Service Transformation Appendix B

FCID presentation of risk to Strategic Project Board
30 April 2014



Service Transformation 'Option 3' implementation options



Information

- Service transformation is due to be implemented in phases between 2nd June 2014 and the end of November 2014.
- •The phased implementation will create a shortfall of staff to investigate SAC and MIT offences on LPUs that do not move to the new operating model in phase 1. This shortfall is **81 staff** during phase two, falling to **60 staff** during phase four.
- •Various options to address this risk were presented to DCC Rowe.
- 'Option 3' was selected based on information received from the Service Transformation team, HR, IT services and FCID.
- 'Option 3' ensures that the homicide unit and emerging trends teams will go live in phase 1 as planned but will support the investigation of MIT and SAC offences throughout the implementation period.
- The emerging trends team will be amalgamated with the gangs task force to form six Force Priorities teams that will deliver the terms of reference for both.
- DCC Rowe has directed that a crime allocation policy be written to minimise the organisational risks surrounding MIT and SAC investigation during the implementation period.
- ACC Nicholson has commissioned FCID SLT to produce a series of options regarding this policy in line with the national decision making model.

Overview of Threat-Risks

- Impacts on following key issues
- Public and protecting them from harm, quality of service and confidence
- Performance Police and Crime Plan (Strive to have lowest ever crime levels, Improve service to public)
- People Staff morale, ability to give their best
- Project Perception, reputation
- Therefore we need to ensure that we
- Minimise the risk to the public
- Minimise the impact on the force through this phased approach
- Maximise our ability to deliver a quality service to the public
- Deliver timely and accurate communication for our people to understand
- Maximise the integrity of the project

Overview of Threat and Risk

- 1. Reduce capability to conduct MIRSAP compliant murder investigations (divert Homicide staff)
- 2. Reduce capacity to mitigate threats to life (divert Force Priorities Team staff)
- 3. Undermine quality of victim safeguarding and support (inconsistent ownership of SAC & MIT)
- 4. Increase risk of missed investigative and enforcement opportunities (inconsistent performance accountability and reduced performance)
- 5. Increase risk of disjointed investigations, reducing effectiveness to reduce/detect (LPU offence investigation split between central and local resources)
- 6. Reduce capacity to support LPUs with emerging trends/priorities (divert Force Priorities Team staff)
- 7. Risk that lack of capacity/skills delay or undermine investigation (need for crime allocation policy)
- 8. Risk of post-implementation compromise to investigation/trial/victim care (need for crime reallocation policy)
- 9. Reputation of project and new operating model could be compromised (need for credible communication strategy)
- 10. Reduce capability to meet regional tasking requests (divert Force Priorities Team staff)

Threat and risk

- Protect life Article 2 ECHR. The use of staff from the homicide unit to support MIT and SAC offences will prevent the implementation of a shift pattern capable of delivering MIRSAP compliant murder investigations 7 days a week.
- 2. Protect life Article 2 ECHR. The use of staff from force priorities teams will reduce the capacity for them to support hot tasks relating to threats to life.
- Quality of service and consistency of victim care. Inconsistent ownership and governance of SAC and MIT offences could undermine the quality of safeguarding and victim support.
- 4. Force performance. Inconsistent ownership and governance of SAC and MIT offences could undermine accountability for performance and increase risk of missed opportunities in relation to proactive investigations, neighbourhood enforcement and offender management.

Cont....

Threat and risk

- 5. Force performance. The investigation of SAC and MIT offences on the same LPU will be split between central and locally based resources creating risk of disjointed investigations and a lack of information sharing between these teams, LPU's and force intelligence.
- 6. Capacity and skills base to manage force priorities. The use of staff from the force priorities teams will significantly reduce the capacity for FCID to support LPU's with emerging trends, cross border SAC / MIT offences and other hot tasks. LPU investigations teams are not built to meet this demand in terms of capacity or skills base.
- 7. Crime allocation policy. A clear and robust crime allocation policy will be required to ensure that all SAC and MIT offences are allocated to teams with capacity and skills base to respond quickly and effectively.
- 8. Crime <u>re-</u>allocation policy. A clear and robust crime reallocation policy will be required at each phase of the implementation period to transfer SAC and MIT offences from the homicide unit and force priorities teams to LPU's without undermining victim care or pre trial requirements.

Cont.....

Threat and risk

- 9. Communication plan. A clear and credible internal communication strategy is required to ensure that the implementation period does not undermine the reputation of the project or new operating model.
- 10. Regional responsibilities. Ability of the force priorities teams to meet responsibilities from regional tasking.

Consequential risks on other departments and functions would need to be further considered through the Service Transformation Strategic Board.

Powers and policy

Include:

- ECHR Articles, primarily Article 2 Right to Life
- The Victim's Code 2013 sets out the services to be provided by criminal justice agencies to victims of crime, laying down minimum standards of service including revised timescales in which victims can expect to receive them.
- Police and Crime Plan 2013-The plan includes commitments to increase public confidence in policing, while sustaining the downward pattern in recorded crime.



Option A

Force Priorities Teams support SAC investigations and Homicide unit support MIT investigations on LPUs that have not yet changed operating model through the implementation period.

The service transformation team has calculated the degree to which demand will exceed capacity of remaining MIT/SAC officers, and stated that the resource requirement for this option is:

3 x Force Priorities Teams for phases 1-3, reducing to 2 teams at phase 4 (due to volume that is taken out of demand at this phase) and 1 team at phase 5.

2 x Homicide teams for phases 1-4, reducing to 1 team at Phase 5.



Option B

Force Priorities Teams support SAC and MIT investigations (which are a designated a force priority throughout implementation) on LPUs that have not yet changed operating model through the implementation period.

Homicide unit is dedicated to the terms of reference set under service transformation.

Given that homicide teams are bigger than the emerging trends teams, this option is likely to require all of the staff being posted into Force Priorities Teams from emerging trends for phases 1 to 3 and then reducing in phases 4 and 5.

As this still does not generate enough staff for Phases 1 & 2 (at phase 3, we can start to reduce capacity against demand), they will require further support from elsewhere (option C)

Options and contingencies Serving our communities, protecting them from harm



Option C

If it is decided that the threat and risk is not effectively mitigated by options A or B then the SAC and MIT investigations will need additional support from other teams and departments.

Such teams could include the staff posted onto force priorities from the gangs task force, homicide unit, the FCID violent crime teams, local investigation teams or the PPU.

This would require further data analysis from the STT, and should include the added demand of the summer period (World Cup, AL abstractions, etc) but in brief:

SAC & MIT for first 3 phases of project (prior to Phase 4) = **shortfall of 81 FTE** Use of 36 (6 teams) Emerging Trends staff = shortfall of 45 FTE

Additionality option:

Use of 21 Gangs Task Force staff = shortfall of 24

Alternative option:

Reallocation of specific crime types to other team/department/LPU during Phase 1-3 eg: s.18 with permanent life altering injury = Homicide Team s.18 DA related = PPU

STT will model the volume of appropriate crime types for consideration

Review

It is proposed that once a preferred option is chosen, the service transformation team should conduct regular reviews throughout the implementation period:

- To review implementation in line with operating model (to include effectiveness of crime allocation)
- To identify emerging or unforeseen threat and risk and highlight for early intervention and service recovery
- To identify successes and opportunities for organisational learning