costs of the capital programme which are scheduled to be funded through capital receipts and further borrowing (whilst a small amount - circa £0.5m).*

The capital programme is subject to regular review through the Resource Control Board, and also as part of the annual budget / MTFS process. The financing arrangements are considered alongside the programme. Progress of schemes and associated funding will be reviewed next at the end of Quarter 2 and any resulting actions agreed at the Resource Control Board.

Work on the capital programme from 2020/21 onwards is already in progress with the revenue effects of capital funding being built into the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The impacts will be considered as part of that process, alongside other budget pressures.

3. For the minutes and for the new panel - could the OPCC please provide an overview of their Financial Year 19/20 £2m budget (ie Office costs, commissioning budget etc).

The budget for the OPCC is broadly split 50:50 between the costs of the office (Staff costs alongside office expenses) and the budget for commissioning projects in support of the Police and Crime Plan. The Office undertakes the administration of scrutiny panels, consultations and engagement with the public, support volunteers such as Independent Custody Visitors as well as co-ordinating the commissioning and spend of the project budgets. In addition to this are the costs of the Independent Audit Committee (shared with Devon and Cornwall) and audit fees.

The Community Safety Fund and Local Innovation Fund provide funding for schemes with statutory partners and voluntary sector providers which support the four pillars of the Police and Crime Plan. The Community Safety Fund is focused on long term contracts and grant agreements whilst the Innovation Fund is directed to more once off funding.

The Ministry of Justice provides grants to PCC's to be spent on services that support victims of crime, with funding confirmed on an annual basis.

A breakdown of the 2019/20 budget is shown below:

	£000's
Office Costs	1,013
Joint Independent Audit Committee	16
Internal / External Audit Fees	43
Community Safety Fund	695
PCC Local Innovation Fund	309*
Victims Fund - Expenditure	890
Specific Grants - Victims Fund	(890)
Total	2,076

**In 2019/20 a further £507,000 is earmarked to be added to the PCC Innovation Fund from reserves set aside in previous years. This will increase the total funds available in the fund to £816,000 but the contribution to reserves will maintain the net cost to the budget of £309,000.*

Resolved

1. In respect of Action Fraud, the PCC would write to the other Dorset MPs as part of the consultation process.
2. In respect of South West Forensics, that the Panel agreed to write to GMB saying they were satisfied with due diligence and request that any future letters be sent centrally and not to individual members.

22. Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021 (Refresh)

The Panel considered a report by the PCC's Chief Executive updating members of a light touch refresh of the Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021, which would be published in a months' time.

The Chairman asked members to provide comments to the Clerk by 3 October 2019 in order to formulate a formal response from the Panel by 11 October 2019. He particularly sought views in order to assist in shaping any future plan following the PCC elections in May 2020.

Resolved

That comments by the Panel on the Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021 are submitted to the Clerk by 3 October 2019.

23. Spotlight Scrutiny Reviews - Police Bail and the Effectiveness of CCTV

Members considered a report from the Independent member, Iain McVie, which set out the purpose of the review into the use of Police Bail. The Panel endorsed progress on this workstream.

The Service Manager for Assurance updated members on a proposed scrutiny review on the effectiveness of CCTV. Following a discussion with the Chief Executive, OPCC, it was felt that the current focus was too operational and therefore the Pillar Lead and Service Manager would meet with the OPCC staff to ensure a more strategic key lines of enquiry. The Panel endorsed progress on this workstream.

Noted

24. Follow up on Bodyworn video (BWV)

The PCC updated members on the roll-out of BWV across Dorset Police as detailed below:

‘As the Panel knows, I pledged to work with Dorset Police to improve Force technology and infrastructure. One element of this included a commitment to continue work from my first term of office to introduce Body Worn Video (BWV) for police officers.

I believe they are a vital tool to increase the evidence gathering ability of the police, especially in domestic abuse and public order scenarios. They also provide an unbiased record of what an officer has experienced, making the police more transparent and officers’ actions more accountable. Cameras can help diffuse difficult situations as people behave differently when told they are being filmed, as well as proving extremely useful in court to assist officers who have been assaulted and in cases of complaints against police. Public surveys undertaken by my team have shown consistent support from the public in introducing this tactic to the policing of Dorset.

As a quick reminder for those who are new, BWV was introduced with a pilot scheme in Bournemouth in 2016 and thereafter usage was phased-in across Dorset thereafter. The introduction of BWV was, in part, funded by money raised through my precept setting responsibilities. My office was heavily involved in the governance of this process, primarily through the force’s

change and transformation board, PRISM, which my Chief Executive attends. This included having oversight of the budgeting and procurement process.

In May 2019 the decision was taken to expand the roll out to include access and availability to members of the Special Constabulary. By October 2019, there will be 913 camera devices in operation within Dorset Police (and approximately 3,000 across the alliance) – with a mixture of personal issue to individual frontline officers and shared issue for those on less frequent frontline duties (eg Sergeants). While it is still too early to appreciate the full impact and benefits of the introduction of BWV in Dorset, the initiative has been well received by both officers and members of the public. Early indications are also that partner agencies appreciate the availability and benefits of real-time visual evidence.

One ‘anecdotal’ account of the benefits of BWV was submitted by DCI Sarah Derbyshire (then of the Major Crime Investigation Team (MCIT)) relating to the capturing of “some compelling and relevant evidence for the investigation team” following the murder of Stela Domador-Kouza in 2018. Ryan Thornton has subsequently been found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment. A number of positive testimonies and experiences were captured as part of the pilot scheme evaluation.

As part of a Spotlight Scrutiny Review undertaken by this Panel, it was concluded that “there was clear evidence both nationally and locally... that the use of BWV does impact on prevention and detection of crime, nuisance and disorder” and that “there is clear evidence of the force being held to account” by me for the project.

Furthermore, my independent scrutiny panels are also making use of this new technology to view footage in cases of Use of Force and Stop and Search, thereby giving them a greater ability to understand and assess Force activity on behalf of the public. An evaluation survey is currently in process and I expect to hear the results of this later this year.’

A link to the Independent member’s scrutiny report on BWV can be accessed via this link:-

<https://moderngov.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/Data/258/201809271000/Agenda/Spotlight%20Scrutiny%20Review%20-%20Body%20Worn%20Video.pdf>

Noted

25. An update on the cost implications from a recent cyber attack

In respect of Minute 10 from the meeting held on 9 July 2019, the PCC updated members on the recent European cyber-attack which he stressed was not a cyber-attack on Dorset Police systems but an attack on the biggest research provider. There would be significant cost implications for the industry but not for the police. A review was underway and the PCC undertook to update members when the work had been completed.

Resolved

That an update would be provided for members following the review.

26. **Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Development Plan**

The Panel considered a report which provided an update on Dorset Police's approach to officer and staff health and wellbeing, as well as the Force's utilisation of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Health and Wellbeing Fund. It was highlighted to members that health and well-being of police officers and staff was a national problem and not just one for Dorset.

One member commented there was a figure missing on one of the points in the Pulse Survey and officers undertook to provide this outside of the meeting. Members were also interested to know how many people responded to the survey overall, police officers and police staff. The Chairman felt it would be helpful to have this information displayed in a table format for future reference.

A Panel member expressed concern over the sickness data was quite a concern and was disappointed that the OPCC was not able to keep a track on this. The Director of Operations, OPCC advised members that whilst they did have the data, which was reasonably static, they were unable to compare it with other forces as there was no central policy requirement to publish this data. One member highlighted the importance of managers and supervisors having access to this data to note any trends that might arise.

The Chairman queried how the amount of £250k that had been earmarked for this wellbeing work had been arrived at. The OPCC advised that the Force had presented an indicative figure for 2 years *before* the OPCC confirmed what funding would be made available in order to support this initiative.

Members were advised that there were no areas for improvement highlighted in the report.

In respect of whether this initiative would continue, the PCC advised that this would be something for the new PCC to consider but he was getting the evaluation together in readiness.

The Chairman asked that Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Development Plan be added to the Forward Plan for review in September 2020. He also highlighted that elements of this funding fell in Resource Departmental Expenditure Limit and some in Capital Departmental Expenditure Limit, therefore financial planning needed to be undertaken in order to maintain this excellent initiative.

Resolved

1. That officers provide the missing figures from the Pulse Survey to members along with the number of respondents.
2. That the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Development Plan be reviewed by members in September 2020.

27. **PCC Update on utilisation of Targeted Precept Funding**

The Panel considered a report which provided an update on the outcomes that had been achieved so far as a result of the targeted Precept increases for 2019/20.

The PCC confirmed that the six areas of focus as detailed by the Chief Constable had been achieved.

One member made reference to rural crime prevention and that a paper had recently been published that referred to the hidden cost of this and asked if any more work was planned on this. The PCC responded that the paper had now gone to Dorset Police and he undertook to send a copy to members for their information.

The Chairman made reference to the £7.8m uplift achieved by raising the in-year precept and advised the PCC that the Panel would be seeking costing evidence of how this additional funding had been used.

The Chief Executive, OPCC updated members on their procurement processes and confirmed that procurement was carried out in a variety of cost effective ways.

Noted

28. **Commissioning Overview**

The Panel considered a report which advised how the PCC conducted commissioning, including benchmarking for success and obtaining value for money for the Dorset taxpayer.

An overview of the commissioning process was given to members and the Chief Executive, OPCC advised that there was more information available on their website. He added that the PCC commissioned on a pump priming basis with a good focus on contract management.

Following a comment from a member about safeguarding and how this linked through the Force, the Chief Executive, OPCC advised this was tasked four ways by the four leads of the task force.

A member asked for the PCCs views as to whether commissioning arrangements were risk averse. The Chief Executive highlighted that he was comfortable that due diligence was carried out. He added that they did deliver against innovative schemes and also accepted controlled risk with community grant schemes.

Noted

29. **Police Recruiting**

The Chief Executive, OPCC updated members on the current status of the recruitment of police officers following the Prime Minister's promise of an additional 20,000 police officers. The OPCC were waiting for central direction on how this would be accomplished. Officers would be put in place by 2023 with up to 6,000 officers nationwide in place by 2021. There was £750m available to deliver against this pledge with a further £35m to kick start recruitment.

Officers had developed a number of recruitment models based on initial assumptions. Dorset received 0.9% of the Police budget and based on this Dorset would get 190 officers but this could be scaled up or down. Work was in progress to try to lobby through the correct channels and a large contingency spend was being used on officers being tied into national meetings. The Chief Executive undertook to provide more information to members when it was available. However, he added that whilst the uplift was welcome - it was only for police officers.

Following a question from the Vice-Chairman about the levels of Dorset Police Officers in 2010 compared with now, the Chief Executive advised that in 2010 there were 1500 and to date there were 1200.

Noted

30. **Complaints Update**

Members received the minutes of the Complaints Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 August 2019 which included an updated Complaints Protocol.

The Chairman of the Complaints Sub-Committee updated members on the number of complaints that had been received in the last quarter and of any ongoing complaints. He added that the sub-committee were due to meet following this meeting to consider a new complaint.

Resolved

That the update Complaints Monitoring Protocol be agreed and be used for any future complaints.

31. **Protocol for Managing Programmed or Unprogrammed Disruptions to Meetings**

The Panel considered a report by the Corporate Director for Legal and Democratic, Dorset Council which advised that the Council was in the process of establishing clear guidelines on managing protests at Council buildings and this would form the basis of the Panel's response to any disruptions that might occur. Once approved by Dorset Council it would be presented, along with the Panel's addendum, to a future meeting of the Panel for sign-off.

Resolved

Members agreed the interim proposed procedures as set out in the appendix to the Corporate Director's report.

32. Work Programme

The Panel considered its Work Programme and noted the inclusion of the following items:-

- Inclusion of future meeting dates in the work programme;
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Development Plan update ssssssssreview in September 2020.

Resolved

That the Work Programme be updated accordingly.

33. Urgent items

There were no urgent items of business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.05 pm

Chairman

.....