

SOUTH WEST POLICE AUTHORITIES JOINT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the
South West Police Authorities Joint Committee (SWPAJC) held at
Salisbury Police Station, Wilton Rd, Salisbury on 1 February 2010 at 9.30am.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Devon and Cornwall Police Authority

Mr M Bull

Mr B Preston

Dorset Police Authority

Mr M Taylor CBE DL

Mr B Cooper

Gloucestershire Police Authority

Mrs V Clouston

Dr M Gibbs

Wiltshire Police Authority

Mr C Hoare (*to item 9 only*)

ALSO PRESENT

Mr A Champness (Chief Executive, Gloucestershire Police Authority)

Mr M Goscomb (Chief Executive, Dorset Police Authority)

Ms S Howl (Chief Executive, Devon and Cornwall Police Authority)

Mr K Kilgallen (Chief Executive, Wiltshire Police Authority)

Mr M Prince (Treasurer, Gloucestershire Police Authority)

Mr P Rook (Treasurer, Dorset Police Authority)

Mr M Baker (Chief Constable, Dorset Police)

Mr S Otter (Chief Constable, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary)

Mr D Ainsworth (Deputy Chief Constable, Wiltshire Police) (*to item 9 only*)

Mr C Lee (Deputy Chief Constable, Dorset Police & Senior Responsible Officer,
South West Regional Collaboration Programme)

Mr M Bennion-Pedley (Programme Director, South West Regional Collaboration
Programme)

Mrs R Bassett (Programme Manager, South West Regional Collaboration
Programme)

Mr R Martin (Policy Officer, Devon and Cornwall Police Authority)

1. Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Mr Taylor opened the meeting and welcomed everyone present to the inaugural meeting of the South West Police Authorities Joint Committee.

Apologies were received from Mr B Crowther (Gloucestershire Police Authority), Mr T Melville (Chief Constable, Gloucestershire Police) and Mr B Moore (Chief Constable, Wiltshire Police).

Mr Hoare reported that he and Mr Ainsworth would need to leave the meeting at 12pm.

2. Terms of Reference and Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Members agreed that the Terms of Reference would be considered at the next meeting of the SWPAJC.

Mr Hoare proposed Mr Bull as Chair of the SWPAJC. Seconded by Mr Preston. There were no other nominations.

Mr Bull proposed Mr Hoare as Vice Chair of the SWPAJC. Seconded by Mr Cooper. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED

That

i) Mr M Bull be elected Chairman of the South West Police Authorities Joint Committee.

ii) Mr C Hoare be elected Vice Chairman of the South West Police Authorities Joint Committee.

Mr Bull thanked the Committee for electing him Chairman. He stated he looked forward to working with the Programme Team to drive forward with energy the effective collaboration amongst the Forces and Authorities in the region.

The Chairman also welcomed the representatives from the unions and Staff Associations present.

The Chairman expressed his disappointment that Avon & Somerset Police Authority had chosen not to be part of the SWPAJC at this time. He hoped that this would change but stated that there would need to be further discussion regionally as to how to best operate the regional governance arrangements given Avon & Somerset's position.

The Vice Chairman supported this view and hoped that Avon & Somerset Police Authority would engage with the SWPAJC even if this only meant they attended the public part of the Joint Committee as observers.

The Chairman indicated that the Joint Committee's work would be stronger and more effective if all five regional police authorities committed to it. Accordingly, the Chairman offered to contact the Chairman of the Avon & Somerset Police Authority on behalf of the SWPAJC urging that Authority to reconsider its position in relation to the SWPAJC.

It was pointed out that it was important to recognise that all five Forces already work collaboratively on a day-to-day basis on operational policing matters. This will not be affected by the work of the SWPAJC.

The Chairman stated that the picture of collaborative working in the regional was understandably complex. The detail of which of the five Forces was engaged in which project needed to be clearly spelt out to assist Members and officers of this Committee as well as the Unions and Staff Associations. The Chairman asked the Programme Director to prepare this.

The Chairman also asked the Programme Director to undertake to brief the Police Federation and Unions on the governance aspects of the Regional Collaboration Programme.

RESOLVED

That

- i) the Chairman approach the Chairman of the Avon & Somerset Police Authority with a view to encouraging them to reconsider their position with the SWPAJC.*
- ii) The Programme Director prepare a table of the different projects and work streams of the Regional Collaboration Programme indicating which Forces are engaged with each.*
- iii) The Programme Director brief the Police Federation and Unions on the governance aspects of the Regional Collaboration Programme.*

3. Governance Paper and Programme Initiation Document

The Regional Collaboration Programme SRO presented a report detailing the governance arrangements to enable the delivery of the South West Regional Collaboration Programme.

Certain aspects of the document would need to be updated following decisions taken earlier during this meeting.

Mr Goscomb reminded the Committee that, for reasons discussed earlier, in future it would be necessary for the South West Regional Chiefs' & Chairs' meeting to be held in two parts: the first part with Avon & Somerset Police Authority present, and the second part without them. This latter stage would be referred to as the Board under the new governance arrangements outlined within the Joint Committee agreement.

The SRO explained that the Project Initiation Document (PID) established the starting point of the Regional Programme and mapped out the planned series of work and scope of the effort required.

Mr Champness asked the table at paragraph 5.9 be populated once individual authorities had agreed their budgets for the forthcoming year.

RESOLVED

That

- i) the South West Regional Collaboration Programme governance framework be noted.*
- ii) The South West Regional Collaboration Programme Project Initiation Document be approved.*

4. Programme Update Report and Funding for 2010-11

The Regional Collaboration Programme Director provided Members with an update of the progress made across the full spectrum of the region's collaborative activities.

There are currently twenty-one different strands of collaborative working in the region. Most of these involve Avon & Somerset except those where the Southwest One initiative excludes them from doing so.

The Programme Director highlighted certain points within his report.

Firearms - a common armoury asset management system is being implemented by Avon and Somerset, Devon & Cornwall, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire. Dorset have agreed to adopt the same product in due course and the programme team is working up a mechanism to achieve this, whilst preserving the discounts offered by the software supplier for a 'whole region' adoption.

Mobile data - Devon & Cornwall have decided not to go ahead with the mobile data investment at this time due to its 2012 major change programme. It is anticipated that Dorset and/or Gloucestershire will take up additional licences to enable the original contract to remain on track.

Mr Otter apologised for Devon & Cornwall's withdrawal from the mobile data arrangements but explained it was necessary to embed the new critical systems it was procuring through its change programme before adding a front-end application such as this.

The Chairman stated that this was likely to be an issue that arose again in the future but stressed that the important principle was regional commitment rather than all agreeing to doing something at the same time.

Mrs Clouston hoped that between Gloucestershire and Dorset, they would be able to accommodate the extra licences. The Programme Director reported he would be meeting with representatives from Gloucestershire Police on 2 February 2010 to clarify the situation.

Dr Gibbs questioned the RAG status (green) this issue had been given in the Programme Highlight Report. There may be some significant issues for Gloucestershire on this matter and a green status did not sit comfortably with Gloucestershire's feel for the situation.

ICT - The region has appointed an ISIS/ ICT Architect & Delivery Manager, Mr Brian McCartney - based at Avon & Somerset. Alongside DCC David Ainsworth, the nominated Chief Officer Lead for Information Management in the region, Mr McCartney is scheduled to deliver a presentation on the subject of ICT convergence to Chiefs and Chairs on 26 March 2010.

Identity access management - A regional proposal has been agreed which should bring financial savings of at least £350,000 over individual approaches.

Management of change - Progress in agreeing a regional management of change policy to assist in the treatment of staff impacted by initiatives and proposals resulting from regional collaboration is not progressing as quickly as would be liked. HR Directors are meeting prior to a report to Chiefs and Chairs on 26 March 2010 to ensure unions and staff associations are fully sighted.

Programme budget - The Programme Director stated that subject to a £30,000 contribution from each of the five Authorities, plus 25% of the first full year's savings

of any workstream delivered, the Programme should remain financially viable until 31 March 2011, at which point the SWPAJC will need to take a view about its future direction.

Mr Prince questioned the savings the Programme will have realised and the spend that would have been incurred.

The SRO explained that the PID contained detail of this and clarified that each Police Authority would get back more in terms of financial savings than the Programme Team cost. A benefits log was in preparation which would pick up this issue. Members were advised that the South West invested significantly less than other regions and the SRO would be seeking further financial support in the future.

Mr Otter called for further clarity on the investment versus benefits data provided in the report. It was suggested a graphical representation showing when returns on investment took effect would help to illustrate this to the Committee and assist Members when reporting back to their parent Authorities.

RESOLVED

That

i) the Programme Delivery Update report be noted.

ii) The risk register together with the proposed mitigation factors and expected risk closure dates be endorsed.

iii) The continuation of the programme funding along the lines set out in the report be agreed.

5. Procurement Shared Service - proposed Tender, Timescales and Communication Statement

The Programme Director presented a report setting out the proposed tender for the contract for a partner to support the establishment of a joint shared procurement service, together with the associated communication requirements.

The Chiefs and Chairs considered the business case for this project on 18 December 2009 and supported the move to a joint in-house shared service between the four Authorities. It was also recognised that external consultancy support would be required to assist the four in establishing and supporting this new arrangement.

The Programme Manager reported that there were already good examples of joint working and effective framework agreements amongst the four Procurement teams. However, the level of savings achievable by creating one shared service would be much more significant, with net cashable savings of up to £24.7 million predicted over an eight year period through the shared service (in house) approach. The Programme Manager emphasised that this would be a major change to the way procurement is currently undertaken – hence the need for external support to guide the forces through the process.

The recommended approach was for the Committee to agree to go to the market to seek its professional expertise on how best to approach this major change and obtain costed proposals for helping the four forces establish and sustain the new arrangements, so that it could then deliver the scale of benefits predicted. This

would then give the four authorities the benefits information and hopefully reassurance they would need to progress implementation of the shared service and commit the resources needed to make it happen. The actual draft tender document itself would be considered by the Committee later under exempt business because it was commercially sensitive.

Mr Otter suggested that the report did not set out clearly enough what it was that was needed at this stage. The business case refers to an estimated investment requirement of £1.2 million across the region and Devon & Cornwall, as an example, did not have anything budgeted for this.

Other Members of the Committee including Mr Taylor and Mr Bull agreed that the supporting papers did not set out clearly enough what it was the Committee were being recommended. There was a feeling amongst the Committee Members that it was unlikely a contracting agent would be willing to submit a tender unless it had confidence that the region would have the financial provision to meet it.

Further detailed discussion took place on this issue. The Chairman commented that it was clear that further dialogue was needed, particularly between the Programme Team and the Directors of Finance from the four Forces and the Programme Director acknowledged that the papers should have been clearer. In the course of the ensuing discussion, Members were agreed that the four authorities are looking for a partner to support them in establishing a shared procurement service to deliver the scale of benefits sought, as endorsed by Chiefs and Chairs at their December meeting. This would need to be clearly reflected in the invitation to tender.

The Programme Director then went on to explain that the team had included the estimated investment figure of £1.2 million so that Members were sighted on the potential costs of establishing and sustaining a shared service capable of delivering the scale of benefits predicted. However, he confirmed that the actual level of investment required would depend upon the proposals received from the market and that the team were hoping that some suppliers would propose a 'risk and reward' model, thereby allowing authorities to provide less up-front investment, if this is what they wanted to do. He also confirmed that no investment was required at this stage.

Mr Baker suggested that in the light of this, the second recommendation in the report should be changed to:

“note the potential investment requirements” rather than “endorse the investment requirements”.

The Committee accepted this suggestion.

In conclusion therefore it was agreed that the SWPAJC was not signing-up to the headline expenditure at this time but was supporting a procurement exercise to identify a partner to support them in establishing a shared procurement service to deliver the scale of benefits sought. The SWPAJC asked for confirmation that the results of the tender process would be brought back to the next meeting clarifying

the recommended resourcing levels sought from each of the four Authorities and the savings they could expect and / or are guaranteed to receive as a result.

Finally there was discussion regarding the appropriate procurement route (recommendation 1 of the paper) and it was agreed that an OJEU process would be most appropriate.

Post Meeting Note – following discussion with the lead procurement authority for this process (Dorset), the tender exercise will now be conducted using an OJEU ‘competitive dialogue’ route, with the results coming back for consideration by the SWPAJC in October 2010.

Members then considered the draft Communications statement. The Chairman called for there to be greater distinction between the ‘5/4’ issue (meaning where Avon & Somerset are included and when they are not).

The Vice Chairman commented that the statement needed further work to correct some inconsistencies. Generally, however the statement was endorsed.

RESOLVED

That

- i) the majority preference for an in-house shared procurement service be noted.*
- ii) Further dialogue needed to take place between the Programme team and Directors of Finance to ensure their endorsement of the Invitation to Tender and their engagement with the procurement process*
- iii) The proposed procurement process should be commenced but, in so doing, it be clarified that the four authorities are looking for a partner to support them in establishing a shared procurement service to deliver the scale of benefits sought.*
- iv) The potential investment requirement of £1.2 million be noted but that the actual level of investment required would emerge from the market exercise and that the SWPAJC would meet again to determine if and how to proceed before any investment decisions be taken*
- v) The Communications statement be approved subject to clarification on the ‘5/4’ Force / Authority issue.*

6. Programme Plan for 2010-2011

The Programme SRO presented a report outlining the main projects the South West Regional Collaboration Programme will be progressing during 2010-2011. The document was under continuing development and awaited the Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) from each of the workstreams prior to it being finalised.

Mr Baker updated the Committee on a meeting of the National Protective Services Board which met in the week commencing 25 January 2010. He advised Members that there appeared to be a risk to promised Regional funding due to apparent civil servant sympathy to divert money from this region to elsewhere in the country. This was coupled with the fear that there is a perception nationally that the South West Region lags behind in this business area.

It is hoped that a visit to the region by Home Office officials scheduled for 9 February 2010 will be an opportunity to address these concerns and demonstrate plans to progress the issue.

Mr Prince called for benefits to be more clearly defined in the Programme Plan.

RESOLVED

That

i) the South West Regional Collaboration Programme Plan 2010-2011 be approved.

7. Joint Policing Plan Chapter

The Programme SRO presented the draft Joint Policing Plan Chapter for approval. This had been drafted following agreement from the regional police authorities at the Visioning Day in June 2009 that it would be beneficial to both the agreed regional vision and the collaboration programme to have a common chapter in individual Policing Plans for 2010. The Programme SRO also made reference to the Regional Policing Plan launch event scheduled for 29 March 2010.

The proposed Joint Chapter had already been agreed in general terms by the Chiefs and Chairs and Regional ACPO.

Members debated the drafting of the Common Chapter. Comment was made about the style of the document and Members reflected that the language used was rather general and lacked focus. Mr Baker identified the need for the financials to be included in the Joint Chapter in future years.

Members appreciated that this was a tricky paper to get right and did not lend itself well to being drafted by Committee. However, there was general agreement that the document as it stood was too vague and would benefit from being more specific in what exactly the Programme would be delivering.

Mr Champness offered to work with the Programme Director to refine the wording of the paragraphs relating to the Regional Asset Recovery Team and mobile data.

The Chairman summed up the discussions by broadly supporting the approach to the document but with some of the wording to be refined and sharpened a little.

RESOLVED

That

i) the South West Regional Collaboration Joint Policing Plan Chapter 2010-2011 be approved subject to some further refinement.

8. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

9. Dates of Future Meetings

The Chairman asked that Ms Howl consult the Programme SRO and Chief Executives outside of the meeting to propose future meeting dates.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break.

Mr Tovagliari (Devon and Cornwall Police Federation) sought the Chairman's permission that the Staff association representatives be permitted to remain in the room during discussion of the Closed items.

Ms Govey (Unison - South West Region) echoed this request stating that the union had a long history of treating sensitive information confidentially.

The Chairman stated that he was conscious of the Staff associations' views and heard their views and would discuss with Committee colleagues whether in future there were ways in which to deal with these sensitive issues in some other way. However, on this occasion the press and public would be excluded.

The meeting resumed.

10. Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED

That

i) in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting for the business specified in Items 11, 12 and 13 below because it is likely that if a member of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

11. Corporate Services Due Diligence Proposal

Closed Para 3, Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972

12. Procurement - Draft Specification for External Consultancy

Closed Para 3, Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972

13. Streamlining Firearms Licensing and Similar Business Processes through ICT - Proposed Procurement and Draft User Agreement

Closed Para 3, Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972

The meeting closed at 12.43pm.

Approved by SWPAJC 4 May 2010