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**Purpose**

To provide the Police & Crime Panel with an overview of performance for the year 2012/13 of both Bedfordshire Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner, since taking up office in November 2012.

**Executive Summary**

The report provides information on Force performance against the priorities set out in the 2012/13 Strategic Plan in relation to:

- Crime Reduction/Crime Detection
- Anti-Social Behaviour and Victim Satisfaction
- Financial Outturn
- Annual Governance Statement
- Complaints

Bedfordshire Police has achieved excellent improvements in performance against a backdrop of significant financial cuts and unprecedented national and local events.

The Police and Crime Panel have met previously to review, and where appropriate, to support key aspects of the Commissioner’s responsibilities in relation to; the development of the initial Police and Crime Plan, 2013/14 police precept decision.

**Recommendations**

That the Bedfordshire Police & Crime Panel note the 2012/13 performance achievements of Bedfordshire Police and the activities, both statutory and otherwise, undertaken by the Police and Crime Commissioner to represent the public, working with the police and communities to fight crime and protect the public.

**Background/Supporting papers**

2012/13 Bedfordshire Police Authority Strategic Plan
### Contribution to the Police and Crime Plan


### Implications

1. **Strategic Risk Implications** – Performance improvements against the priorities as stated in the strategic plan 2012/13 will provide the public with the reassurance that Bedfordshire Police deliver an efficient and effective policing service.

2. **Financial Implications** – As set out in the report.

3. **Equality and Human Rights Implications** – None other than those identified within the reports.

4. **Legal Implications** – None identified

5. **Regional/Collaborative Working Implications** – The work of the collaborated and regional teams contribute to overall Force performance, enabling more resources to be available to tackling local policing issues than would otherwise be afforded by Bedfordshire.
Report

1. Introduction

Performance priorities and objectives for Bedfordshire Police were set out in the 2012/13 Strategic Plan formally agreed by the Police Authority in May 2012 and adopted by the Commissioner for the remainder of 2012/13.

2. Appendices

- Appendix A: Report to the Police & Crime Commissioner, 20th May 2013, End of Year Performance Report (Balanced Scorecard)
- Appendix D: Professional Standards Annual Report 2012/13

3. Issues for consideration

**Balanced Scorecard – Appendix A**

The End of Year Performance Report provides a comprehensive overview.

Worthy of note is the continued improvements in the priority crime types against the backdrop of severe financial cuts and a number of high profile national and local events, eg. Diamond Jubilee, Olympics, Luton and Bedford Festivals:

**Crime Reduction**

Bedfordshire’s overall crime rate for the period was 59.7 crimes per 1000 population, below the England and Wales rate of 67.0 crimes per 1000 population.

- 15% reduction in overall crime – the 4th largest reduction in England and Wales;
- 14% reduction in Domestic Burglary – the 11th largest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
- 28% reduction in other burglary – the 2nd highest reduction;
- 18% reduction in Violence Against the Person – the 3rd highest reduction (6% decrease nationally);
- 17% reduction in offences against vehicles – the 15th highest reduction;
- 15% reduction in Criminal Damage – the 8th highest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
- Robbery recorded rates fell in 2012 but by much less than the national average.

**Crime Detection**

- Improvement in robbery detection from 20.7% in 2010/11 to 29% in 2012/13.
- Detection rates for Domestic Burglary, Vehicle Crime, Most Serious Violence and
Serious Sexual Offences and all meeting the long term ambition to be ranked 20th or better nationally, as set by the Chief Constable.

The successful partnership based Integrated Offender Management programme has contributed to the detection of a number of serious acquisitive crime types.

**Anti-Social Behaviour**

Reported incidents of anti-social behaviour (ASB) have fallen by 16%. An HMIC inspection of ASB capability within the Force during 2012 highlighted a number of areas for improvement. A range of initiatives have since been implemented including: a new performance framework, introduction of a case management system for use by all partners and the implementation of a new command and control and triage system that enables the assessment of the vulnerability of the victim. At the request of the Commissioner and Chief Constable HMIC were asked to assess the effectiveness of the new systems in May 2013: the official report is expected in autumn this year, however, initial feedback is extremely positive.

**Victim Satisfaction**

Victim satisfaction remains a key area for improvement. Plans are in place to improve performance, co-ordinated by the Force’s Victim Satisfaction Working Group.

**Revenue, Capital & Treasury Management Outturn – 2012/13 (Appendix B)**

The report presents the final position for 2012/13. Of the final outturn total of £100.637M there was an under spend of £2.57M which represents some 2.5% of the revenue budget. Significant variations were reported in the areas of police pay, police pensions, staff pay and collaborated units. Details of the under spend can be seen at page 18 of the Annual Report appendices.

Decisions on the use of the under spend were agreed by the Commissioner as follows:

- £0.9M agreed in January 2013 and to be used to increase General Reserves to provide for a greater fund to deal with unexpected spikes in cost, not budgeted for (£0.5M)
- Enhance the Force’s Tactical Tasking Fund enabling it to provide a proactive capability to enhance performance. This type of fund has proved extremely important in targeting pro-actively specific criminal activity, as well as reducing crime and ASB, impacting on the lives of communities – (£0.250M)
- Funding for the Force to utilise resources in determining how savings required in 2014/15 and 2016/17 can be achieved without significant impact on Force Performance and the Policing Crime Plan – (£0.150M)
- The enhancement of the volunteer capacity within the Force.
- £0.500M to be transferred to the Performance and Change Reserve
- £1.1M to be transferred to the Capital Expenditure Reserve.

Although not yet available at the time of writing this report, the publication of a recent HMIC inspection - Valuing the Police (pt3) for Bedfordshire is due to be published on the 18th July. An oral update will be provided at the Panel meeting. A copy of the national report can be seen at [www.hmic.gov.uk](http://www.hmic.gov.uk)
Annual Governance Statements (AGS) of Police & Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable — Appendix C (1 and 2 respectively)

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act established the Police & Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire and the Chief Constable for Bedfordshire as two separate corporation soles. This reform has created a requirement for both to publish their own separate sets of accounts. The Chief Constable is under the direction and control of the Commissioner giving rise to a group structure whereby the Chief Constable is a 100% subsidiary of the Commissioner and together they form the Police & Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire Group.

The AGS for the Police & Crime Commissioner and Bedfordshire Police set out the positions of the organisations at the end of the financial year 2012/13 and provides details of how each has met their statutory duties in 2012/13.

The next phase of the transition to establish the Commissioner and Chief Constable as separate corporation soles is the ‘stage two’ transfer of certain staff, property, rights and liabilities from the Commissioner to the Chief Constable. A project group has been established to lead on progressing the transition.

Complaints – Appendix D

Bedfordshire Police

In addition to the data relating to complaints against Bedfordshire Police (pg 8 of Appendix A) the annual report of complaints against Bedfordshire Police has also been included. As the Professional Standards Department is a collaboration of the strategic alliance the additional report provides for comparisons across the three Force areas.

Complaints against the Police & Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire

There were no complaints made against the Police & Crime Commissioner in 2012/13.

Strategic Decisions of the Police and Crime Commissioner

The Commissioner made a number of strategic decisions during 2012/13 which have been considered by the Panel at previous meetings. These include decisions to discontinue any further work to deliver organisational support through the Lincolnshire/G4S contract, 2013/14 policing precept set at 2% thereby reversing previous plans to reduce the number of PCSOs in 2012/13 and a variety of decisions in relation to governance arrangements covering financial, collaboration, health and safety etc which can be seen at http://www.bedfordshire.pcc.police.uk/public-information/decisions/

The Commissioner has been reviewing and establishing future collaboration partnerships that will maximise the resources available, through the efficiency, effectiveness and resilience of collaborated units, to deliver the Police and Crime Plan and the local policing and frontline services required for Bedfordshire.

Police and Crime Commissioner – 2012/13 activity

The Panel were presented with a summary of the Commissioner’s engagement activity since coming into the office which informed the Police and Crime Plan presented to the Plan. This was provided to the February 2013 Panel meeting.
The Panel have requested a summary of both the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner’s engagement activity which has been provided at Appendix C of the Quarter 1 2013/14 Performance report. It should be noted that this includes the February and March 2013 engagement activity too.

4. Conclusion

Overall Bedfordshire Police has performed extremely well against the performance priorities and objectives set out in the Strategic Plan 2012/13. The achievements have been made despite significant financial challenges and extraordinary national events.

The Police and Crime Commissioner had a number of key responsibilities upon coming into office in November 2013 some of which were time critical and these statutory responsibilities were fulfilled. In addition the Commissioner has engaged extensively with communities, partners and business and voluntary organisations to ensure that the Police and Crime Plan is influenced and shaped by the needs of the county and the policing services meet the needs of the public. The Commissioner has held the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of the 2012/13 performance and in setting the 2013/14 priorities has introduced a mix of quantitative and qualitative measures to better assess whether the outcomes are those most valued by the public.

5. Recommendations

That the Bedfordshire Police & Crime Panel note the 2012/13 performance achievements of Bedfordshire Police and the activities, both statutory and otherwise, undertaken by the Police and Crime Commissioner to represent the public, working with the police and communities to fight crime and protect the public.

Public Access to Information

Information in this report is subject to publication under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and other legislation. Any information that should not be made publically available should be included in an appendix to this report and the reason for restriction given.

Is any 'restricted' information appended to this report? NO
If 'yes' please advise reason for restriction.
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REPORT TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR BEDFORDSHIRE

Date 20th May 2013  Report No AR App A

Title 2012/13 End of Year Performance Report (Balanced Scorecard)

Purpose
This report informs the Commissioner's Executive Board on the Force's Performance over the full 2012/13 financial year to meet its objectives, as stated in the 2012-2016 Strategic Policing Plan, and to meet its purpose of fighting crime and protecting the public.

Executive Summary
Performance continues to improve, with more priority crimes being detected and the level of priority crimes being further reduced.

Crime Detection: The Force is currently achieving its Performance Ambition to be ranked 20th or better in its priority crime areas of Serious Acquisitive Crime, Domestic Burglary, Vehicle Crime, Most Serious Violence and Serious Sexual Offences. Detection performance in the remaining priority area, Robbery, has improved substantially (ranked 22nd nationally), though it remains outside the ambition.

Crime Reduction: Compared to 2011/12, daily crime rates for priority crimes have fallen by 15% (overall Serious Acquisitive Crime), 10.5% (Domestic Burglary), 17% (Robbery), 12% (Vehicle Crime), 47% (Most Serious Violence) and 12% (Overall Crime). The latest British Crime Survey (2012 calendar year) shows Bedfordshire as having some of the largest reductions in crime rates in England and Wales, including:

- 15% reduction in overall crime – the 4th largest reduction in England and Wales;
- 14% reduction in Domestic Burglary – the 11th largest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
- 28% reduction in other burglary – the 2nd highest reduction;
- 18% reduction in Violence Against the Person – the 3rd highest reduction (6% decrease nationally);
- 17% reduction in offences against vehicles – the 15th highest reduction;
- 15% reduction in Criminal Damage – the 8th highest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
- Robbery recorded rates fell in 2012 but by much less than the national average.
- Bedfordshire's overall crime rate for the period was 59.7 crimes per 1000 population, below the England and Wales rate of 67.0 crimes per 1000 population.

Anti-Social Behaviour: ASB rates in 2012/13 were 16% lower than for the twelve months to March 2012. A new ASB performance framework has been developed based on the risks from ASB.

Victim Satisfaction: Victim Satisfaction levels have remained similar over the year to date. The Assistant Chief Constable (Local Policing and Crime) is leading a Victim Satisfaction Improvement Plan to improve satisfaction over the longer term. The last three months data shows an improving picture.

Complaints: Data for 2012/13 shows 271 recorded complaint cases, an increase of 18%
from 2011/12. 97.2% of complaints were dealt with within the agreed 120 day timescale, a continuing increase from previous years.

Recommendations

**Recommendation 1.** The Executive Board is asked to review and endorse the Force’s maintained and improved crime investigation, reduction, satisfaction and anti-social behaviour performance in 2012/13.

**Recommendation 2.** The Executive Board is asked to note and endorse the approach to reporting performance to deliver the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan in 2013/14.

Background/Supporting papers

- Bedfordshire Strategic Policing Plan 2012 to 2016.
- Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan.
- Chief Constable’s Performance Objectives for 2013/14 (report to the Commissioner’s Executive Board, 18th February 2013).

Contribution to the Police and Crime Plan

Further to reporting current performance, this report presents the approach to be used for reporting performance through 2013/14, to deliver the objectives in the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan.

Implications

1. **Strategic Risk Implications.** The Force Strategic Risk Register includes the risk that ‘The Force fails to achieve performance objectives’. The Strategic Risk Register summarises the controls in place, the assurances given and the actions being continued to mitigate this risk. Consideration of strategic risks is a standing item on the agenda for the Joint Audit Committee for the Bedfordshire PCC and Bedfordshire Police.

2. **Financial Implications.** The continuing performance improvements are taking place alongside continuing national reductions to police funding. Increasing or moving resources to address specific areas of threat, risk and harm may have implications for the size and / or distribution of the Bedfordshire Police budget.

3. **Equality and Human Rights Implications.** Further specific initiatives to improve performance may have implications for equality and human rights. Equality assessment is a standing element of change initiatives.

4. **Legal Implications.** Further specific initiatives to improve performance may have legal implications.

5. **Regional/Collaborative Working Implications.** The work of the collaborated and regional teams contributes to the performance objectives of Bedfordshire Police. Business cases for all functions under consideration for collaboration include an assessment of the expected impacts on performance.

Public Access to Information

Information in this report is subject to publication under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
and other legislation. Any information that should not be made publically available should be included in an appendix to this report and the reason for restriction given.

Is any 'restricted' information appended to this report? **NO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Author</th>
<th>Edward Major, Planning and Inspections Manager, on behalf on Chief Constable Alfred Hitchcock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of report</td>
<td>15th May 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The Bedfordshire Police performance priorities and objectives for 2012/13 were formally agreed on 30th May 2012. This report reviews performance against those priorities for the full financial year from 1st April 2012 to 31st March 2013.

The 2012 to 2016 Strategic Plan set out the purpose of the Force; to Fight crime and protect the public.

The Purpose is delivered by ensuring that the public are protected, satisfied and reassured. The Force has a continuing ambition to be the most efficient force in England and Wales.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Strategic risks are actively managed by the Force’s senior officer team. A documented risk subject to ongoing monitoring is that the Force fails to achieve performance objectives.

The Force Strategic Risk Register is updated every four weeks is a standing item at the Joint Audit Committee for the Bedfordshire PCC and Bedfordshire Police.

END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Balanced Scorecard at Appendix A shows Force performance against the agreed performance priorities for the 2012/13 financial year. This shows further improvements over the excellent results seen through the 2011/12 financial year.

The performance improvements have taken place against a backdrop of unprecedented national and local events. Additional demands were placed on the Force by the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee, the European Football Championships, the Luton Cultural Festival, the biennial Bedford River Festival, and Olympic Torch Relay, the London Olympics and the London Paralympics, and of which took place between June and September 2012.

The Force has completed three major restructuring programmes over the last 16 months to both improve performance and meet the savings required under the Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review. The Operational Policing Model was subject to two major restructurings, in October 2011 and October 2012. Organisational Support Services were restructured in early 2012. Through each of these programmes the Force has landed improved performance, significant savings and major organisational change simultaneously. At the same time the Force has continued to collaborate on major areas of protective services with Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire constabularies which have provided increased resilience and capability whilst delivering financial savings.

Force operations and performance are managed on a daily basis through Daily Intelligence Meetings and Daily Management Meetings, chaired by a member of the Force’s Senior Command Team. These are supported by intelligence systems and processes and Executive level boards to manage Resources, Performance, Change and Risks at the strategic level. The Force uses a Threat, Harm, Risk approach, to ensure that resources are dedicated to where they are needed most, both on a day-to-day basis and when making longer term resourcing decisions.

Crime investigation

The Force is currently achieving its Performance Ambition to be ranked 20th or better
in its priority crime areas of Serious Acquisitive Crime, Domestic Burglary, Vehicle Crime, Most Serious Violence and Serious Sexual Offences. The detection rates for Vehicle Crime and Serious Sexual Offences have fallen, though they remain within ambition. The falling detection rate for Serious Sexual Offences was expected, as the previous year’s rank was boosted by the effects of two exceptional cases each leading to multiple detections. The Overall Positive Disposal Rate (which includes sanction detections and restorative justice outcomes) has improved from the previous year and is better than the end of year performance ambition.

3.5.2 Robbery detection performance has improved substantially over the last two years. 20.7% of Robberies were detected in 2010/11, 23.1% in 2011/12 and 29.0% in 2012/13. The Force has gone up ten places in the national ranks, to 22nd, though remaining just below ambition.

3.5.3 The following activities are continuing to contribute to improved crime investigation performance:

- The partnership based Integrated Offender Management programme is firmly established, working with prolific and priority Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC) offenders and with high volume offenders in less serious acquisitive crimes.
- Other measures have been introduced to disrupt and arrest the most prolific SAC offenders, seriously impacting on their offending behaviour.
- Greater use is being made of forensics in SAC investigations.
- Continuous development of the INSPIRE performance reporting tools is helping officers and staff to understand performance and monitor the impact of local initiatives.
- Improved management of assigned crime workload improves productivity.
- The Collaborated Units (including Dogs, Firearms and Roads Policing) give continued support for local policing teams and for priority crime arrests.

3.6 Crime reduction

3.6.1 A focus on the Force Purpose fighting crime and protecting the public, adopted in early 2011, helped drive big reductions in 2011/12 in the numbers of burglaries and violent crimes (down by around 20% and 40% respectively). Bedfordshire recorded the greatest reduction in Burglary (Other) and was in the top five forces for Burglary Dwelling reduction. Other priority crime types also saw reductions. Smaller reductions were recorded in Vehicle Crime and Overall Crime.

3.6.2 Between March 2012 and April 2013 daily crime rates for priority crimes have further fallen by 10% (overall Serious Acquisitive Crime), 6.5% (Domestic Burglary), 20% (Robbery), 10% (Vehicle Crime), 27% (Most Serious Violence) and 12.5% (Overall Crime), compared to the levels throughout 2011/12. The Force is middle ranked for Overall Crime and in the top third for Most Serious Violence.

3.6.3 The Force’s Serious Acquisitive Crime ranks remain low, although Robbery is reducing at a faster rate than most other forces, while Domestic Burglary and Vehicle Crime are reducing at similar rates. Whilst national rankings have not changed over the last year the reductions show the focus and commitment in this area. The Force is exploring how to cut crime further without jeopardising the use of tactics that have delivered crime reductions to date.

3.6.4 The latest British Crime Survey (for the 2012 calendar year) shows Bedfordshire as having some of the largest reductions in crime rates in England and Wales, including:

- 15% reduction in overall crime – the 4th largest reduction in England and Wales;

---

1 Serious Acquisitive Crime combines Domestic Burglary, Robbery and Vehicle Crime.
• 14% reduction in Domestic Burglary – the 11th largest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
• 28% reduction in other burglary – the 2nd highest reduction;
• 18% reduction in Violence Against the Person – the 3rd highest reduction (6% decrease nationally);
• 17% reduction in offences against vehicles – the 15th highest reduction;
• 15% reduction in Criminal Damage – the 8th highest reduction (8% decrease nationally);
• Robbery recorded rates fell in 2012 but by much less than the national average.
• Bedfordshire’s overall crime rate for the period was 59.7 crimes per 1000 population, below the England and Wales rate of 67.0 crimes per 1000 population.

3.6.5 A dedicated Crime Reduction Plan has been in place since early 2012. This is managed by the Force’s Performance Board, led by the Assistant Chief Constable (Local Policing and Crime). The Plan collates work under:

• Offender Management. Including traditional offender management methods as well as tackling offenders by more direct means.
• Crime Prevention. Tactics ranging from simple target hardening measures around vulnerable premises or victims to the more sophisticated tactics focused on causation and enabling factors around crime. For example attacking and disrupting the infrastructure which surrounds serious acquisitive crime such as the distribution and handling networks that convert stolen goods into cash.
• Hot Spot Management. Focusing on the locations with the highest concentrations of crime. Considerations will include tackling ‘Hot Points’ such as very small geographic areas such as street corners or shopping parades to larger geographic areas, such as a crime ridden ward or estate.
• Crime and ASB Series Management. This approach enables consideration of tactics around specific crime types and crime series based on the characteristic of the crime rather than locations or offenders.

3.6.6 The following activities are continuing to contribute to improved crime reduction performance. Some of these activities are captured within the Crime Reduction Plan:

• Local Policing Operations teams are focused on reducing local priority crime, engaging with the local public, gathering intelligence to identify threats (including prolific offenders, vulnerable victims and localities) and disrupting prolific offenders and members of organised criminal gangs.
• Operations to ‘deassure’ offenders, including covert operations, high visibility operations and publicising Force successes on social media.
• Crime prevention campaigns using posters on buses and fences, the local press, social networks and the web for key messages around domestic burglary, robbery and personal safety.
• Improved management of crime hotspots, vulnerable victims and vulnerable locations through the Force’s performance reporting tool.
• Use of the National Decision Making Model within the Force Control Room.
• A more intrusive, objective and supportive supervision regime for investigation of all priority crime types.
• Improved investigative processes for all priority crime types through improved forensics availability, dispatch times, initial investigations, fast-time arrests and early allocation of crimes.
• The Bedfordshire Special Constabulary is fully embedded in Local Policing. Deployments are focused around the night-time economy (especially on Friday and Saturday nights), helping to reduce Most Serious Violence.
3.7 Victim Satisfaction

3.7.1 Victim Satisfaction is assessed through surveys of victims of crime, using a Home Office approved approach and set of questions. In line with Home Office guidance, the victim surveys take place two months after the month in which the incident occurred. The latest survey results are therefore for incidents from February 2013.

3.7.2 Overall Victim Satisfaction levels remained similar in the data to November 2012. From November the Force initiated a series of initiatives under a dedicated Victim Satisfaction Improvement Plan. Key among these has been the introduction of routine calls to victims of crime, before they are surveyed, to discuss progress in their cases and to learn about the customer experience. Victims of crime receiving these call-backs show a clear improvement in satisfaction levels when they are surveyed during the following weeks. As a result of the call-backs, backed up by other victim focused activities, the victim satisfaction survey results from November showed a marked improvement.

3.7.3 Full national comparative data is expected to be available in late May 2013. This is likely to show an improvement from 41st to around 34th in the national rankings, due to the improved performance since November 2012. This would represent the single biggest jump since well before the current strategic intent was adopted. Taken in isolation, the Victim Satisfaction data for incidents in the four months from November to February would place the Force approximately 12th.

3.7.4 The Victim Satisfaction Action Plan has been developed through research into the key drivers of satisfaction. The Plan is managed by the Force’s Performance Board, led by the Assistant Chief Constable (Local Policing and Crime). The Improvement Plan collates work in the following areas:

- Working with Victim Support to achieve better co-ordination across Victim Support and the Police to the best effect for victims;
- Identifying dissatisfied victims at an early stage and driving successful service recovery;
- Designing and delivering a training package for officers and staff to drive improved victim satisfaction;
- Developing a process to ensure each crime investigation consists of a tailored investigation plan, which includes a victim contact plan;
- Developing a robust supervisory regime which recognises the central importance of victim satisfaction in all crime investigations;
- Central scrutiny of victim satisfaction survey results to identify and address poor performance in individual officers and staff;
- Ensuring the data set for the victim satisfaction survey is constructed and applied ethically, in line with the Home Office guidance;
- Publicising the Force’s successes in reducing crime and achieving improved rates of victim satisfaction.

3.8 Anti-Social Behaviour

3.8.1 Improved call handling procedures since April 2012 have resulted in a number of incidents being recorded as crimes where they may previously have been recorded as ASB. This change is behind part of the 16% reduction in 2012/13 ASB rates compared with 2011/12. The 2012/13 objective has been met, though recorded levels of ASB tell only part of the story regarding the Force’s effectiveness in tackling ASB.

3.8.2 To effectively tackle and reduce the impacts ASB the Force has been focusing on improving its understanding of the risks it poses to individuals and communities. A new ASB performance framework has been developed based on identifying and
tackling the highest risk cases of ASB. This approach records new, ongoing and concluded high risk ASB cases, and will form the basis of reporting ASB performance during 2013/14.

3.8.3 The Force works with partners in the three unitary authorities (Bedford Borough, Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough) to tackle anti-social behaviour in their areas. The Force runs a consistent risk assessment process, starting from the first point of contact, to identify the most vulnerable victims of ASB. Standalone ASB teams, staffed by PCSOs, are dedicated to each unitary authority area. They work with local partners to review high risk ASB cases to reduce the level of risk and harm to the victim, with different agencies taking responsibility as appropriate. The process of implementing an ASB case management process and IT solution is underway. The model will continue to develop built upon shared good practice and harmonised processes.

3.8.4 During March 2013 Bedfordshire Police adopted the STORM Command and Control system, to manage the call handling and incident response processes. With STORM now in use across Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire a consistent triage system has been adopted across all three forces. This enables call handlers to assess the vulnerability of the victim, to determine an appropriate response based on threat, harm and risk. Calls are categorised as low, medium and high risk, allowing small issues to be linked to a wider context which may require a different response.

3.8.5 Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) inspected ASB capabilities in all police forces in England and Wales during 2012. The outcomes of the 2012 HMIC ASB inspection report on Bedfordshire were reported to Bedfordshire Police Authority on 28th September 2012, alongside the Force’s response and ongoing activity. The ongoing work described in the previous three paragraphs directly addresses the issues raised in the HMIC report.

3.8.6 The Force asked HMIC to carry out a re-inspection to independently assess the effectiveness of the new systems and approaches introduced since the previous inspection. The inspection took place in the first half of May 2013. Results are expected in the summer or autumn of 2013.

3.9 Complaints

3.9.1 Complaints levels were previously reported to the Bedfordshire Police Authority on an annual basis, to give an overview of the preceding year.

3.9.2 Recorded complaints – Data for 2012/13 shows 271 recorded complaint cases. This is an increase of 70 (18%) from 2011/12, but remains lower than the 355 complaint cases recorded in 2010/11. Complaint cases may contain a number of individual allegations. In 2012/13 there were 527 recorded allegations.

3.9.3 The most common types of complaint allegation are ‘Other neglect or failure in duty’ (31%), ‘Incivility, impoliteness and intolerance’ (13%), ‘oppressive conduct or harassment’ (9%) and ‘other assault’ (9%).

3.9.4 Timeliness – During 2012/13 97.2% of complaints were dealt with within the agreed 120 day timescale. This is a continuing increase, from 91% in 2011/12 and 86% in 2010/11.

3.9.5 Complainant ethnicity – The following table shows the proportion of complainants according to their ethnicity compared to the usual resident population. Black complainants are under-represented in the complaints system when compared to the

---

2 Partnership activity is co-ordinated by Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in each unitary authority area. Anti-social behaviour is a key concern for all three CSPs.
3 Resident population is taken from the 2011 Census.
usual resident population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of complainants</th>
<th>Proportion of complainants</th>
<th>usual resident population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9.6 **Direction and Control** – These are complaints related to general policing standards, operational management decisions, organisational decisions and strategy. There were a total of 28 such complaints during 2012/13, a continuing downward trend (from 87 in 2011/12 and 143 in 2010/11).

4. **LOOKING AHEAD – PERFORMANCE REPORTING IN 2013/14**

4.1 The approach to be taken in reporting performance to deliver the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan was presented in a report to the Commissioner’s Executive Board on 18th February 2013. In line with the Police and Crime Plan this shows separate Quantitative and Qualitative performance areas. Appendix B shows the agreed performance objectives in these quantitative and qualitative areas, delivery against which will be reported in performance reports to future meetings of the Executive Board.

4.2 A meeting took place on 1st May 2013 between the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) and Force leads on corporate services, performance and finance. Work is continuing to agree the measures which will be monitored on an ongoing and exception basis.

5. **CONCLUSION**

5.1 Bedfordshire Police is here to **fight crime and protect the public**. This report reviews the Force’s performance in the 2012/13 financial year to meet its purpose.

5.2 Performance continues to improve, with more priority crimes being detected and the level of priority crimes being reduced significantly. The report summarises initiatives and commitments made to performance in crime detection, crime reduction, victim satisfaction and managing anti-social behaviour.

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 1**: The Executive Board is asked to review and endorse the Force’s maintained and improved crime investigation, reduction, satisfaction and anti-social behaviour performance in 2012/13.

**Recommendation 2**: The Executive Board is asked to note and endorse the approach to reporting performance to deliver the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan in 2013/14.
APPENDIX A: 2012/13 PERFORMANCE BALANCED SCORECARD

### Priority Crime Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Last Year (01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012)</th>
<th>This Year (01/04/2012 to 31/03/2013)</th>
<th>Recent Direction</th>
<th>End of year ambition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Positive Disposal Rate**</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Burglary</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Violence</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Sexual Offences</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* End of year performance ambition is to be ranked 20th or better.
** Overall Positive Disposal rate includes sanction detections and restorative justice outcomes.

### Priority Crime Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Last Year (01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012)</th>
<th>This Year (01/04/2012 to 31/03/2013)</th>
<th>Recent Direction</th>
<th>End of year ambition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Recorded Crime</td>
<td>111.4/day</td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>97.8/day</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Burglary</td>
<td>8.6/day</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>8.0/day</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2.3/day</td>
<td>39th</td>
<td>1.9/day</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>12.4/day</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>11.2/day</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Violence</td>
<td>0.4/day</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>0.3/day</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* End of year performance ambition is to be ranked 20th or better, an 8% reduction in overall recorded crime, so that members of the public in Bedfordshire are less likely to be a victim of crime compared to the national average.
** Ambition is to reach the national average crime rate position, as a step towards mid-table rank.
*** End of year performance ambition is to be ranked 20th or better, lower than the national position.

### Victim Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Year (01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012)</th>
<th>Latest 12 months (01/03/2012 to 28/02/2013)</th>
<th>Recent Direction</th>
<th>End of year ambition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>National Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* End of year performance ambition is to be ranked 20th or better. This represents an overall satisfaction rate of 85.3%, based on national comparison data for March 2012.

### Anti-Social Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Year (01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012)</th>
<th>This Year (01/04/2012 to 31/03/2013)</th>
<th>Recent Direction</th>
<th>End of year ambition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded ASB level</td>
<td>90.3/day</td>
<td>76.4/day</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This represents a 3% reduction in recorded ASB, to reach the national position.
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE OBJECTIVES

Summary of Quantitative performance objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Long-term ambition</th>
<th>2013/14 objective</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority crime reduction</td>
<td>Serious Acquisitive Crime*</td>
<td>20th rank</td>
<td>Police forces average</td>
<td>Stretching objectives set as a step towards Chief Constable’s long term ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary Dwelling*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Crime*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Serious Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority crime detection</td>
<td>Serious Acquisitive Crime</td>
<td>20th rank</td>
<td>20th rank</td>
<td>Consistent with Chief Constable’s long term ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Serious Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Sexual Offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Positive Disposal rate</td>
<td>No objective</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Included for easy comparison with other forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction***</td>
<td>20th rank</td>
<td>20th rank</td>
<td>Consistent with Chief Constable’s long term ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Overall savings delivered in line with Medium Term Resources Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To become the most efficient Force in England and Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver savings in line with Medium Term Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Meeting the proposed priority crime reduction performance objectives would entail reducing the number of crimes per day: from 8 to 5 for Domestic Burglary; from 2 to 1 for Robbery; from 11 to 10 for Vehicle Crime; from 21 to 16 for overall Serious acquisitive Crime.
** Meeting the proposed priority crime detection performance objectives would entail increasing detections for Robbery from 28% to 31%. The other priority crimes are already meeting the ambition.
*** Meeting the proposed overall satisfaction performance objective would entail increasing the number of surveyed victims of crime who are satisfied with the overall police service in relation to their incident from 81.5% to 85.3%.

Summary of Qualitative performance objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Long-term ambition</th>
<th>Qualitative performance monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Tackle persistent ASB which seriously undermines the quality of life for an individual or community or which results in seriously increased community tension.</td>
<td>Force and partnership ASB initiatives, including the Force’s ASB Strategy and Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>Encourage the reporting of hate crime and reduce its impact on community cohesion and integration.</td>
<td>Force and partnership Hate Crime initiatives, including links to ASB and public order issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic abuse</td>
<td>Encourage the reporting of domestic abuse and reduce repeat victimisation.</td>
<td>Force and partnership Domestic Abuse initiatives and management of domestic abuse cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised Crime</td>
<td>Reduce the impact that organised crime has on victims of crime and offending behaviour.</td>
<td>With other local and national agencies disrupt the organised crime groups having the biggest impact on communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Strategic Risk Implications  
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As set out in the report itself.
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None
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Both the Commissioner and Chief Constable have an obligation to ensure that public funds are used affectively in ensuring that the public receive the level of service they deserve as well as ensuring the financial longevity of Bedfordshire Police.

5. Regional/Collaborative Working Implications
The proposed use of underspends incorporated within this report support the direction of travel both the Commissioner and Chief Constable have agreed in relation to collaboration.

---

**Report**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This report sets out the outturn position of Bedfordshire Police for both revenue and capital expenditure in 2012/13. It also contains a summary of the Treasury Management activities the Force entered into in 2012/13. The report is therefore split into these three sections.

The financial environment in which the Commissioner and Chief Constable envisage they will be operating in within the next four years raises significant challenges and risks in relation to the overall delivery of the Commissioners Police and Crime Plan and specifically in relation to revenue budgets and capital programmes as well as market volatility in relation to Treasury Management. In considering this report therefore it is helpful to be aware of some specific context in relation to the financial environment and these are highlighted below.

- As a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) there is an estimated funding gap of £3.4m in 2014/15. This was preceded by the requirement to fund savings of £13.2m between 2011/12 and 2013/14.

- The Policing sector is envisaging similar reductions to those experienced between 2010/11 to 2014/15 in the following CSR period 2015/16 to 2018/19. However, at this stage no formal announcements have been made, but an announcement with regards to the next CSR is expected at the end of June and this should provide for more substantive estimates of funding to be made.

- To manage the reduction in officers and staff needed to meet the funding gap the Force has stopped the recruitment of officers since August 2010. Police staff vacancies have not been filled unless supported by a skills based business case approved by chief officers, or used for redeployment opportunities.
An increasing percentage of the Annual Budget is spent on areas of policing delivered by Collaborated Units. While this has provided savings for the Force and increased resilience, the priorities for Bedfordshire within those service areas that are collaborated have to be considered alongside those of Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire Constabularies.

The 2012/13 Annual Policing Plan set the context for financial decisions made during the year:

- The model for delivering local Police Services was changed enabling us to maintain frontline services, deliver savings and improve performance by focusing on crime and protecting the public.

- The Force and the then Police Authority set savings of £5.585m within the 2012/13 budget. Because these savings have been removed from the budget, the monitoring of these savings has been captured in the normal monthly budget monitoring process of Bedfordshire Police.

Recognising this context, this report provides details of the final 2012/13 outturn positions and provides for recommendations for the use of 2012/13 revenue budget underspends and for the financing of the 2012/13 capital programme.

2. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

This report complies with the Commissioner’s financial management scheme.

3. REVENUE OUTTURN 2012/13

Under the budget management scheme the then Police Authority and latterly the PCC’s Executive Board, receive regular information comparing revenue expenditure to available resources. This report summarises the final outturn for 2012/13.

3.1 Revenue Budget Provision

The Police Authority at its meeting on 17 February 2012 approved a revenue budget of £100.637m, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force Budget</td>
<td>99,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC/Authority budget</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,637</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Final Outturn

The final outturn for 2012/13 totals £98,063M, an under spend of £2.574M. This underspend represents some 2.5% of the revenue budget and is comprised of a combination of both developing practices to reduce costs and support the long term, as well as lower activity than anticipated, particularly in the areas of collaborative services. The volatility of policing can be both positive and negative from a financial viewpoint, with the first quarter of 2013/14 seeing a significant level of greater cost than envisaged due to the need for the Force to balance daily performance with a spike in activity within Luton. The under spend for 2012/13 arose in the following areas:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Final Outturn</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Final Variance</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Pay</td>
<td>38,518,800</td>
<td>39,536,500</td>
<td>-1,017,700</td>
<td>The new policing model introduced in October 2012 enabled the Force to reduce officer numbers by more than the budgeted requirement in 2012/13. The budget had been set six months prior to the introduction of the new policing model with an expectation that there would be 920 officers in non collaborative functions from October 2012 within Bedfordshire Police. By March 2013 the comparable figure was 866 with no obvious loss of performance. The reduction to this number was achieved by a combination of the continuation of a recruitment freeze, planned retirements and the proactive use of regulation A19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Pension</td>
<td>7,929,100</td>
<td>8,092,600</td>
<td>-163,500</td>
<td>The reduction in officer numbers had a knock on effect to the budget for Police Pensions. However the variance is far lower as this budget has been set on the basis of the estimated number of officers paying into the scheme at any one time rather than a fixed establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Overtime</td>
<td>1,693,700</td>
<td>1,659,200</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>The spend on police overtime has been dramatically reduced over the past 4 years as detailed within the outturn report. The introduction of the new policing model and the change in shift patterns ensured the continuance of this trend, with a minor variance in final spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Pay</td>
<td>23,101,400</td>
<td>23,916,300</td>
<td>-814,900</td>
<td>The majority of vacancies with the staff pay budget occurred within the PCSO function as originally it was thought that numbers would be reduced in the new policing model, but the PCC managed to protect these in setting the 2013/14 budget. Within the Force Control Room staff vacancies have been filled by officers that are supernumary to the new policing model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Overtime</td>
<td>283,700</td>
<td>177,400</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>The main element of this relates to the Force Control Room filling staff vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborated Units</td>
<td>20,509,600</td>
<td>21,689,600</td>
<td>-1,180,000</td>
<td>Areas of Protective Service collaboration are subject to high degrees of volatility, such as major crime and scientific services. For 2012/13, the level of spend in these areas was less than budgeted for and work is being undertaken to re-assess these budgets, however, the first half of 2013 has seen an increase in spend in these areas. There have also been underspends within ICT as the future of the Strategic Alliance has been subject to agreement and therefore tri-force expenditure on ICT has been reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>786,200</td>
<td>873,000</td>
<td>-86,800</td>
<td>Savings from moving from the previous Police Authority to PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Pay</td>
<td>14,352,700</td>
<td>13,191,500</td>
<td>1,161,200</td>
<td>The underspends on police pay enabled the Force to make additional contributions to capital of £1.2M to enabling a lesser reliance on external borrowing and thus reducing ongoing impacts on the revenue budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-9,112,900</td>
<td>-8,499,600</td>
<td>-613,300</td>
<td>Additional income received via the Olympics has boosted income compared to budget this year. Unbudgeted income in relation to mutual aid, legal costs, vehicle sales and speed awareness has produced additional underspends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2012-13</td>
<td>98,062,300</td>
<td>100,636,500</td>
<td>-2,574,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objective analysis for this level of underspending is shown at Appendix A.

3.3 Performance

It is important to recognise that in the backdrop of large budget cuts along with a further prudent use of resources creating the underspend in 2012/13 the Force has delivered some excellent results in performance. The table below highlights the performance achieved by the Force in 2012/13

*Priority Recorded and Detected Crime & Victim Satisfaction (data to 30\textsuperscript{th} March 2013, source INSPIRE)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2011/12 Performance</th>
<th>2012/13 Objective</th>
<th>2012/13 Improvement</th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>YTD cmp</th>
<th>National Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Acquisitive Crime</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>-0.8pp</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-0.2pp</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Burglary</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>-1.2pp</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>+0.7pp</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-53%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-20.2%</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>+8.9pp</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>+5.7pp</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-1.8pp</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>-1.7pp</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Serious Violence (excl. GBH w/out intent)</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>+115%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-27.1%</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>+9.4pp</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>+8.8pp</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Sexual Offences</td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>-18.3pp</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>-20.8pp</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Crime</td>
<td>Crimes per day</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>+1.3pp</td>
<td>29th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative justice rate</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>+0.0pp</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive disposal rate</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>-0.3pp</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>+1.3pp</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction Rate</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>+1.9pp</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>+1.6pp</td>
<td>36th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is useful to note that the Commissioner and Chief Constable still have some performance areas that require further enhancing, specifically crime reduction and victim satisfaction, as well as sustaining the strong performance in the other areas. This at a time when the level of funding continues to fall, potentially over the next four years at the same rate as the previous four years. This highlights the need to be flexible, from a financial perspective to manage the volatility of policing such as that seen by Bedfordshire in the first quarter of 2013/14.

In relation to performance and the longer term issues facing Bedfordshire Police, the issue of custody provision in the North of the County is likely to require some extensive expenditure in the next three to five years and whilst exploratory work will be undertaken to minimise cost in this regard the Commissioner and Chief Constable need to continuing planning for this expenditure to ensure that it does not impact significantly on the annual revenue budget.
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3.4 Proposed Utilisation of Underspending

The Executive Board previously approved the use of £0.9M of underspends, when it considered the 2013/14 revenue budget in January 2013. The agreement at that time was as follows:

- £0.500M be transferred to the Police General Fund to ensure the Commissioner had an appropriate level of general reserves to offset any extraordinary demand placed upon him and also to assist the smoothing of budgetary reductions over the next four years, where necessary.

- £0.250M be given to the Chief Constable to be used as a Tasking Fund providing the Chief Constable with the ability to better manage daily performance with spikes in demand, but more importantly to provide a pro-active capability in the drive to bring those people to justice that are causing the public of Bedfordshire most harm.

- £0.150M be used for fast tracking the lean process work already being undertaken within the Force to drive out efficiency savings at a greater pace to assist with balancing the future years budgets but also to reduce bureaucracy within the Force thus allowing more time for our officers and staff to deliver a more effective policing service to our residents.

It is proposed that the remaining £1.6M of 2012/13 underspending be utilised as shown below thus providing an appropriate use of funds to help deal with both the short term priorities of the Commissioner and Chief Constable as well as the longer term issues highlighted within this report:

- £0.500M be transferred to the Performance and Change Reserve. This allowing the Commissioner, along with the Chief Constable to be able to both assist with sustaining and where possible improving the level of policing service to the public, as well as being able to fund any set up costs, particularly attributable to collaboration, which will assist in driving out the savings the Commissioner and Chief Constable will need to set a balanced budget during his initial period of tenure and beyond.

- £1.100M be transferred to the Capital Expenditure Reserve. This allows the Commissioner to plan for any developments that are needed within the Force’s custody capability within the next three to five years, removing the reliance on both borrowing and revenue budget, thus assisting the Chief Constable in providing an effective policing service whilst investing in an enhanced custody capability.

4. CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

The table contained at Appendix B shows the actual capital outturn of £3.064m in 2012/13 compared to the provisional outturn position of £4.830m presented to the PCC's Executive Board in January 2013.
4.1 Capital Outturn

The original programme was set at £6.031M; the outturn position of £3.064M represents a reduction of £2.967M. Of this £2.030M was anticipated and had already been built into the next year’s programme and mainly relates to national ICT projects which have slipped into future years.

During 2012/13 the then Police Authority and latterly the Police & Crime Commissioner has received regular updates about the progress of the Capital Programme detailing adjustments to the programme, variations in spend and reports of updated forecasts.

As a result of the interim report from January 2013 many of the known variances have been anticipated and incorporated into the draft Capital Programme for 2013/14 to 2016/17. The remaining variances are shown in Appendix B and detailed in the paragraphs below.

4.1.1 Estates (reduced spend of £76,000)

Of this total £46,000 relates to slippage mainly on the Transearch scheme that is improving our storage capability, the work is now complete but the timing of payments have meant the cost so is added to next year’s programme. The remaining £30,000 is an under spend, the majority relating to the Force Operational Policing Review.

4.1.2 ICT Strategy (reduced spend of £1,699,000)

The Command & Control system budget was under spent by £213,000, the project scope was limited to exclude full rationalisation of underlying technologies which is the reason for the under spend. Other variances equating to £48,000 as listed on Appendix B make up the balance of under spends.

The remaining variance of £1,438,000 is slippage, this means projects will still go ahead, they have just fallen behind the original programme. Delays are often suffered in collaborative ventures and this has been the case with the Athena, which is a semi-national project involving the replacement of Crime, Custody, Intelligence and Case Management systems, which will provide greater in force capabilities as well as enhancing the sharing of information with other Forces. It has also been the case with the mobile data projects, which commenced as a tri-force project with Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, but has slipped during the period whereby the Commissioners and Chief Constables of the three Forces have been determining the future of the three Force Strategic Alliance.

4.2 Capital Resources

The resources available in 2012/13 to fund capital expenditure are as follows:
### Specific Capital Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Capital Grants</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grant</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital receipts</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct revenue financing</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure Reserve</td>
<td>3,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total – Resources available 7,766

The resources available of £7.766M exceed the requirement to finance expenditure of £3.064M by £4.702M. This includes some specific capital grants that have been received in advance of project completion.

### 4.3 Capital Financing

The financing of the capital programme is based upon maximising the carry forward of those resources that can be used to fund both revenue and capital expenditure i.e. Capital Expenditure Reserve and Direct Revenue Financing, thus providing the Commissioner with greater flexibility with his resources in future years. Therefore those resources that can only be used to fund Capital expenditure are used initially. On this basis, and recognising the fact that some specific grants have been received in advance of spend, the proposed financing of the capital spend in 2012/13 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Capital Grants</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Receipts</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grant</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Revenue Financing</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – Resources Used</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In utilising the above funds to finance the 2012/13 Capital expenditure, the following resources are available in future years to fund the ongoing capital programme, or where there is a necessity to assist with balancing revenue budgets, in the case of the Capital Expenditure Reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Capital Grants</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure Reserve</td>
<td>4,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – Resources c/fwd</td>
<td>4,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of specific capital grants related to expenditure on ANPR, Case & Custody, the remaining grants available are earmarked for specific projects in the current capital programme.

It should also be noted that, in accordance with the Prudential Code, £0.262m has been set aside for Minimum Revenue Provision (set at 4% as approved by the Police Authority Compliance & Risk Management Committee in June 2012).

### 5. TREASURY MANAGEMENT

This section of the report summarises the treasury management operations in which Bedfordshire Police has engaged during the 2012/13 financial year.
5.1 Treasury Strategy for 2012/13

The Treasury Strategy Statement for 2012/13 was agreed by the Resources Scrutiny Committee in 19 January 2012 and can be summarised as follows:

- That the main treasury management activity of the Authority would be as a lender of funds during 2012/13. Borrowing (if required) would be infrequent and short term in nature.

- That long-term borrowing may be undertaken from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) to finance capital expenditure during 2012/13 if it is deemed necessary.

- That the benefits of restricting the long-term debt portfolio would be considered and kept under review during 2012/13.

This strategy was pursued throughout the year.

Prudential Indicators are a way of measuring the affordability of the PCC’s Treasury Management Strategy. By setting self-imposed targets around the level of borrowing, monitoring the exposure to fluctuations in interest rates and under-standing our capital financing requirements the PCC is able to make informed decisions around the capital programme, the effect on the revenue budget and ultimately whether our plans are affordable.

Performance Indicators are agreed within the Treasury Management Strategy and monitored throughout the year, year-end performance against these measures is shown at Appendix C.

5.2 Treasury Management Conclusion

The following table summarises treasury management transactions in 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Term Borrowing £’000</th>
<th>Temporary Borrowing £’000</th>
<th>Temporary Investments £’000</th>
<th>Instant Access Accounts £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance as at 1 April 2012</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>3,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaid</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 31 March 2013</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average daily level of funds available for investment during 2012/13 was £16.8m, compared to £16.6m the previous year.

Net interest income was £0.150m compared to an original budget of £0.225m, the decrease reflecting the continued low interest available rates during the year.

6. CONCLUSION

The revenue outturn was an under spend of £2.574m. The capital payments in 2012/13 totalled £3.064m, £1.766m lower than anticipated at the last review, and £2.967m lower than
the original programme. The financing of the Capital Programme allowed for £4.702m of resources to be carried forward for future years capital programmes and to provide some financial planning towards custody needs in the medium to long term. The Treasury Management practices of the Authority and latterly the Commissioner were in accordance with the indicators and approved strategy although due to the financial markets seeing no improvement during 2012/13 the level of interest from investments was lower than originally budgeted for.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 – the board are asked to note the revenue outturn at paragraph 3.2 and the capital outturn at paragraph 4.1

Recommendation 2 – the board are asked to approve the proposed use of the 2012/13 underspends as shown at paragraph 3.4

Recommendation 3 – the board are asked to approve the method proposed for financing capital expenditure in 2012/13 detailed at paragraph 4.3.

Recommendation 4 – the board are asked to approve the arrangements for the carry forward of capital resources of £4.702m from 2012/13 to future years at paragraph 4.3.
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## Year End Budget Outturn 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Final Outturn</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Final Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>25,222,302</td>
<td>25,811,850</td>
<td>-589,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Policing</td>
<td>34,487,906</td>
<td>35,636,350</td>
<td>-1,148,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTCG</td>
<td>723,330</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>53,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Policing</strong></td>
<td>60,433,539</td>
<td>62,118,200</td>
<td>-1,684,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborated Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>287,682</td>
<td>287,700</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAS</td>
<td>186,500</td>
<td>236,500</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERSOU</td>
<td>1,060,791</td>
<td>1,057,300</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS Support Collaborated</td>
<td>952,976</td>
<td>998,100</td>
<td>-45,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Collaborated Units</td>
<td>13,012,196</td>
<td>13,726,100</td>
<td>-713,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Collaborated Units</td>
<td>5,009,416</td>
<td>5,383,900</td>
<td>-374,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Collaborated Units</strong></td>
<td>20,509,561</td>
<td>21,689,600</td>
<td>-1,180,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPO</td>
<td>1,052,740</td>
<td>1,080,350</td>
<td>-27,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>362,844</td>
<td>360,600</td>
<td>2,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>644,391</td>
<td>-528,450</td>
<td>1,172,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally Funded</td>
<td>3,205,800</td>
<td>3,743,900</td>
<td>-538,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Cost Centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Corporate</strong></td>
<td>5,265,775</td>
<td>4,656,400</td>
<td>609,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>123,876</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>74,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Support</td>
<td>52,644</td>
<td>83,900</td>
<td>-31,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>563,093</td>
<td>607,750</td>
<td>-44,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates</td>
<td>3,539,868</td>
<td>3,527,900</td>
<td>11,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>780,680</td>
<td>753,300</td>
<td>27,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3,106,202</td>
<td>3,243,350</td>
<td>-137,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>764,361</td>
<td>693,700</td>
<td>70,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Comms Non-Collaborated</td>
<td>54,149</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>-2,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>183,554</td>
<td>208,100</td>
<td>-24,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Planning</td>
<td>762,535</td>
<td>767,150</td>
<td>-4,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Federation</td>
<td>208,779</td>
<td>211,250</td>
<td>-2,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement - Non Collaborated</td>
<td>317,673</td>
<td>441,200</td>
<td>-123,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Projects</td>
<td>68,191</td>
<td>179,300</td>
<td>-111,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services Command</td>
<td>444,751</td>
<td>386,600</td>
<td>58,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>96,896</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Business Support</strong></td>
<td>11,067,251</td>
<td>11,299,300</td>
<td>-232,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>786,203</td>
<td>873,000</td>
<td>-86,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>98,062,329</td>
<td>100,636,500</td>
<td>-2,574,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Treatment of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provisional Outturn (Jan 13)</th>
<th>Outturn</th>
<th>Variance (to provisional outturn)</th>
<th>Outturn Slippage</th>
<th>Over/ (Under)- spend</th>
<th>Variance (to provisional outturn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command &amp; Control</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Upgrades</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Systems</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV - Level One</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Capability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Evidence System</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Helpdesk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Data Network (was Inter Force Links)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Rostering System</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Records Management (Transearch)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Data Infrastructure</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-205</td>
<td>-205</td>
<td>-205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena (Case &amp; Custody &amp; Crime &amp; Intelligence)</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-801</td>
<td>-801</td>
<td>-801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPIS (Case &amp; Custody)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLMES2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC's (was PS's &amp; Printers)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Centres</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Modernisation Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Function Devices (MFDs)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airwave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,699)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,438)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(261)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,699)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estates Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Works</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration - Firearms</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ Mast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Replacement Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyfriars Replacement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator at Headquarters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Car Park Upgrades</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Alarm Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transearch (Racking)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Operational Policing Review</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>731</strong></td>
<td><strong>655</strong></td>
<td><strong>-76</strong></td>
<td><strong>-46</strong></td>
<td><strong>-30</strong></td>
<td><strong>-76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV (Custody Suites)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR (Central Beds)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>263</strong></td>
<td><strong>236</strong></td>
<td><strong>-27</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>-27</strong></td>
<td><strong>-27</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Replacement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>736</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>-282</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TREASURY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### 2012/13 Performance against Prudential Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual £'M</th>
<th>2012/13 £'M</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Limit for External Debt</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The maximum the Authority can borrow (four year's borrowing in year one).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Boundary</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>The amount of debt the Authority expects to carry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits for Interest rate exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper limit for fixed rate borrowing as an absolute amount</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>The amount of fixed rate borrowing the Authority expects to carry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper limit for variable rate borrowing as an absolute amount</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>The minimum investments the Authority expects to make at any one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of borrowing compared to net revenue budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C.1

DRAFT ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2013 OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR BEDFORDSHIRE

1. INTRODUCTION
This Annual Governance Statement reflects the position at the end of financial year 2012/13. This statement is an opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the Code of Corporate Governance, adopted by the Commissioner and based on the CIPFA/SOLACE Framework “Delivering Good Governance in Local Government” which sets out six core principles on which effective governance should be built. On the 22 November 2012, during the financial year 2012/13, the Police and Crime Commissioner (Commissioner) for Bedfordshire commenced in office following the abolition of the Bedfordshire Police Authority (the Authority) on 21 November 2012.

2. SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITIES
The Commissioner is responsible for ensuring that his business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded, properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively. In discharging this responsibility, the Commissioner must put in place proper arrangements for the governance of his affairs and for facilitating the exercise of his functions. This includes ensuring that a sound system of internal control is maintained through the year and that arrangements are in place for the management of risk. In exercising this responsibility the Commissioner places reliance on the Chief Constable of the Force to support the governance and risk management processes. The Commissioner has adopted a Code of Corporate Governance, which is consistent with the principles of the CIPFA/SOLACE Framework: “Delivering Good Governance in Local Government” published in 2007 and the CIPFA Guidance Note for Police on the Framework published in autumn 2012. This Code will be refreshed in 2013/14 to better reflect the Commissioner’s in relation to these same principles.

This Annual Governance Statement explains how the Commissioner has complied with Code of Corporate Governance and further how the Commissioner meets the requirements of regulation 4(2) of the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. In accordance with the 2011/12 Code of Practice on Accounting, the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer has reviewed the Commissioner’s financial management arrangements against the governance requirements set out in Principle 3 of the CIPFA Statement upon the role of the Chief Finance Officer to the Commissioner. He is satisfied that the Commissioner’s financial management arrangements conform with each of the governance requirements set out in Principle 3 and that accordingly public money is safeguarded at all times and used appropriately, economically, efficiently and effectively. Both the Commissioner and the Chief Constable are subject to the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. These Regulations require all relevant bodies to prepare an Annual Governance Statement which must accompany the Statement of Accounts. Group accounts must be completed by the Commissioner for the Commissioner and Chief Constable, and the Chief Constable must complete individual accounts. Both the Commissioner and the Chief Constable are required to produce Annual Governance Statements.

3. THE PURPOSE OF THE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK
The governance framework comprises the systems, processes, culture and values by which the Commissioner directs himself and maintains control and the activities through which he accounts to and engages with the community. It enables the Commissioner to monitor the achievement of strategic objectives and to consider whether these objectives have led to the delivery of appropriate, cost-effective services, including achieving value for money. The
system of internal control is a significant part of that framework and is designed to manage risk to a reasonable and foreseeable level. It cannot eliminate all risk of failure to achieve policies, aims and objectives; it can only provide reasonable and not absolute assurance of effectiveness. The system of internal control is based on an on-going process designed to identify and prioritise the risks to the achievement of the Commissioner’s policies, aims and objectives, to evaluate the likelihood of those risks being realised and the impact should they be realised, to manage them effectively, efficiently and economically.

4. THE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK
This section describes the key elements of the systems and processes that comprise the Commissioner’s governance arrangements. It explains the overarching structures that have been put in place to deal with these systems and processes and how they are linked to each other. In producing this explanation steps have been taken to ensure that the actions identified in the Commissioner’s Code of Corporate Governance are being addressed. This statement refers to a number of documents and decisions made by the Commissioner which help to illustrate the Governance Framework of the Commissioner. These documents and decisions are available through the Commissioner website referred to above.

IDENTIFICATION, COMMUNICATION AND REVIEW OF THE COMMISSIONER’S AIM AND OBJECTIVES

This section describes how the Commissioner’s vision for his purpose and the intended outcomes for citizens and service users are identified and communicated in the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan which was issued at the end of March 2013. The Plan describes the Commissioner’s medium term aspirations for policing Bedfordshire during his term of office and his broader aspirations to tackle and prevent crime. The Commissioner’s Plan sets out his overall aim of making Bedfordshire a safer place in which to live, work, travel and invest. As required by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 the Plan contains:

- the Commissioner’s police and crime objectives:
  - for policing;
  - for crime and disorder reduction;
  - for the discharge of national/international functions;
- the policing which the Chief Constable is to provide;
- the financial and other resources which the Commissioners will provide to the Chief Constable;
- the means by which the Chief Constable will report to the Commissioner in the provision of policing;
- the means by which the Chief Constable’ performance will be measured;
- the crime and disorder reduction grants which the Commissioner is to make and the conditions upon they are to be made, supported by subsequent reports.

The Police and Crime Plan has been the product of extensive planning and development starting early in 2012 as part of the Commissioner’s mandate for election. To facilitate this process and to ensure that the Plan was produced in a thorough and systematic way, a number of activities were undertaken as follows:

- obtaining the views of the people of Bedfordshire and victims of crime;
- consideration of the Strategic Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (which included an analysis of risks and threats);
- having regard to the priorities of responsible authorities; and
- consulting the Chief Constable in preparing the draft Plan; and
- sending the draft Plan to the Police and Crime Panel for review in accordance with statutory requirements.
Accordingly the Plan has been produced during 2012 and early 2013 following extensive consultation and development with key stakeholders and communities. The Plan was widely circulated to partners and published on the Commissioner website.

The Commissioner is required to produce an Annual Report. The Commissioner will produced an Annual Report which will be formally submitted to the Police and Crime Panel for consideration in July 2013. This will be an early opportunity for the Commissioner to report upon his progress in office since November 2012 in relation to his activities, achievements, financial position and performance.

ENSURING DELIVERY OF SERVICES AND THE BEST USE OF RESOURCES

This section explains how the quality of policing and crime services is measured and how the Commissioner ensures that they are delivered in accordance with his objectives. Further it explains how it is ensured that the services represent the best use of resources.

The Police and Crime Plan contains the police and crime objectives which all contribute toward achieving the Commissioner’s overall aim of making Bedfordshire a safer place in which to live, work, travel and invest. Each objective is supported by actions that the Force and/or partners will undertake which will contribute to successful outcomes. These objectives and actions are being underpinned by performance measures which are used to assess how well the objectives are being achieved. The performance measures for the policing elements of the Plan are set out in the Commissioner’s Performance Management Framework which is appended to the Plan. The Commissioner is able to utilise the funds available to him to award crime and disorder reduction grants. The Commissioner commissions services from any provider who he considers can provide services to contribute to his police and crime objectives.

The Commissioner regularly reviews progress against his police and crime objectives. Where grants have been awarded the awards have been made against the timescales and milestones for delivery and include agreed success criteria or performance measures. The Chief Constable is held to account for delivery of the objectives primarily through the Commissioner’s Executive Board. Meetings are held monthly and papers are made accessible to the public. The Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account for performance and in doing so publishes information on performance against the previous year and shows comparison against national comparators and the Crime Survey for England and Wales.

Where the Commissioner has awarded grant monies to organisations this has been undertaken against robust applications which clearly set out the success criteria and how the initiative for which funding is sought will deliver clear and measurable outcomes against the police and crime objectives. Where funding has been awarded to a body that body reports on outcomes and progress deriving from the grant.

The Commissioner has established the Executive Board primarily to hold the Chief Constable to account but will also monitor performance in a number of other areas and which include financial monitoring, compliance with the Strategic Policing Requirement, estates issues, collaboration and protective services.

The Commissioner has also established Strategic Alliance arrangements, with Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, to scrutinise performance in collaborated areas and to hold the Chief Constable(s) to account.
The Force Strategic Risk Register will also be viewed at these meetings as well as at the Joint Audit Committee.

The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for 2013/14 to 2016/17 has been drawn up in line with the Commissioner’s manifesto commitments. The MTFP was drawn up following identification of the 2013-14 government grants in December 2012. Delivery of a balanced budget against the 4 year period of the MTFP is dependent upon the Force delivering continued planned savings and currently unplanned savings initiatives. This represents a significant financial and operational challenge and will be monitored formally by the Commissioner through the Executive Board. The position will be monitored on the Commissioner’s behalf on a day-to-day basis by the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer.

The Commissioner and Chief Constable carry out a large number of internal inspections each year. These are undertaken by either the Force itself or through the joint programme of linked audits undertaken by the Internal Auditors. There are also a number of external inspections undertaken of the Force, in the main by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) but also including the external auditors. Reports from the external inspections and auditors are considered by the Commissioner via the Joint Audit Committee. Where actions are required the necessary improvements are monitored by the Commissioner by consideration of progress against action plans. Any matters of concern are recorded upon the Commissioner’s Risk Register.

Overall therefore there are robust and effective arrangements for ensuring that policing services are delivered in accordance with the Commissioner’s objectives and to a high standard and further for ensuring that they represent the best use of resources.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

This section explains the definition and documentation of the roles and responsibilities of the Commissioner, his statutory officers and those exercising delegated authority on his behalf. The nature of the delegation arrangements for challenging and scrutinising the Force are also explained. The Commissioner functions as a corporation sole established by statute and the Commissioner performs a number of functions that are provided for in legislation, namely the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. Principal amongst those functions are the duties to secure the maintenance of the police force, ensure that the force is efficient and effective, and to hold the Chief Constable to account for the exercise of their functions and those under their direction and control. The functions and responsibilities of the Commissioner are discharged by the Commissioner himself except insofar as the performance of the functions is delegated.

The Commissioner has established a corporate governance framework, known as the Governance Scheme. It comprises four essential elements, namely:

- a decision-making and Accountability Framework;
- a Scheme of Delegation;
- Financial Regulations; and
- Contract Standing Orders.

The decision-making and accountability arrangements, including a decision making policy, have been developed to enable the Commissioner and those exercising delegated authority on behalf of the Commissioner to make robust, well-informed and transparent decisions and hold the Chief Constable to account. The formalities relating to the making of decisions is clearly established with decisions, apart from those where there are reasons of confidentiality, being published on the Commissioner’s website. Decisions are recorded through decision reports, Executive Board reports and minutes and even through press.
releases. A review of the website includes a review of the transparency of the decision making to aid continuous improvement.

In order to hold the Chief Constable to account and to enable issues to be discussed (and where appropriate decisions made) the Commissioner established an Executive Board. This Board, scheduled to meet every month, is the primary vehicle by which the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account. In addition to this formal accountability mechanism there are also regular meetings between the Commissioner and Chief Constable. Arranged on approximately a weekly basis, they are also attended by the Chief Executive.

A Scheme of Delegation has been established by the Commissioner. The Scheme of Delegation identifies those powers of the Commissioner which may be exercised by officers on his behalf. The Scheme requires to be read and operated together with the Decision-Making and Accountability Framework, as well the Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders. The four essential elements of the Corporate Governance Scheme provide for how, in addition to operating within statutory parameters, the decisions of the Commissioner and those exercising authority on his behalf, are made. The Chief Executive and the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer monitor the Scheme of Corporate Governance on a continuous basis to ensure it is fit for purpose. The governance arrangements put in place have run from the commencement in office of the Commissioner on 22 November 2012.

Officer Roles
The Chief Executive, Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer, Chief Constable and others as appropriate, are required to advise and support the Commissioner in meeting his responsibilities.

Chief Executive
The Chief Executive’s role is to support and advise the Commissioner in delivering his Police and Crime Plan and in undertaking his statutory duties and responsibilities as well as responsibility for the management and day to day running of the Office of the Commissioner. In discharging this role the Chief Executive is required to report to the Commissioner if it appears that any proposal, decision or failure within their organisation constitutes, has given rise to, or is likely to break the law or code of practice.

Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer
The Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer is required to ensure that the financial affairs of the Commissioner are properly administered. Whilst the Commissioner’s professional adviser on financial matters, the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer also has similar legal duties and responsibilities to the Monitoring Officer in connection with any unlawful, or potentially unlawful, spending by the Commissioner or those acting on the Commissioner’s behalf. The Chief Executive and Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer continually consider the resources and support necessary to perform effectively in their roles. Papers to be considered by the Commissioner for decision are scrutinised by the Chief Executive and/or Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer, as appropriate, for compliance purposes. Indeed any submission for decision by the Commissioner must be certified by the Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer or Deputy Chief Executive.

Chief Constable
The role and responsibilities of the Chief Constable are set out in the common law, legislation and Chief Constable’s job description, amongst other sources. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 and the Policing Protocol 2012 are key in this regard. The functions designated to the Chief Constable are briefly summarised in the Commissioner’s Scheme of Delegation.
The Police and Crime Panel
Whilst the Commissioner is ultimately accountable to the electorate the Panel provides a check and balance in relation to performance of the Commissioner. The Panel scrutinises the Commissioner’s exercise of their statutory functions. Comprising of Unitary Authority councillors and co-opted members and appointed independently of the Commissioner, the Panel exercises its functions with a view to supporting the effective exercise of the Commissioner’s functions. It has two powers of veto in relation to the Commissioner’s proposed precept and the appointment of a Chief Constable. In the Commissioner’s first months in office he has fully engaged with the Panel regarding setting the Precept, the development of the Police and Crime Plan, including consultation responses on the Plan and the appointment of a new Chief Constable.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Commissioner
The Commissioner is accountable to the electorate for his conduct. Upon taking up office the Commissioner made a statutory declaration of acceptance of office by which he committed to serving all the people of Bedfordshire. In discharging this responsibility he is not subject to any formal code of conduct but he is expected to adhere to the Nolan principles relating to standards of behaviour in public life. Briefly stated these relate to selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership. The Commissioner is subject to the Official Secrets Act 1989 in the same way as Crown servants such as police officers. Complaints against the Commissioner fall to be considered under the Elected Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012. The appropriate authority for complaints made against the Commissioner is the Police and Crime Panel. The Panel is responsible for the initial recording of complaints and conduct matters and for referring any complaints which allege criminality to the Independent Police Complaints Commission. Where complaints do not allege criminality, the Panel is responsible for handling and informally resolving these complaints. Under the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) Order 2011 the Commissioner is required to maintain a register of interests of the Commissioner. Accordingly the Register of Interests is maintained and available for examination via the Commissioner’s website.

Officers and others
The Commissioner has not yet adopted a specific code of conduct for those of its staff who are not under the direction and control of the Chief Constable. In any event Commissioner staff are subject to rules of conduct applicable under their contracts of employment. Accordingly there are codes of conduct defining the standards of behaviour of Authority staff. In addition to these rules of conduct the Chief Executive and the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer are also subject to their own professional codes of conduct.

Complaints against the Commissioner officers’ (and other volunteers utilised by the Commissioner) are handled by the Chief Executive. The Commissioner is committed to maintaining the highest level of honesty and integrity and the prevention of corrupt, dishonest, unethical and unprofessional behaviour. All Commissioner staff and volunteers performing custody visitor and Independent Advisory Group duties are subject to police vetting processes.

Gifts and Hospitality
Under the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) Order 2011 the Commissioner is required to publish a register of each offer of gift or hospitality made to the Commissioner or a member of staff, indicating whether the offer was accepted or refused. Accordingly a Register of Gifts and Hospitality is maintained.
GOVERNANCE SCHEME, INCLUDING CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS, FINANCIAL REGULATIONS AND THEIR UPDATE

This section explains the arrangements that apply for Contract Standing Orders and Financial Regulations, both of which are part of the Scheme of Corporate Governance.

Financial Regulations
The Commissioner has adopted a set of Financial Regulations. The Regulations are a major part of the overall governance arrangements for the Commissioner and help establish a sound internal control environment. In order to conduct business effectively, the Commissioner and Chief Constable need to ensure that sound financial management policies are in place and that they are strictly adhered to. The Regulations that have been adopted have been drawn up to ensure that the financial affairs of the Commissioner and the Chief Constable are conducted properly and in compliance with all necessary requirements. They are designed to establish overarching financial responsibilities, and to provide clarity about the financial accountabilities of groups or individuals. They apply to all Commissioner staff and all of the Chief Constable’s officers and staff and anyone acting on their behalf. The Financial Regulations cannot be viewed in isolation but rather as part of the overall regulatory framework of the Scheme of Corporate Governance. The Regulations are subject to continuous monitoring by the Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer and Chief Executive to ensure they are fit for purpose in view of the constantly changing environment.

Contract Standing Orders
The Commissioner has also adopted a set of Contract Standing Orders. The Commissioner and Chief Constable require all procurement activity to be undertaken in a transparent, fair and consistent manner, ensuring the highest standards of probity and accountability. The Contract Standing Orders set out the arrangements to ensure that all contracts shall comply with statutory requirements. The Contract Standing Orders are continuously monitored by the Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer and Chief Executive to ensure they are fit for purpose.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk Management Strategy
A key aspect of decision-making by the Commissioner relates to risk management. The Commissioner has initially adopted a Risk Management Strategy. The Commissioner seeks to identify, analyse and prioritise the risks faced. He then seeks to manage and control the risks in order to maximise the quality and efficiency of service provision. The strategy recognises the importance of working closely with the Force and sets out clearly the various responsibilities of the individuals and groups in the risk management regime. The Chief Executive is overall responsible for overseeing the corporate approach to risk management and each year arranges, as judged necessary, for an audit of compliance with the strategy. Both the Chief Constable and, more recently, the Commissioner maintain strategic risk registers which are regularly reviewed. The Commissioner's Risk Register, which identifies, profiles, controls and maintains all strategic risks, is circulated to the Force. All submissions to the Commissioner for decision are required to address risk and this is specifically provided for in the Strategy. All reports to the Commissioner's Executive Board require the originators to address the risks associated with the subject-matter of the report. This approach ensures that risk management plays a major role in the key elements of the Commissioner's work.
relating to financial and budgetary management, service planning and performance management.

THE ROLE AND FUNCTIONING OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Joint Audit Committee
The Joint Audit Committee for the Commissioner and Chief Constable discharges the functions of an Audit Committee as suggested by the Guidance for Local Authorities on Audit Committees (2005) published by the Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA). The Audit Committee was established in January 2013 and is required “to provide independent assurance on the adequacy of the risk management framework and the associated control environment, independent scrutiny of the organisation’s financial and non-financial performance to the extent that it affects exposure to risk and weakens the control environment, and to oversee the financial reporting process.”

COMPLIANCE WITH LAW AND INTERNAL POLICY AND PROCEDURE

This section addresses the arrangements that are in place to ensure that relevant law is complied with by the Commissioner and to ensure that internal policy and procedure is observed. In particular, the arrangements to ensure that all expenditure by the Commissioner is lawful is described.

Statutory Officers
The Commissioner is responsible for securing an efficient and effective police service for the area, for observing the duties imposed upon it and exercising the powers conferred upon it by legislation. The Chief Executive and the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer are required to support and advise the Commissioner in delivering his manifesto, as expressed through the police and crime plan, and in undertaking his statutory duties and responsibilities. This includes in relation to strategy and resource planning, partnership working, commissioning and service delivery, engagement and information management, scrutiny, evaluation and performance.

The Chief Executive is a statutory officer and is responsible for the effective and efficient administration of the Commissioner’s office and includes the role of the monitoring officer, a statutory officer, with responsibility to draw to the Commissioner’s attention any actual or possible contravention of law, maladministration or injustice.

The Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer, also a statutory officer, has similar responsibilities relating to financial management and governance, and is similarly required report issues of a financial nature to the Commissioner where they may give rise to a breach of requirements, be they statutory or otherwise.

All originators of submissions to the Commissioner for decisions are required to consider a number of issues in the production of their submissions, namely, legal, financial, equality, diversity and human rights and collaboration. The Chief Executive must be satisfied that all relevant advice has been taken into account in the preparation of a submission before it is considered by the Commissioner. Similar issues must be considered by originators in the production of reports for the Commissioner.

Whilst the Commissioner is reliant upon the statutory professional officers to scan and monitor the environment for potential legislative impacts upon him he is also assisted by numerous professional networks. These include the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners which, amongst other things, is a source of support and advice to
Commissioners. This is supplemented by the Chief Executive and Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer membership of the Association of Policing and Crime Chief Executives and the Police and Crime Commissioners’ Treasurers’ Society respectively, both of which provide a conduit for further professional advice. Technical support services of a financial nature, in common with other police areas, is received from Somerset County Council.

Each year a programme of internal audits is undertaken which is aimed at ensuring compliance with internal policy and procedure. The Plan of internal audits, considered by the interim Audit Committee, takes into account current corporate governance and risk management issues. It is clear therefore that there are numerous mechanisms across the Commissioner’s office whereby steps are taken to ensure the Commissioner complies with both his external and internal obligations.

**WHISTLEBLOWING AND COMPLAINTS**

This section describes the processes for whistleblowing and explains the transparent and accessible arrangements for handling complaints.

**Whistleblowing**

The statutory provisions relating to whistleblowing apply to police officers and police staff alike. This means that such staff are able to make disclosures protected by the legislation and remain protected from action by their employer. These statutory provisions are reflected in the policies that apply to staff of the Commissioner and the Force and explain the action to be taken in cases of whistleblowing.

**Complaints**

The handling of complaints relating to the police service is an intricate and complex combination of statutory and employment related provisions. The Commissioner’s website enables a member of the public to make a complaint and dependent on the type of complaint this can then be handled by the most appropriate organisation and department. This removes the need for the public to understand the complexity of the internal complaints process that underpins the police service. This simplified process is also applied to the complaints for which the Office of the Commissioner is responsible. The Commissioner’s complaints policy and procedure can be found on the Commissioner website.

**Complaints against the Commissioner**

The appropriate authority for complaints made against the Commissioner is the Police and Crime Panel. The Police and Crime Panel is responsible for initial recording of complaints and conduct matters and for referring any complaints which allege criminality to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Where complaints do not allege criminality, the Police and Crime Panel is responsible for handling and informally resolving these complaints. The Police and Crime Panel has determined that the Chief Executive of the Office of the Commissioner shall have delegated authority for the receipt and initial handling and recording of complaints against the Commissioner. Complaints are handled in accordance with the Elected Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012.

**Complaints against the Chief Constable**

The Commissioner is responsible for recording and investigating complaints against the Chief Constable. In dealing with complaints about the Chief Constable, the Commissioner follows the statutory guidance issued by the Commissioner and in line with the Police (Complaints and Conduct) Regulations 2012.

**Complaints against Police Officers and Police Staff**

If anyone wishes to make a complaint against a police officer (other than the Chief Constable) or a member of police staff that works for the Force, the Commissioner’s website
requests some initial details and directs these to the appropriate department as the Commissioner does not deal with complaints about police officers (apart from the Chief Constable) and staff who work for the Force. However the Commissioner does have a responsibility to monitor and keep himself informed of complaints and misconduct issues relating to police officers and police staff. Where necessary, the Commissioner also has the power to direct the Chief Constable to take action in relation to complaints matters. The Commissioner regularly monitors information about complaints received by the Force and the lessons learnt by the Force.

**Complaints against Commissioner Support Staff**

For police staff who fall under the control of the Commissioner, their contractual terms provide for how complaints against individual staff are to be handled.

**Other Complaints**

If anyone wishes to make complaint about the conduct of an Independent Custody Visitor or a member of the Independent Advisory Group the same simplified process, as set out above, is adopted.

**CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF OFFICERS IN RELATION TO THEIR ROLES AND TRAINING**

**Terms and Conditions**

The staff of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner transferred to his employment by operation of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 from the Bedfordshire Police Authority on 22 November 2012. These staff, all of whom are under the direction and control of the Commissioner, were employed on the standard terms and conditions of the Bedfordshire Police Force subject to local variation appropriate to their circumstances. The policies of the Force similarly are generally applicable to them subject to variation as necessary within the employment grouping. These variations are provided for in each member of staff's statement of conditions of employment.

The Commissioner also currently employs all police staff who were at 21 November 2012 in the employment of Bedfordshire Police Authority. These staff all fall under the direction and control of the Chief Constable. The future employment of these police staff be with either the Commissioner or the Chief Constable. This will need to be determined by 1 April 2014. This is referred to in Section 6 below as a significant governance issue.

**ENGAGEMENT WITH COMMUNITIES AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**

This section describes how the Commissioner establishes clear channels of communication with all Bedfordshire communities and stakeholders, recognising that different sections of the Bedfordshire community have different priorities and how it ensures accountability and encourages open consultation.

**Communication**

The Commissioner's website, which is regularly updated, is one of the primary sources by which the Commissioner publicises his activity. In easily accessible format, it includes material upon the Commissioner's day-to-day activity, news stories, forthcoming meetings, meeting agendas and associated papers, key governance documentation, advice on how to make a complaint, and decisions as well as information that the Commissioner is statutorily required to publish. In this latter regard information of the expenditure and the running expenses of the Office of the Commissioner can be found. Responses to all Freedom of
Information requests are also published. A review of the website is currently underway to identify opportunities to make further improvements.

**Consultation**

One of the Commissioner’s key functions is to make arrangements for obtaining the views of the community upon policing. This includes obtaining the views of the people in Bedfordshire and victims of crime about the policing of Bedfordshire. Further the views of people in Bedfordshire and victims of crime in Bedfordshire must be obtained upon the draft Police and Crime Plan before it is issued. In addition the views of the people and ratepayers representatives must be obtained on proposals for expenditure. This means that decisions of the Commissioner about police and crime objectives, contained within the Police and Crime Plan, and decisions upon expenditure must be informed by the views gained in pursuit of the above obligations upon the Commissioner. In addition the Commissioner must exercise their functions having regard to the relevant priorities of each responsible authority.

During 2012 in readiness for the election of the Commissioner in November 2012 work began upon processes which lead ultimately to the issue of the Commissioner’s first Police and Crime Plan in March 2013. The production of this plan was based on consultation that took place with responsible authorities, business representatives, stakeholders, obtaining the views of the people of Bedfordshire and victims of crime, and collaboration. The Commissioner ensured that he secured and understood the views of local people about policing, that police and crime objectives were shaped around local needs and which would help improve public confidence. The Commissioner went on to provide feedback on how issues raised through consultation and community engagement were considered and acted upon. Arrangements for further consultation are currently underway and consideration is being given how consultation responses and engagement with partners and stakeholders will feed into future variations to the Police and Crime Plan.

**Engagement**

The Commissioner has also put in place initial arrangements for engagement with the community through a series of planned meetings and these were outlined within the production of his Police and Crime Plan.

**IAG**

A channel of communication also exists through the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) which helps improve the trust and confidence of Bedfordshire’s diverse communities in the police service. It is through the arrangements summarised above that the Commissioner encourages individuals from all parts of the Bedfordshire community to engage with, contribute to and participate in the work of the Commissioner.

**PARTNERSHIPS**

The Commissioner has a number of collaborative/partnership arrangements with members of the wider policing/local government family.

**Collaboration with Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire**

Through agreements by the previous Police Authorities of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire an extensive programme of collaboration on all services apart from local policing was embarked. Protective Service areas are now been collaborated as a three as well as a small number of other collaborated units. The Commissioner has embarked on a programme, initially just with Cambridgeshire, for Organisational and Operational Support service areas, but extendable to other Force areas and other partners.
At the point where collaborative opportunities are identified as able to deliver efficiencies, savings or improved service then the Commissioner is required to give its approval to collaborate. This is recognised by Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire alike. The Commissioners of both Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire have agreed to meet on 6 occasions per year with the Chief Constables to consider issues of mutual interest and to discharge the governance responsibilities of the Commissioners in relation to collaboration between Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Meetings are also held on a bi-monthly basis for Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire with regards to collaborative Protective Services and a small number of other collaborated units.

Agendas, reports and minutes are produced and published in respect of all meetings (except where confidentiality must be maintained) and where appropriate they are published on the Commissioner website. This is determined by reference to the Government’s Protective Marking Scheme. With the continuing expansion of collaborative activity with Cambridgeshire, performance monitoring from the service delivery and financial perspective is undertaken across the agreed areas of collaboration. Any executive decisions arising from this meeting of Commissioners, in Bedfordshire’s case, need to be formalised in compliance with the Commissioner’s decision-making arrangements.

Regional Collaboration
Across the region collaboration is also being pursued. The six Commissioners from the region are currently in the process of considering the governance mechanisms that they wish to initiate. All collaborations that have been entered into have a collaboration agreement which specify the formalities of the collaboration arrangements in relation to specific collaborations. For example the previous 6 police authorities in the region approved a major 6 force collaboration upon serious and organised crime in March 2010. This was formalised into a collaboration agreement which provides for the specific detail of the arrangements.

Wider Public Sector
The Commissioner is also involved in partnerships outside of the police family and in this regard has continued the work overseen by the predecessor authority. The police service in Bedfordshire currently share use of a number of buildings with the three Unitary Authorities. The Commissioner attends the countywide Safer Bedfordshire Partnership Board but is regularly attending the Community Safety Partnerships within the county. It is the role of the Community Safety Partnerships to work together to develop and implement a strategy for reducing crime and disorder. The strategic decision-making body of each Community Safety Partnership is the Responsible Group whose responsibility it is to oversee all aspects of the work of the Community Safety Partnerships, including setting priorities, maintaining progress and agreeing funding for local initiatives. For the financial year 2013/14 the Commissioner has awarded Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants to a number of partners within the public sector of whom each is required to spend their grants in accordance with the terms of award and account to the Commissioner for outcomes and progress in relation to the grants.

5. REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS
The Commissioner has the responsibility for conducting, at least annually, a review of the effectiveness of the governance framework, including the system of internal audit and the system of internal control. Review of these systems has been informed by the work of internal auditors, and officers of the Commissioner who have responsibility for the development and maintenance of the governance environment. Comments made by external auditors and other review agencies have also informed this review.

The Corporate Group comprising the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive and Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer, with the responsibility for drafting this Annual Report
Governance Statement have considered the governance framework and the system of internal controls as necessary and vital concomitants to producing such a statement. These officers collectively have involvement in the oversight of the processes involved in maintaining and reviewing the effectiveness of the governance framework. In producing this statement full regard has been taken of the Commissioner’s Risk Register.

The maintenance and review of the effectiveness of the governance framework also extends to others within the Office of the Commissioner. The Commissioner himself maintains overall control of the governance framework and has been involved, for example, in considering and approving the Scheme of Corporate Governance, the Risk Management Strategy, as well as challenging Force performance.

The Joint Audit Committee has carried out work against its terms of reference which includes the consideration of the effectiveness of the Commissioner’s risk management arrangements and the internal audit plan. Internal audit have carried out a programme of work at a level commensurate with the legal and professional obligations of the Commissioner.

In accordance with Regulation 6 of the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011, the review of the effectiveness of internal audit has concluded that the opinion in the annual report on internal audit work can be relied upon as a key source of evidence. The effectiveness of the system of internal audit includes the effectiveness of the Audit Committee as well as the performance of internal audit. Internal audit provided an independent opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the Commissioner’s system of financial control, including in particular the key controls operating within and around the core financial systems. Deficiencies in internal controls are reported by internal audit to management whose responsibility is to consider them and act appropriately. The result of the internal audit review of the effectiveness of the system of internal control were reported to the Joint Audit Committee, and plans to address weaknesses and ensure continuous improvements are in place.

The Commissioner and Force demonstrate adequate and effective controls. Whilst the programme of internal audit work has identified the need to make certain improvements, overall there are no adverse control issues arising. Officers remain vigilant about the need to continue to apply effective controls and the Joint Audit Committee members will continue to monitor performance on this. There are no significant audit issues in relation to the main financial systems and controls of the Commissioner and Force. In considering this Annual Governance Statement the Joint Audit Committee has reviewed the effectiveness of the governance framework including the system of internal control. In undertaking the review the Committee has been advised by the Chief Executive and the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer.

An interim review was undertaken before the abolition of the Police Authority as part of the handover report to the Commissioner and this provided an Internal Audit Interim Opinion for the period 1 April 2012 to 21 November 2012 which will inform the final Internal Audit Opinion for 2012/13 as well as this Annual Governance Statement. The overall conclusions regarding the adequacy and effectiveness of the arrangements for governance, risk management and control are RAG rated (Red, Amber, Green) and were:

- **Governance (Green)**: Adequate and effective governance processes
- **Risk Management (Green)**: Adequate and effective risk management arrangements in place
- **Control (Amber)**: Adequate and effective control arrangements in place however some weaknesses identified (one red assurance opinion Storage and Disposal of Controlled Drugs)
A full year opinion to support is provided for 2012/13.

6. SIGNIFICANT GOVERNANCE ISSUES
The Bedfordshire Police Authority, as the Commissioner’s predecessor, took steps in the period leading up to its abolition in November 2012, to prepare for the introduction of a Commissioner. This was identified as a significant governance issue in the Authority’s final Annual Governance Statement executed in September 2012. The Commissioner has taken forward the preparatory steps made by the Authority to ensure that initial governance management measures have been put in place to provide for proper and appropriate corporate governance. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 provided that on 21 November 2012, all existing rights, assets and liabilities transferred from the Authority to the Commissioner. This included the transfer of all police staff and was referred to as the “Stage 1” transfer. The Act also provides for a second “Stage 2” transfer which refers to the subsequent management of certain staff, property, rights and liabilities from the Commissioner to the Chief Constable.

The “Stage 2” transfer is designed to allow Commissioners and Chief Constables the freedom to make arrangements about how their respective functions will be discharged in the future. The Home Secretary has directed that the “Stage 2” transfers must be completed by 1 April 2014. Transfer “Stage 2” will impact upon corporate governance by the Commissioner and a number of the governance mechanisms described in this statement will need to be reviewed so that appropriate governance arrangements are put in place for the Commissioner for the period from 1 April 2014 onwards. Steps have been put in place to navigate this next transition phase. It goes to the heart of corporate governance by the Commissioner and is therefore considered a significant governance issue. A transition project group has been established comprising senior officers from the Offices of the Commissioners and the Force, in conjunction with Cambridgeshire, in view of the extensive collaborative activity. This group will lead on progressing the transition.

The Commissioner has also identified that the next Comprehensive Spending Review provides him with a significant financial challenge, with the expectation that police funding will reduce nationally and the inability, except through the use of a referendum, to raise Council Tax, the Commissioner will need to work closely with the Chief Constable and Partners to ensure the delivery of his Police and Crime Plan whilst ensuring that a balanced budget is achieved in the light of significant reductions.

Signed:

Olly Martins
Police and Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire

Stephanie McMenamy
Chief Executive
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire

30 September 2013
Bedfordshire Police
Draft Annual Governance Statement of the Chief Constable

1. Scope of Responsibility

The Chief Constable is responsible for the delivery of operational policing for the County of Bedfordshire and for ensuring that business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards. In addition the Chief Constable is responsible for safeguarding public money, ensuring it is properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively. The Chief Constable also has a duty to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which the Force’s functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

In discharging this overall responsibility, the Chief Constable is also responsible for putting in proper arrangements for the governance of his affairs, facilitating the effective exercise of his functions, and which includes ensuring a sound system of internal control is maintained throughout the year and that arrangements are in place for the management of risk.

The Chief Constable, in conjunction with the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has approved and adopted a code of corporate governance, which is consistent with the principles of the CIPFA/SOLACE Framework: Delivering Good Governance in Local Government.

This statement explains how the Authority has complied with the code and also meets the requirements of regulation 4(2) of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 in relation to the system of internal control.

2. The Purpose of the Governance Framework

The governance framework comprises the systems and processes, and culture and values, by which the Chief Constable is directed and controlled and its activities through which he is accountable. It enables the PCC to monitor the achievement of the Chief Constable through the achievement of the Police and Crime Plan and to take account of the delivery of an appropriate, cost-effective service, including achieving value for money.

The system of internal control is a significant part of that framework and is designed to manage risk to a reasonable level. It cannot eliminate all risk of failure to achieve policies, aims and objectives; it can therefore provide only reasonable and not absolute assurance of effectiveness. The system of internal control is based on an ongoing process designed to identify and prioritise the risks to the achievement of the Commissioner’s policies, aims and objectives, to evaluate the likelihood of those risks being realised and the impact should they be realised, and to manage them efficiently, effectively and economically.

The governance framework has been in place since the PCC took up office on 22 November 2012.
3. The Governance Framework

This section describes the key elements of the systems and processes that comprise the governance arrangements that have been put into place for the Chief Constable. It explains the overarching structures that have been put in place to deal with systems and processes and how they are linked to each other. In producing this explanation steps have been taken to ensure that the actions identified in the Code of Corporate Governance are being complied with.

The statutory framework in which the Chief Constable as a Corporation Sole will operate is:

- Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act;
- Policing Protocol Order 2011;
- CIPFA Financial Management Code of Practice; and the
- Strategic Policing Requirement;

Focusing on Outcomes for the Local People

The Chief Constable set out his purpose and priorities, ‘to fight crime and protect the public’ in the Police Authority’s Strategic Plan. This plan stipulated the four deliverables of the Chief Constable being:

- Protection – by reducing crime and focusing on offences that cause most harm.
- Satisfaction – by agreeing the service we will provide and doing what we say we will do.
- Reassurance – by visible and active local policing, tackling anti-social behaviour and protecting the most vulnerable.
- Efficiency – by using our resources wisely to become one of the most efficient police forces in England and Wales.

These priorities and deliverables were continued with the introduction of the PCC’s Police and Crime Plan as well as those priorities with regards to the Strategic Policing Requirement.

Working together to achieve a common purpose with clearly defined functions and roles.

As set out above the governance arrangements have been developed in line with the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, the statutory Policing Protocol and the Home Office Financial Management Code of Practice.

The Scheme of Delegation includes details of the various duties delegated to senior officers. Financial Regulations (including contract standing orders) have been developed to ensure that the financial responsibilities of the Chief Constable are clear.

The Chief Constable regularly meets with the PCC and meets formally as an Executive Board on a monthly basis, along with the Deputy Chief Constable and Chief Finance Officer, to review activities and take decisions relating to strategy, governance and for the PCC to hold the Chief Constable to account.
The PCC also holds the Chief Constable to account, through the Alliance Summit Board for the provision of those services that have been or will be delivered collaboratively under Section 22 of the Police Act 1996.

The Force Executive Board and Joint Audit Committee review the risk registers to ensure a shared understanding of the strategic risks of the Force.
Promoting values and demonstrating the values of good governance through upholding high standards of conduct and behaviour

The Chief Constable has adopted a policy on Anti-Fraud and Corruption. The policy is designed to encourage prevention, promote detection and identify a clear pathway for investigation of fraudulent and/or corrupt activities or behaviour.

The Force takes the view that conduct issues are not just the domain of the collaborated Professional Standards Department. New codes of conduct and a review of the way police officers are subject to misconduct inquiries were introduced in October 2008, following the Taylor Report, directed at making timelier and less bureaucratic interventions.

The Force has policies for Professional Standards, which are tri-force policies, with Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, and a policy for whistleblowing to deal with all disclosures of inappropriate behaviour or malpractice, including fraud and misappropriation. This includes areas catered for under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998.

Policy is developed and assessed for equality impact. This ensures that compliance with legislation and the interest of stakeholders is considered prior to producing policy. Policy is managed corporately and individual policies are the responsibility of Heads of Business or the collaborated units.

Equality objectives have been agreed and published for the Force and the Chief Constable chairs an Equality and Diversity Board which considers equality issues on the delivery of our service both internally and externally.

Taking informed and transparent decisions which are subject to effective scrutiny and managing risk.

All decision making is carried out in accordance with the Governance framework.

The Governance arrangements ensure that the key decisions taken by the Chief Constable are made in the light of all necessary information and analysis and made public (unless exempt under the Provision of Access to Information rules). Appropriate legal, financial, human resources and other professional advice is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Chief Constable has appropriate oversight and scrutiny of the Force decision-making through the Force Executive Board.

The Force decision making process also includes a Force Resources Board, chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable which is fed by both the Continuous Improvement Board and the Performance Board.

The Force is subjected to an extensive internal and external inspection regime and the results of these inspections are published to ensure appropriate scrutiny of decision-making.

The Force’s Risk Management Strategy is fed by an Organisational Strategic Assessment that considers both current and future issues with regards to performance, organisational aspect, finance and changes in legislation.
The Force Executive review the Strategic Risk Register, which flows from the Organisational Strategic Assessment, on a monthly basis to ensure that all decisions made are made in cognisance of the Strategic Risks for the Force.

Particular emphasis has been placed on the clear distribution of roles and responsibilities and the distinctive ownership for risks. These are also considered at the relevant Governance Boards, dependent on the risk itself, of Force Resources Board, Continuous Improvement Board or Performance Board.

**Developing the capacity and capability of staff and officers to be effective.**

The Chief Constable takes a pro-active approach to staff development, and has developed processes that identify training requirements for individuals.

There is a programme in place for the senior officers of the Force who will require continuing professional development.

The Force adopted a programme of training to develop the investigation capability of the Force.

**Engaging with local people and other stakeholders to ensure robust public accountability.**

The Force, through their dedicated Chief Inspector roles regularly meet and discuss local issues with their Community Safety Partnership representatives to ensure that local issues are picked up and dealt with. The Chief Constable and Commissioner resisted reducing actual PCSO numbers in the 2013/14 budget thus continuing to provide a local resource to help enhance local engagement.

The Force has undertaken an internal workforce survey to help understand views of key stakeholders, i.e. staff and officers, in the delivery of their work and this will be tied in with an overall review of the Operational Policing Model to ensure that the service delivery meets the needs of the public.

The Force has initiated a Strategic Co-ordination Group with key partners as a result of the increase in gun crime to help formalise individual partners roles in gun crime specifically and more widely formalise roles for all partner agencies in prevention, education, reassurance and detection/investigation.

The Commissioner and Chief Constable have a joint Engagement Strategy.

**Reliable financial reporting and internal financial controls.**

Financial control involves the existence of a structure which ensures that all resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible to attain the overall objectives and targets. Internal financial control systems are in place to minimise the risk of loss, unlawful expenditure or poor value for money, and to maximise the use of the assets and limited resources. The Financial Regulations and Standing Orders provide the overarching framework for this control.

The Force’s financial management framework follows national and/or professional best practice and its key elements are set out below:

- The Chief Constable as Corporation Sole has a Chief Finance Officer (CFO) with responsibility under Section 151 of the Local Government Act
1972 to ensure that there are arrangements in place for the proper administration of financial affairs. The CFO also has certain statutory obligations under Section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 which cannot be delegated, namely, reporting any potentially unlawful decisions by the Force on expenditure and where a loss or deficiency may arise. The CFO must also report in the event that spending in the year is likely to exceed available resources. The organisation fully complies with the CIPFA Statement on the Role of the Chief Financial Officer in the Police Service.

- The finance function is governed by the Financial Regulations which are framed under the Home Office Code of Financial Management. The Chief Constable is responsible for adherence to Police Regulations and the Force monitored for additional compliance by HMIC and HM Revenue and Customs.

- Responsibility and accountability for resources rests with managers who are responsible for service provision.

- The Commissioner has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management requiring approval of an annual Treasury Management Strategy including an annual investment strategy which the Force adheres to.

- In accordance with the CIPFA Prudential Code and best accounting practice a four-year medium-term financial plan (MTFP) and a four-year capital programme are produced.

- The revenue budget provides an estimate of the annual income and expenditure requirements for Bedfordshire Police (PCC and Chief Constable) and sets out the financial implications of the Police and Crime Plan. It provides chief officers with the authority to incur expenditure and the basis on which to monitor the financial performance.

- Capital expenditure is an important element in the development the policing business since it represents major investment in new and improved assets. The Commissioner approves the capital programme each year and monitors its implementation and funding closely.

4. REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

The Chief Constable's role in maintaining the effectiveness of the governance framework extends to ensuring that there is an approved Code of Corporate Governance and that the Code includes the arrangements for review thereof.

The Chief Constable manages the Force through a series of Boards. The Force Executive Board (FEB), which is responsible for governance and strategic direction, is chaired by the Chief Constable. This is fed through three key strategic Boards, these being Continuous Improvement Board, focusing on change, The Performance Board, focusing on operational performance and the Resources Board, focusing on the strategic and value for money aspects of the resources of the Chief Constable.

Through the combination of these Boards the Chief Constable ensures there is a tight control framework around financial management, performance, corporate
governance and the risk management process and also oversees areas of business such as Professional Standards, Human Resources, and the Change Programme.

The Chief Constable and Commissioner have introduced a Joint Audit Committee which fulfills the core functions of an audit committee in accordance with the guidance set out in the CIPFA publication ‘Audit Committees – Practical Guidance for Local Authorities’.

The Force is subject to regular external scrutiny of the quality of service by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), internal and external auditors. Inspection reports are considered as appropriate and made public (unless this is not possible for the reasons outlined above).

- A review of integrity and standards resulted in the publication of a single national report from which strategic recommendations are being implemented through the collaborated professional standards department and this area of business was re inspected by the HMIC in 2012,
- The inspection into crime and incident recording standards resulted in favourable comment, both in terms of the correct recording of crimes and also the quality of the investigation.
- The Follow up Report on Anti-Social Behaviour provided for a positive picture for the Force.

The Joint Audit Committee plays a pivotal role in the system of internal control through its oversight of audit arrangements. The Committee approved the external audit plan and received the annual audit letter from the external auditor. The Committee also approved the annual internal audit plan, receives regular internal audit reports and monitored management performance against agreed action plans to address any weaknesses identified. In addition, the Committee oversaw progress on Risk Management and related issues.

The Head of Internal Audit’s Annual Report for the year ended 31 March 2013 has been received and was considered by the Interim Joint Audit Committee on 26th June 2013. The Report includes an opinion on the internal financial control framework which stipulates that the control framework is adequate, as shown below.

“For the 12 months ended 31 March 2013, based on the work we have undertaken for the Police Authority prior to 22 November 2012 and for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire and Bedfordshire Police Force since this time, in our opinion the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Bedfordshire and Bedfordshire Police Force has adequate and effective arrangements for governance, risk management and control.

Some of these arrangements are in the early stages of development and the new structures have not yet been subject to audit review and therefore these may require enhancing and embedding through the new structure of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Police Force.”
5. SIGNIFICANT GOVERNANCE ISSUES

In 2011/12 two issues of governance were identified, as shown below:

- **Governance in relation to Collaborated Services**
  Upon the introduction of the Commissioner a new Board has been created comprised of the three Commissioners and Chief Constables. This Board meets on a bi-monthly basis and has approved a Memorandum of Understanding to provide a bedrock for existing working arrangements for the Protective Services collaborative units.

- **Financial Challenges**
  The Chief Constable, in conjunction with the Commissioner has instigated a number of change programmes associated with collaboration and operational policing which will deliver both savings and ongoing performance. The Chief Constable has also, through the continuous Improvement Board and Force Resources Board put processes and a culture in place whereby the Force are identifying areas of saving on a regular basis to support both the current financial year as well as the medium term financial position.

In 2012/13 there were a few governance issues that the Chief Constable needed to or has had to address in relation to improvements, these are shown below:

- **Storage and Control of Controlled Drugs**
  An internal audit of this activity provided a low level of assurance and incorporated a fundamental recommendation. Based upon the low level of assurance immediate action was taken to strengthen the controls in this area and the internal auditors undertook a follow up audit that concluded that good progress had been made in strengthening the control environment for this activity.

- **Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)**
  The HMIC, following an examination of the Forces processes in relation to ASB highlighted areas of weakness within the processes. The Chief Constable undertook to improve in this area and the Force have recently received a positive report in relation to ASB after they were asked by the Chief Constable to undertake a follow up inspection.

- **Collaboration**
  The Chief Constable is reliant upon collaboration to secure savings for the Medium Term and to ensure delivery of services in the ‘back’ and ‘middle’ office functions i.e. Support Services and areas such as Contact Management and Custody, continues to be effective. Progress in these areas was slowed during 2012/13 and there is now an impetus on the Chief Constable to develop these areas of collaboration rapidly to support the medium term financial position, and in doing so where possible protect the operational/front-line policing resources.

- **Financial Challenges**
  The Force faces significant financial challenges over the Medium Term, with expectations that the next four year Comprehensive Spending Review, 2015/16 to 2018/19 will include similar levels of reduction as the previous CSR, which saw 20% reductions in police funding. The Chief Constable will therefore need to develop initiatives that bridge the funding gap these reductions in
funding produce whilst still delivering a police service that the public expect and maintain the performance ambition set out in the Police and Crime Plan.

Signed

John Fletcher  Philip Wells
Acting Chief Constable  Chief Finance Officer to the Chief Constable
SECTION 1
Executive Summary

The amendments to the 2002 Police Reform Act enacted in 2012 together with a change in the way complaints suitable for Local Resolution are dealt with has resulted in fluctuating performance figures during this current financial year. Some key points worthy of note are:

- The number of recorded complaint cases has increased compared to YTD for 2011/12, Beds 18%, Cambs 4% and Herts 32%. The results for Beds and Herts are primarily due to the change in recording practices and to move away from not formally recording complaints under the PRA but rather referring to them as a Dissatisfaction matter.

- The number of complaint allegations per 1000 employees over the last 3 years shows a levelling off of performance comparable across the 3 forces. This will be a key measure to consider during 2013/14 as recording practices will be stable from the beginning of the year.

- The categories of allegations that attract the most complaints remain the same as for many years, with ‘other neglect or failure in duty’ and ‘incivility, impoliteness and intolerance’ accounting for more than more than 36% of the total allegations in each of the 3 forces.

- Further work needs to be explored to ascertain a productivity measure in relation to the number of cases finalised year on year when compared to the number of cases recorded.

- The average time to resolve an investigated complaint is 58 days, 59 days and 53 days for Beds, Cambs and Herts respectively.

- The percentage of investigated complaints resolved within 60 days is 61%, 64% and 62% for Beds, Cambs and Herts respectively.

- The average time to resolve a local resolution complaint is 26 days, 25 days and 27 days for Beds, Cambs and Herts respectively.

- The percentage of complaints locally resolved within 30 days is 71%, 53% and 71% for Beds, Cambs and Herts respectively.

- The majority of appeals recorded and upheld are against the Outcome of an Investigation.

- The number of recorded conduct cases has decreased for all 3 forces and of those recorded there has been a reduction in those assessed as Gross Misconduct compared to last year.
As a result of conduct 5 employees were dismissed and 14 resigned.

SECTION 2
Public Complaints

This section provides data in relation to public complaints for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire Forces.

2.1 Cases Recorded

A public complaint case may contain one or multiple allegations made by a member or members of the public against person/s serving with the police force. One case signifies a single investigation.
Key Points:
The monthly figures show that a high number of cases were recorded during Oct 12 and Jan 13; during Oct 12 Cambs and Herts recorded their highest number of cases in one month and Jan 13 Beds recorded their highest alongside Herts second highest.

End of year figures display all three forces have seen an increase in the number of complaint cases recorded compared to last year, Beds 18%, Cambs 4% and Herts 32%. In comparison to the previous year against 2010/11 all three forces saw a decrease in the number of complaint cases recorded; Beds by 39%, Cambs 21% and Herts 19%.

The three year fluctuation for Beds and Herts is mainly due to recording practices as during the three years a new category of recording known as Dissatisfaction was implemented with only 2011/12 seeing a full year of recording in this category. Including these figures in the main complaint category 2012/13 would report a 10% decrease for Beds compared to last year and Herts an increase of 6%. This cannot be said for Cambs as they did not record Dissatisfaction due to the fact that the process was implemented prior their collaboration and ceased not too much longer after.

Taking dissatisfaction into account it is evident that all three forces are aligned in the recording decision making.

Last year saw the number of allegations per 1000 employees exceptionally high for all three forces; this year it has significantly decreased. Beds and Cambs has also seen a decrease against the previous year whereas Herts has slightly increased.

2.2 Allegations Recorded

A complaint case can have multiple allegations within it, the allegations are categorised by the Home Office. The table below is a reflection of the top four public complaint allegations recorded April 2012 – Mar 2013, compared to the same period last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Public Allegations</th>
<th>Beds 11-12</th>
<th>Beds 12-13</th>
<th>Cambs 11-12</th>
<th>Cambs 12-13</th>
<th>Herts 11-12</th>
<th>Herts 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Other neglect or failure in duty</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Incivility, impoliteness and intolerance</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Oppressive conduct or harassment</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Other assault</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Points:
The top four allegations recorded across the three forces have remained consistent compared to last year and is in line with the national trend as reported by the IPCC. These account for over half of all complaints for each force.

The increase in recorded allegations is in line with the increase in cases with Beds continually reporting on average 1.9 allegations per case; Cambs a slight decrease from 2.3 to 2.0 and Herts 2.3 to 2.2.
### 2.3 Cases Finalised

The charts below show the number of complaint cases finalised, with a rolling 12 month average together with chart for the last 3 years.

#### Chart 4 Complaint cases finalised

#### Chart 5 Complaint cases finalised over the last 3 years

**Key Points:**

Compared to last year Cambs is the only force to have seen a decrease in productivity; compared to 2010/11 all three forces have significantly decreased. The fluctuation for Beds and Herts could be aligned to the recording and finalising of Dissatisfaction.

The average complaint cases finalised for all three forces has seen a slight increase over the last three months after it having been stabilised during the previous five months.
### 2.4 Complaint Allegations Results

Each allegation within a case is independently resolved and can be resulted in the following ways, Withdrawn, Disapplied, Locally Resolved or Investigated. Where an allegation is investigated it will be either found Upheld or Not Upheld. Where a complaint allegation is Upheld the result against subjects will either be Case to Answer or No Case to Answer.

**Complaints Allegations Finalised**

**Chart 6** Complaint allegations finalised over the last 3 years

**Chart 7** Complaint allegations upheld over the last 3 years

**Chart 8** Allegations not upheld over the last 3 years

**Chart 9** Complaint allegations locally resolved over the last 3 years

**Key Points:**

The number of complaint allegations finalised is reflective of the complaint cases with Cambs showing a reduction.

All three forces have seen an increase in the number of allegations Upheld and Not Upheld compared to last year, Beds by 34%, Cambs 53% and Herts 72%; Beds 23%, Cambs 3% and Herts 37% respectively. Cambs report a slight decrease in the number of allegations Locally Resolved, whilst Beds and Herts display an increase this is reflective of the Dissatisfaction recording process as allegations suitable for Local Resolution were recorded in the category of Dissatisfaction hence the reduction in the previous year.

Although an allegation result is Upheld it is not necessarily true that the individuals involved would have a Case to Answer. Compared to last year the number of subjects who had their result as a Case to Answer has decreased for Cambs from 86% to 53%; Beds and Herts have increased both standing at 42% and 45% respectively.
2.5 Timeliness of Complaint Cases

This is a measure from the date a case is recorded to the date the complainant is informed of the outcome. The charts are showing Year to Date figures.

Key Points:

Compared to the previous year all three forces have improved in the percentage of investigated cases finalised within 60 days, Beds from 54% to 61%, Cambs 64% from 60% and Herts 62% from 50%; also a decrease in investigations taking over 120 days with Beds from 15% to 4%; Cambs 10% to 5% and Herts 6% to 4%.

Compared to the previous year those Locally Resolved both Beds and Herts have seen an increase in the percentage of cases finalised within 30 working days; Beds from 33% to 71% and Herts 38% to 71%. Cambs has seen a decrease from 63% to 53%.

The average number of days to investigate a complaint is similar amongst the three forces, Beds 57.8%, Cambs 58.8% and Herts 52.6%; this is a significant decrease compared to last year’s 111.8%, 91% and 78.7% respectively. This is also true for those locally resolved with Beds 26%, Cambs 25% and Herts 26.5% compared to 51.5%, 35.5% and 42.5% respectively.

The percentage of all cases finalised taking over 120 working days has also decreased for all three forces compared to last year to 3% this year.
2.6 Discriminatory Behaviour Allegations

Key Points:

Compared to last year both Beds and Herts have seen a decrease in the number of Discriminatory Behaviour allegations recorded whilst Cambs has significantly increased; this is also true of those finalised.

Chart 14 shows that by far Race is the largest sub category of Discriminatory Behaviour allegations accounting for over 50% of those recorded across all three forces and has been consistently ranged from 50% to 80% over the last 3 years. Of all allegations recorded Discriminatory Behaviour has consistently accounted for a range between 2% - 4.5%.

As seen in Chart 16 the number of allegations that have been Locally Resolved or Upheld have decreased since 2010 and has since been very low numbers; this is due to more allegations being investigated and Not Upheld. In 2010 the percentage of allegations Not Upheld has increased for Beds from 25% to 57%; Cambs 18% to 71% and Herts 41% to 85%.
### 2.7 Organisational Allegation Recorded

#### Table 2: Organisational Allegations Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Beds 11-12</th>
<th>Beds 12-13</th>
<th>Cambs 11-12</th>
<th>Cambs 12-13</th>
<th>Herts 11-12</th>
<th>Herts 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Policing Standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operational Management Decisions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisational Decisions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Policy on Operational Policing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Organisational Allegations</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Points:

Beds have seen a 61% decrease in the number of Organisational allegations recorded and Herts 70%; Cambs has seen a significant increase.

The legislation change in November 2012 required Organisational allegations to be recorded under the Police Reform Act and since the implementation the number of Organisational allegations have significantly decreased, with Beds & Herts recording 3 and Cambs 5; it is not evident that this is the cause for the decrease as both forces had significantly decreased by the end of November, Beds by 61% and Herts 55%. Although Cambs has increased a possible factor for this is that they did not before collaboration record Organisational allegations on the PSD database.

### SECTION 3

#### Appeals

The complainant has the right to appeal against three main areas which are Non Recording of a Complaint, Local Resolution Process and the Outcome of an Investigation.

#### IPCC Appeals

The majority of IPCC appeals recorded for all 3 forces are against the Outcome of an Investigation, they account for 89% of Beds, 88% of Cambs and 87% of all Herts recorded IPCC appeals.

Beds has a 12% decrease in the number of IPCC appeals recorded compared to last year, this is mainly in the number against Non Recording of a Complaint. Herts has a 5% increase, all against the Outcome of an Investigation. Cambs has a 24% decrease spread across the three appeal categories.

The percentage of Upheld IPCC appeals has decreased for Beds from 38% to 23% and all those Upheld are against the Outcome of an Investigation. Cambs has seen an increase from 22% to 39% and Herts from 29% to 30% with the increases in those against the Outcome of an Investigation.

#### FORCE Appeals

The appropriate authority for appeals was amended in the November 2012 legislation with some appeals now being dealt with by PSD.

Beds have recorded 7 Force appeals, 5 against Outcome of Local Resolution and 2 Application for Disapplication, Cambs 2 against Outcome of Local Resolution and Herts 10 against Outcome of Local Resolution and 1 Application for Disapplication.

No Force appeals have been Unheld.
SECTION 4
Conducts

4.1 Cases Recorded

A conduct case may contain one or multiple breaches of the Code of Professional Standards. One case signifies a single investigation and could emanate from a public complaint or an internal matter.

Chart 18 Conduct cases recorded over the last 3 years excluding those from within a complaint

Chart 19 Conduct recorded from and within a complaint

Chart 20 Conduct cases recorded per 1000 employees last three years

Key Points:

Compared to last year Cambs & Herts have seen a decrease in the number of internal matters conduct cases recorded; Beds has seen an increase of 1. Those emanating from a complaint have remained stable.

Conducts that arise from a public complaint are very small, Beds have none recorded this year compared to Cambs 5% and Herts 3% of total Conducts recorded.

The number of Conducts recorded per 1000 employees has significantly decreased for Cambs from 14 to 7; Herts decrease is from 10 to 8. And Beds has remained stable with 10.

Of the Conduct cases recorded this year 12% of Beds, 38% of Cambs and 23% of Herts were initially assessed as gross misconduct this is a significant decrease compared to last year’s 46%, 44% and 49% respectively.
4.2 Breaches Recorded within a Conduct Case

A conduct case can have multiple breaches within it, which are categorised by the Home Office. The table below is a reflection of breaches recorded in conduct and complaint cases recorded April 2012 to February 2012 compared to the same period last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beds 11-12</th>
<th>Beds 12-13</th>
<th>Cambs 11-12</th>
<th>Cambs 12-13</th>
<th>Herts 11-12</th>
<th>Herts 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Points:

- Conduct breaches have reduced compared to last year for all three forces, Beds by 13%, Cambs 50% and Herts 2%.
- The number of breaches within a Conduct case that was initially assessed as gross misconduct has significantly decreased, Beds by 78%, Cambs 57% and Herts 53%.

4.3 Conduct Results

The conduct results identified in the key points section below are for those cases finalised during the period which may or may not include any of the cases recorded during the same period.

Key Points:

- The number of Conduct cases finalised this year has decreased across the three forces; of those finalised 87% of Beds, 68% Cambs and 97% of Herts were found to have a Case to Answer. Compared to last year this is an increase for Beds and Herts from 69% and 75% respectively; Cambs has reduced from 83%.
- The 23 cases finalised by Beds involved 26 employees of which 4 resigned, 2 dismissed and 3 received a final written warning. Cambs finalised 22 cases involving 23 employees, 4 of whom resigned 1 was dismissed and 1 received a final written warning. 30 cases involving 33 employees were finalised by Herts, 6 resigned 2 were dismissed, 6 received a final written warning and 1 was referred as UPP.